United States of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, January 28, 1970*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

*Happy is the man that findeth wisdom and the man that getteth understanding.*—Proverbs 3: 13.

Almighty God, who art our light in darkness, our life in trouble, and our love in sorrow, bless us as with one mind we draw to Thee seeking the power of Thy presence and the guidance of Thy spirit.

Throughout this day keep our hearts with Thee that in quiet confidence we may solve the perplexing problems of these hours with a wisdom greater than our own.

In the midst of this divided world send us forth as heralds of good will crossing all barriers of class and creed that we may make our contribution to the glorious day when justice and freedom shall live in every heart and in every nation.

In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

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

### CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. 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. 6]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Anderson, Tenn. | Fulton, Tenn. | Moss |
| Ashley | Gallagher | Murphy, N.Y. |
| Broyhill, N.C. | Green, Oreg. | Nichols |
| Burke, Fla. | Hawkins | Ottinger |
| Cabell | Hébert | Pollock |
| Celler | Hollfield | Powell |
| Clark | Kastenmeier | Pryor, Ark. |
| Clay | Kirwan | Rosenthal |
| Corman | Lipscomb | St. Onge |
| Cramer | Lloyd | Sandman |
| Davis, Ga. | McFall | Scheuer |
| Dawson | Macdonald, Mass. | Stuckey |
| Edwards, La. | May | Teague, Calif. |
| Evins, Tenn. | Monagan | Teague, Tex. |
| Frelinghuysen | Morton | Wilson, Bob |
| | | Wolff |

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 386 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

### DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1970 — VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is: Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, H.R. 13111, an act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) for 1 hour.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on the veto message of the President in the body of the RECORD prior to the vote on the question.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members speaking on the veto message of the President may revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, under the limitations of time it will not be possible for me to yield to Members as I would like to. I will be as brief as I can in what I have to say.

Mr. Speaker, in my actions as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations I always try to keep in mind the fact that money does not bear a Democratic or Republican label. We are confronted today with a practical problem, and I propose to deal with it in a practical manner, and, if I may say so, in a nonpartisan manner.

Last July when the House overrode the Committee on Appropriations and added about $1 billion above the budget to the Labor-HEW appropriation bill, I stoutly opposed the add-on and voted against it on the teller and rollcall votes. On final passage it was a question of voting for no appropriation at all or for the bill with the amendment. I had no logical alternative but to vote for the bill on final passage.

Now, about 7 months have elapsed; school districts and administrators have long since made plans and in many instances heavy expenditures based on the House action and the subsequent Senate action on the measure.

I see no practical way to turn back the clock and erase commitments and plans that have been made in good faith throughout the Nation upon the basis of congressional action. Had the veto come last July we would have been confronted with an altogether different proposition, but that was impossible in view of the delay in final action on the bill.

To me it seems wholly impractical today to take the $20 billion Labor-HEW bill back to the committee and try to secure passage through Congress of a substantially different measure.

Under these circumstances, I cannot vote to sustain.

And in voting to override I do not endorse, of course, all of the provisions in the vetoed bill nor do I imply approval of the harassment tactics of HEW in dealing with school districts. Rather, I deplore these tactics.

I recognize the weaknesses in the basic legislation involving impacted aid and for years I have supported remedial action, but it has not been attained and the Appropriations Committee has no jurisdiction over the committee which initiates impacted aid legislation. I do hope that as a result of the President's veto and other factors a meaningful overhaul of the program may be approved at this session of Congress, and that wasteful practices in education programs which have at times occurred in the past may be eliminated in the future.

I believe that the ravages of inflation must be strongly resisted and that spending must be held to the lowest practical level and I have supported that belief with positive action. Last year under the initiatives of the committee which I head we reduced the President's appropriation budget—with the cooperation of the administration—in the net sum of $5.6 billion.

It is true that these cuts were almost precisely offset by congressional approval of spending actions under the initiatives of the legislative committees. Specifically, reductions in the appropriation bills were offset by such items as the social security increase, additional authorizations in the housing and mortgage market field, and failure to enact proposals counted in the budget as offsets to budget spending.

Broadly, in all actions and inactions,



AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Congress wound up within about two-tenths of 1 percent of approving the President's budget—about two-tenths of 1 percent over on an obligating authority basis, and about two-tenths of 1 percent under on an estimated expenditure basis. The net effect amounted to a virtual endorsement of the overall fiscal spending posture recommended in the President's budget. It was close to a standoff.

Since Congress approved approximately in toto the overall sums in the President's budget, readjusting priorities to a limited extent here and there, it could be said that if the actions of Congress were inflationary, then the President's budget was inflationary. At a time like this, it must be conceded that all Federal spending is in a sense inflationary.

Speaking of inflationary trends, Mr. Speaker, the administration's April 15 budget proposed to spend in the current fiscal year 1970, $8 billion more than was spent in the preceding year. And as shown by the veto message yesterday, there were some miscalculations in the budget relating to certain so-called uncontrollable expenditures. These overruns principally explain why the President's projected spending total is now close to $198 billion—some $13 billion above last year.

The uncontrollables have had a damaging impact. It developed that the administration's estimates early last year were entirely too low—too low for such items as interest on the debt, medicare, and other social insurance trust funds. Additional interest on the debt alone has skyrocketed $1.5 billion.

I quote from the President's veto message of yesterday:

> It is the "uncontrollable" outlays—driven upward by the very inflationary forces we are trying to contain—that have frustrated the efforts of both the Executive and the Congress to hold down spending.

Let us be practical. That is the way legislation must be approached. For me to vote to sustain the veto and thereby invite the Congress to call upon the Committee on Appropriations to draft, present, and pass through Congress a new Labor-HEW bill—and it was the most complicated and controversial bill of the last session—would place the committee in an untenable position. Last year we did the best we could, and I see no practical way as we move into the eighth month of the fiscal year to do substantially different. Would congressional actions be markedly different? I doubt it. Is there anybody who does not believe that the Joelson amendment would be reenacted and that we would be back where we are?

Last year's battles have been fought—some were won; some were lost.

We now move into a new year and a new session. We will have a new budget next Monday. Some of us have promised to try to get all of the appropriation bills through the House by June 15. It would not seem wise to take time out now for what could become a time-consuming exercise with highly uncertain results.

I agree that the President's veto message is most compelling—and I am completely in accord with the President's desire to hold the line on spending and combat inflation—and I hope that this dramatization of the spending issue will contribute heavily toward fiscal restraint in this session of Congress. I regret this situation which confronts us but as to the course to follow at this point in time it would seem that since both Houses of Congress have overwhelmingly approved the Labor-HEW bill that the most practical course is for the administration to withhold spending wherever reasonably possible—and in the public interest—in an effort to reduce inflationary pressures.

Mr. Speaker, I am not one who believes that under our system the Executive can compel the Congress to pass legislation or that Congress can compel the Executive when the chips are down to spend appropriated funds such as those contained in the spending measure.

This year if I am supported in my determination to pass a separate appropriation bill for education early in the session so that schools can know what they can count on and make adequate plans, a repetition of today's event will not occur.

I am voting to override the veto on the grounds that to do otherwise at this point in time would be impractical and unrealistic.

Mr. Speaker, this is my best judgment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow).

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal about education and health.

I want to talk about money.

The schoolmen have told us how an extra billion will help children.

I want to talk about the people it will not help.

It will not help 25 million people who are fighting a losing battle to make social security checks cover the cost of living.

It will not help 9 million people on public assistance—most of them children—who have already lost the battle against inflation.

It will not help the children of millions of middle-class Americans—men and women so caught between taxes and inflation that they cannot properly clothe children to send them to fancy schools.

None of these people will be helped if we feed the fire of inflation by increasing the public debt. They will be hurt.

Interest on the public debt will cost $18.8 billion this year—more than twice the price in 1960.

Interest on the public debt costs $35,769 every minute of every hour the whole year round.

Think what that sum would do for education.

The issue is not education. The issue is inflation. The issue is learning to live within our income. The issue is providing dollars for scholars that will buy a dollars worth. The issue is saving education itself from the terrible cost of inflation.

President Nixon has done his part. While we talk about congressional cuts in obligational authority, President Nixon has made actual cuts in spending of over $7½ billion.

He has done that job by careful balancing of priorities.

All he asks in this veto message is the right to continue to balance requirements, to economize where necessary and possible—in other words, he is asking freedom from the mandatory spending of $1.3 billion in the next 4 months, whether it is needed or not.

The American people—bone weary of taxes and inflation—support the President. We should do the same.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the chairman of the subcommittee on the Labor-HEW appropriation bill, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD), who brought the bill to the floor of the House.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations which was responsible for this bill, I feel it is incumbent upon me to say a few words at this point. I begin by saying that I urge the Members of this House to vote to override the President's veto.

As we all know, most of the $1.1 billion increase over his budget to which the President objects was not added by our committee. It was put in on the floor of the House. However, I think it worthy of note that even the conservative House Committee on Appropriations found it necessary to increase the President's budget for HEW programs by $181 million in the bill as it was reported by the committee. And the committee was fully aware that there would be further increases on the floor of the House. As a matter of fact, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL), offered an amendment which would have added another $319 million for impacted area aid, and another distinguished member of the committee from the Republican side, the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON), offered an amendment which would have added another $100 million over the budget for education programs. So I think it has been perfectly clear to all of us on both sides of the aisle that the President's budget for HEW was inadequate and would not stand the test of congressional scrutiny.

I do not see how we can possibly take an action here today which might put us in the position of going back to the figures in the President's budget which, as you know, provides nothing, I repeat nothing, for a number of ongoing, operating, education programs, and which makes drastic cutbacks in many others.

Frankly, with all due respect for the President, I think that he has been given very bad advice by those who have urged him to veto this bill. It is my suspicion, although I cannot prove it, that he has fallen into a trap laid for him by those bureaucrats in the Bureau of the Budget who have given other President's similar bad advice in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see how anyone can say, with a straight face, that these appropriations will have any significant effect one way or the other on inflation. The billion-dollar increase to which the President objects is only one-half of 1 percent of the total Federal budget of over $200 billion, and it is less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the gross national

product for 1970. Furthermore, we know that many school districts have been operating on the assumption that they will receive Federal funds at least as great as they received last year—so the impact of these funds on the economy has already occurred.

There has been some discussion to the effect that if appropriated, these funds will not be wisely used because it is so late in the fiscal year. Mr. Speaker, I do not think such fears are well founded. The fact of the matter is that many, many States and cities all over the country have made their plans on the assumption that these funds will be forthcoming. I am sure that HEW and the States have plenty of grant applications in hand for the use of this money. In many of the programs included in this bill, the additional money will not really expand ongoing projects or provide any new projects, but simply take care of the increased cost of carrying on the present level of activity.

In his state of the Union message last Thursday, the President talked about putting good money into bad programs. The only bad program which the administration has put the finger on is impacted area aid. As this body well knows, I have never been one of the impassioned defenders of the impacted area aid program. Our committee tried to cut it back last year—unsuccessfully, of course. But let us not kid the troops—one way or another, this impacted area aid money will be appropriated this year, regardless of whether or not the President's veto is sustained.

I cannot understand why the President has picked out education as the place to save money. The President himself, when a candidate stated on October 1, 1968:

> When we talk about cutting the expense of Government, either Federal, state, or local—the one area we can't short-change is education.

A year later, just a few months ago, a Harris poll indicated that of all Federal programs, 60 percent of those queried believed that Federal expenditures for education should be the last to be cut. Yet, the first budget submitted by the President called for $416 million less for programs of the Office of Education than had been appropriated for 1969.

Mr. Speaker, all of this leads me to conclude that the President has been badly advised in his decision to veto this bill. I strongly urge the Members of this House on both sides of the aisle to exercise the independent judgment which their constituents expect of them, and vote to override his veto.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare (Mr. MICHEL).

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to devote the few moments I have to answering the very shallow, obviously politically motivated arguments directed against the President's veto of this bill. Let us set the record straight. The veto of this bill does not mean we are summarily cutting off all Federal aid to schools, hospitals, medical research, and so forth.

The President did not veto this bill because he is opposed to air pollution control; his budget called for an increase of $7.1 million over the 1969 level of spending.

He is not opposed to rubella vaccinations. His budget provided for an increase from a $9.6 million figure in 1969 to $16 million in 1970.

He is not opposed to the Food and Drug Administration. His budget provided for an increase from $68.9 million to $72 million.

He is not opposed to health manpower training, for his budget carried an increase from $182.4 million to $228.9 million.

He is not opposed to health educational research and library facilities, for his budget reflected an increase from the 1969 level of $93.2 million to $127.1 million.

Now, so far as the National Institutes of Health are concerned, you would think from the screams of anguish that the President was terminating the entire research program in the fields of cancer, heart, stroke, communicable diseases, and so forth.

It may be of interest to the Members to know that we cut severely into these programs 2 years ago by enacting the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act, and I do not recall any weeping, wailing, and gnashing of teeth from those who are now sanctimoniously maligning the President's position.

I will say that there is a significant decrease in the President's budget for hospital construction grants, but what the administration would like to do in this area is to move to a form of federally guaranteed loans. By this mechanism $650 million could be made available for construction as contrasted with $258 million carried in the 1969 bill.

In the field of education the President's budget actually provided for increases in bilingual education, in education for the handicapped, in vocational education, and over a $100 million increase in title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

What the President is opposed to—and I believe a majority of the Members of this body are opposed to—is the outmoded formulas applicable to the so-called federally impacted aid programs, and this program needs to be corrected. I will be the first to say that we have no right to attempt rewriting the authorizing legislation in an appropriations bill, but if it serves no other purpose, we seek to dramatize the urgency of addressing ourselves to this problem now—this spring.

The President in his message has called for a "no hardship clause" which will guarantee that no school district will, as a result of changes in the impacted school aid program, have a school budget less than 95 precent of what it had in 1969. What more assurance do we need?

We on the Appropriations Committee on both sides of the aisle have pretty well agreed that in considering the fiscal year 1971 bill we would like to break out the education portion of this bill and have it behind us by, say April, so that the educational community will know where they stand for the coming school term.

In the education field there are some other very significant increases that the President is opposed to. Actually some were written into the bill by our subcommittee before we reported our bill to the House, and I still stand behind several of those nominal increases over the President's budget, but I have got to oppose the outlandish increases over and above what your committee originally provided, particularly so since at this juncture we have only 5 months of the fiscal year remaining.

Can you imagine pumping these increases into the compressed period of 5 months for title I of the ESEA? Do you think it is possible to provide any additional teachers, any teaching assistants, any new and innovative programs this late in the school year? You know and I know what is going to happen. There are going to be more orders placed for the fanciest band uniforms, batons, theatrical equipment and what-have-you to get all this money spent before the end of the fiscal year.

In the field of vocational education, the President's budget called for in increase of over $30 million over the 1969 level of spending and, what is more, your committee recommended an increase to provide for the mandatory set-aside in this program as provided for in the 1968 amendments. But the additional increases over and above what your committee originally provided just cannot possibly be prudently and efficiently spent in the remainder of this fiscal year. Here again, what is so vitally needed are new teaching methods and updating the old shopworn policies of the past. If you talk to those actually working in the field they say we have actually got the cart before the horse and need first to train or retrain the teachers themselves.

In summary, I support the President's veto of this bill and urge my colleagues to sustain that veto. When this is done we will have to get right down to the business of reworking this bill, and it's obviously going to be finalized at a figure somewhere between last year's $18.2 billion figure and the figure in this bill. We simply aren't going to be so irresponsible as to let all these activities in the Departments of Labor and HEW die at the expiration of the continuing resolution the end of this week.

Making adjustment for the advance funding of $1.2 billion, this bill is approximately $2.5 billion over the spending level for 1969 and that is just entirely too much for the President to take and it is far too much of a burden for the American taxpayer.

As Mr. Mason said to Mr. Dixon: "We've got to draw a line somewhere." And it might just as well be right here and now.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AYRES).

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I am going to direct my brief remarks to those millions of Americans who will not have a vote here today.

Just as a little review for them. We got into this Federal money for education back in 1950 when the impact program started, where there was to be a real impact and where the Federal Government had taken lands off the tax duplicate. Now we all know that program has grown like Topsy. President Eisenhower complained that money was not being allocated properly. Congress did nothing. President Kennedy recommended reductions in the program, and Congress did nothing. President Johnson not only recommended reductions but a review and a revision. Now President Nixon's veto speaks for itself, and it speaks for America.

A study can now be made, and fairness will finally prevail. You recall in 1958 sputnik went up. Everybody got excited, and justly so, and we had the National Defense Education Act. That was for science, foreign languages, math, and equipment that would help in teaching of foreign languages and math. That, Mr. Taxpayer, Mr. American, is where the equipment manufacturers of the United States got their nose under the tent. Now they will have $150 million to sell equipment, not necessarily textbooks—not things to educate children directly. You will find a lot of this pressure that you have been getting has not come from the educators but, rather, has come from the individual operator of the businesses manufacturing this equipment. Sustaining the veto will correct this.

In 1960 we had a school construction bill. It passed the House. In the other body we had the Murray-Metcalf bill but neither went into conference because at that time we still had on education bills, the so-called Powell amendment which was put on to kill the bill.

In 1963 we had the Vocational Education Act of 1963. In 1963 we also had the Higher Education Act for college facilities. Then in 1965 we got into elementary and secondary education. The House, as you know, last spring extended this to 1972. That is all the education we have.

But where has the money gone? Do you realize that since 1960, when the Office of Education had $474 million, that now has gone up to the point where now they have just over $4 billion; and in fact, in all the areas of education, including veterans' benefits, school lunch, and education under the Manpower Training Act, that we have over $10 billion plus being spent on education. The veto does not stop education. It will help, it will improve. New approaches will provide better education for less money.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MACGREGOR).

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AYRES) spoke about the large number of Americans who have not had a chance to be heard or to vote on this issue. A well-known Minnesotan, a very successful businessman from Duluth, will have a chance to be heard and to vote through the medium of a telegram which he sent to me yesterday. He is a very strong supporter of a former Vice President of the United States, the Honorable Hubert Humphrey, and his telegram reads as follows:

DULUTH, MINN.

President Nixon veto makes sense. Let's not override it.

Regards,

JENO F. PAULUCCI.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, again I want to say that I am going to vote to sustain the President's veto. Before I go any further, I want you to know that I was one who voted for the Joelson amendment and for the Cohelan amendment and for the conference report. I intend to do what I can to get the Federal Government's commitment to education increased so that they will provide 25 percent of all elementary and secondary school costs, but I believe that the President is right now for education when he wants to control inflation. If that is what it is necessary for him to do, I think it is good for education, because in the last 2 years the cost of education through inflation has been greater than any additional Federal moneys that could be made available under present programs. Some of the people from education, good friends of mine, have threatened that some of you would be defeated in the next election if you voted to sustain the veto. Let me point out to you before the next election, the 1971 budget will be up here, and the education appropriation bill will be voted on and you will be able to establish your position for or against education funds. If that is a question in the next budget, it will come before the 1970 election.

I believe that, when we work out our compromise with the President for this fiscal year 1970 in the time that is left of this school year, that a reasonable figure will be reached between the administration and the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Secretary Finch, addressed to me with reference to the impact aid agreement which this administration has proposed.

Many of my colleagues have said, "I would like to see in writing that proposal for $440 million in impact aid." I shall place that letter in the RECORD at this point.

The letter referred to follows:

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION AND WELFARE,
*Washington, D.C. January 28, 1970.*

Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. QUIE: In response to your request, I am providing you with information on the appropriation amounts required to:

(1) Insure full funding for children whose parents live and work on Federal installations ("A" students);

(2) 50 percent funding for children whose parents work for the Federal Government but do not live on Federal installations ("B" students); and

(3) A "no hardship clause" which will guarantee that the Impacted Area Aid appropriation will not cause any school district budget to be reduced more than 5 percent below the 1969 level.

The amounts required to carry out the above program would be:

| | *In millions* |
|---|---|
| "A" students and Federal schools | $187 |
| "B" students | 230 |
| No hardship clause | 8 |
| Total | 425 |

The above figures do not contain the $15 million for Public Law 815 (impacted areas aid construction) that is normally a part of the same appropriation. The total appropriation would, therefore, be $440 million.

In addition to the above information, we have also prepared appropriation language which would carry out these funding concepts. We will be glad to furnish this to you at the appropriate time.

Sincerely,

ROBERT FINCH,
*Secretary.*

Mr. QUIE. Further, Mr. Speaker, some have asked about the "no hardship clause" and how it really works. I can assure you that no school now receiving impact aid will suffer a cut of more than 5 percent of their total budget of 1969. I shall place that statement in the RECORD at this point which was sent to me by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, realizing the lateness of the school year which places an undue hardship on the schools which have received impact aid, the administration is willing to make this compromise. It is the Congress controlled by the Democratic Party which has caused us to take up the bill at this late date. Further correction of the abuses of impact aid can and should be made in 1971.

The statement referred to follows:

EXPLANATION OF WHAT IS MEANT BY THE "NO HARDSHIP CLAUSE" UNDER IMPACTED AREA AID

The payment to each school district for impacted area aid will be calculated on the basis of 100 percent funding for children whose parents live and work on Federal installations and 50 percent funding for children whose parents work for the Federal government but do not live on Federal installations. Wherever this figure for 1970 would cause a reduction of more than 5 percent of the total budget of the school district, including the Federal impact funds, for fiscal year 1969, a supplementary payment will be made from the impacted area aid appropriation to make the difference no greater than 5 percent.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, some of us will be astounded as I was at the number of programs that would have mandatory requirements placed upon the President to expend the money, and I shall place in the RECORD the decision that was made by the General Counsel of HEW with reference to programs where spending the appropriated funds are mandatory and the reasons why.

The statement referred to follows:

AUTHORITY TO IMPOUND FUNDS APPROPRIATED FOR FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS

The SECRETARY:

I have examined the substantive legislation for each of the formula grant programs for which either the House or Senate has increased the amounts requested by the Administration for these programs in Fiscal Year 1970. (See attached list of programs showing budget requests and the amounts voted by the House and Senate in H.R. 13111.)

With the exception of two Public Health programs (Community Mental Health Center

Construction Grants and Grants to the States for Public Health Services), and subject to the qualifications discussed below with respect to a few other programs, I have concluded that these are mandatory programs and that there is no authority in the Executive Branch to withhold amounts from the appropriations for these programs. Each of these programs is discussed briefly below. I have also included in this memorandum a brief discussion of the constitutional question raised by the Congressional mandate that the appropriations for these programs be spent.

I. OFFICE OF EDUCATION PROGRAMS

A. Elementary and secondary education:

1. *Educationally Deprived Children* (Part A of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act). This program provides for grants to local educational agencies under a prescribed formula for the education of children of low-income families (ESEA, § 103(a)(2)). State agencies directly responsible for educating handicapped children, children of migrant laborers, and children in institutions for neglected or delinquent children are also eligible to receive payments computed on a statutory formula (§ 103(a) (5), (6), (7)). The mandatory nature of the program is made clear by § 107(a)(1) which provides, "The Commissioner shall * * * pay to each State * * * the amount which it and the local educational agencies of that State are eligible to receive under this part." The State agencies are directed by Section 107(a)(2) to distribute the payments to the local educational agencies. Additional support for the conclusion that the entire appropriation must be made available for the payments for which the State and local agencies are eligible is found in Section 108. That section prescribes a formula for use "[I]f the sums appropriated for any fiscal year * * * are not sufficient to pay in full the total amounts which all local and State educational agencies are eligible to receive under this part for such year."

Section 103(a)(1)(A) provides that not more than 3% of the appropriation shall be allotted among Puerto Rico and several territories on the basis of need, and for payments to the Secretary of the Interior with respect to Indian children. Since these payments are not made in accordance with statutory formulas, the Commissioner probably has sufficient discretion to withhold some of those funds.[1]

The payments to States provided by Section 107(b) for administrative expense (up to 1% of the total maximum grants for State and local educational agencies of the State) are clearly discretionary since the Commissioner is "authorized" rather than directed to make such payments.

2. *Supplementary Educational Centers* (Title III of ESEA). That the entire appropriation of this program must be allotted is made clear by Section 302(a)(2) which requires the Commissioner to allot $200,000 to each State and "the remainder" of the appropriation in accordance with a prescribed formula. Title III originally provided for direct grants by the Commissioner to local educational agencies from sums apportioned among the States. As revised by P.L. 90-247, grants are now made by State educational agencies pursuant to an approved State plan to local educational agencies (Sections 303, 304). Under Section 306, in F.Y. 1970, up to 25% of a State's allotment may be used for direct grants to local agencies by the Commissioner to complete projects initiated in prior years. Section 307(a) directs the Commissioner to pay to each State, from its allotment, the amount necessary to carry out its State plan.

Section 302(c) provides that amounts allotted to any State "which the Commissioner determines will not be required for the period for which the amount is available" shall be available for reallotment. In my opinion, funds available for reallotment need not be reallotted.[2]

There would, however, be no basis to conclude that because the Commissioner can reallot funds if he finds that the full amount of the allotment to a State "will not be required" (presumably on the basis of need), he can withhold part of the appropriation and thereby reduce the amount available for initial allotments to the States.

3. *Library Resources* (Title II of ESEA). This program provides for grants to States for the acquisition of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials. This program is clearly mandatory. As in the case of Title III, there is a prescribed formula for the allotment of the entire appropriation (§ 202). This is a State plan program. The State plan must be approved if it complies with the statute (§ 203). The Commissioner is directed to pay to the State an amount equal to the amount spent by the State in carrying out its plan (§ 204). This program has a discretionary reallotment provision similar to that of Title III.

4. *Guidance, Counseling, and Testing* (Part A of Title V of the National Defense Education Act of 1958). This program provides for grants to State educational agencies to assist them to establish and maintain programs of testing, guidance, and counseling. Section 502(a) requires the entire appropriation to be allotted and Section 502(b) includes a discretionary reallotment provision similar to that in Title II of ESEA. Section 503 requires a State which desires to participate in the program to submit a plan. The Commissioner must approve the plan if it meets the statutory requirements. Section 504(a) requires payments to be made by the Commissioner under a prescribed formula to cover the Federal share of the State's expenses in carrying out the State plan. This program is also clearly mandatory.

5. *Equipment and Minor Remodeling* (Title III of NDEA). This program provides for grants to State educational agencies for the acquisition of equipment and for minor remodeling, and for making loans to private, non-profit elementary and secondary schools (§ 301). The entire appropriation is allotted or reserved for grants and loans (§ 302(a)). The grants to the States are mandatory and are made in accordance with a formula prescribed in Section 302(a), pursuant to an approved State plan on a matching basis (§§ 33, 304). Section 302(c) has a discretionary reallotment provision. 12% of the appropriation must be reserved for loans under Section 305. These loans are merely "authorized" and, therefore, are not mandatory.

B. School assistance in federally affected areas:

1. *Maintenance and Operation* (P.L. 874). This program provides for financial assistance for local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activities. Section 3 requires the Commissioner to compute the "entitlement" of a local educational agency under a prescribed formula. Section 5(b) requires the Commissioner to pay each local educational agency the amount which the Commissioner estimates such agency is entitled to receive. In the event that Congress does not appropriate sufficient money to fund the program at 100% entitlement, Section 5(c) provides for adjustments. Clearly, Section 5 (b) and (c) do not permit any discretion in the application of appropriated funds to the payment of the entitlements. Section 7(c) authorizes appropriations for assistance to local educational agencies located in areas which have suffered major disasters. To the extent that Section 7(c) funds are not needed to reimburse other P.L. 874 appropriations which had been tapped in an emergency for assistance in disasters, appropriations under Section 7(c) are not mandatory and are controllable by the Secretary.

C. Education, professions, development:

1. *Grants to States* (Subpart 2 of Part B, Title 5 of the Higher Education Act of 1965—The Education Professions Development Act). This program provides for grants to States to enable them to support the efforts of local communities experiencing teacher shortages or the efforts of State educational agencies to attract teachers and teacher aides (§518). The entire appropriation must be allotted (§519(a)). There is also a discretionary provision for reallotting a State's allotment which the Commissioner determines will not be required (§519(b)). This program is a State plan program. The Commissioner is required to approve any State plan which meets the statutory criteria (§520). The Commissioner is directed by Section 520A to pay to a State, from its allotment, an amount equal to the amount expended by the State in carrying out its State plan. This is clearly a mandatory program.

D. Higher education:

1. *Under Graduate Instructional Equipment* (Part A, Title VI of the Higher Education Act). This is a grant program to institutions of higher education for the acquisition of equipment and for minor remodeling (§601). The entire appropriation must be allotted (§602(a)). Section 602(c) has a mandatory reallotment provision: (The reallotment provision in other OE programs referred to above are discretionary). This is a State plan program and the Commissioner is required to approve a State plan which meets the statutory requirements (§603). Applications for grants by institutions of higher education are approved by the Commissioner. The Commissioner must approve an application which meets the statutory requirements (§605). The Commissioner is required by Sec. 606 to pay the Federal share of the grant. The criteria for determining the Federal share is set forth in Section 604. This program is therefore mandatory, in that no discretion is left in the Commissioner either to withhold part of the appropriation or to withhold approval from an application which meets the statutory standards.

2. *Direct Loans* (Title II, NDEA). This program provides for Federal capital contributions to student loan funds of institutions of higher education (§201). The entire appropriation must be allotted to each State in accordance with the formula set forth in Section 202. Section 203 requires the Commissioner to pay the Federal capital contribution to institutions with which he has agreements. Section 203 also provides for adjustments in the amount of the Federal capital contribution if the application of an institution which meets the requirements exceeds the allotment of the State. This section also provides that the Commissioner may reallot the remaining amount if the applications are less than the amount of the allotment of the State.

In short, this program is also mandatory, both in terms of allotment of the appropriation, and expenditure from that appropriation in the event there are sufficient acceptable applications.

3. *Facilities Grants* (Title I, Higher Edu-

[1] Other programs, e.g., Titles II and III of ESEA, have similar provisions. Because the amounts involved are small, and because it is questionable whether the discretion to withhold such funds would be exercised in the case of grants to the territories when no such discretion is available in the case of grants to the States, no further reference will be made to such provisions in other OE programs.

[2] Former General Counsel Willcox reached the same conclusion in a memorandum to Mr. Cardwell, dated July 21, 1966.

cation Facilities Act). This is a program of grants to institutions of higher education for construction of academic facilities. Section 102 requires the entire appropriation to be allotted among the States in the manner prescribed therein. Sections 103(c) and 104(c) both have mandatory reallotment provisions. Grants are made on the basis of applications approved by the Commissioner. Section 108 provides that the Commissioner must approve an application which meets the statutory requirements. Section 109 requires the Commissioner to pay the Federal share of the project.

This program is also mandatory, both in the requirement that the entire appropriation be allotted, and the requirement that the Commissioner approve applications which meet the statutory criteria and make payments to the applicant.

E. Vocational education:

1. *Grants to States* (Part B of the Vocational Education Act of 1963). This program authorizes grants to States to assist them in conducting vocational education programs. Section 102(a) requires the entire appropriation to be allotted, 90% for Part B and 10% for Part C. Section 103(a)(1) requires the Commissioner to reserve an amount not to exceed $5,000,000 from the appropriation for transfer to the Secretary of Labor to finance certain studies. This sum can be withheld. The remainder of the appropriation must be allotted among the States on the basis of a formula based on population and per capita income. The Commissioner is directed by Section 124 to pay to each State an amount equal to 50% of the State and local expenditures in carrying out its State plan. There is also a reallotment provision (§ 103(c)) which is somewhat stronger than the reallotment provisions in other programs, e.g., Title II of ESEA, in that it sets up priorities for the reallotment. However, it is a discretionary provision since it merely makes the amounts involved "available" for reallotment.

In short, this program is also mandatory, both in terms of the allotment of the entire appropriation, and the requirement to make payments to States in carrying out their approved State plans.[3]

2. *Work-Study* (Part H of the Vocational Education Act of 1963). This program is for assistance to States in carrying out the work-study programs for vocational education students. This program is similar to the Part B program discussed above in that the entire appropriation must be allotted to each State (§ 181); it is operated under a State plan (§ 182); and the Commissioner is directed to pay the State amounts in accordance with a prescribed formula within the allotment to the State (§ 183). There is also a discretionary reallotment provision in the event the Commissioner determines that the State's allotment will not be required to carry out the State plan (§ 181(b)(2)). This program is also mandatory.[4]

3. *Programs for Students with Special Needs* (§ 102(b) of the Vocational Education Act). This program is for assistance to persons with handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational education program. Since the provisions applicable to Part B above (grants to States) are applicable to this program, I conclude that it is also mandatory both from the standpoint of the allotment of the entire appropriation and the requirement that payments be made to each State within its allotment of the Federal share of the State and local expenditures in carrying out the State plan.[5]

4. *Research (State Portion)* (Part C of the Vocational Education Act). Fifty percent of the appropriation for research and training in vocational education is for a discretionary program of direct grants and contracts. The remaining 50% is a mandatory program governed by the same provisions that are applicable to Part B grants discussed above. Therefore, the conclusions applicable to Part B are also applicable to Part C.[6]

5. *Consumer and Homemaker Education* (Part F of the Vocational Education Act of 1963). This program is for the purpose of providing educational programs to encourage home economics and for ancillary services. The statute requires the allotment of the entire appropriation to the States, with a discretionary reallotment feature where the Commissioner determines that the entire allotment for the State will not be required (§ 161). The Commissioner is directed to pay the Federal share of amounts spent for authorized purposes by a State under its approved State plan (§ 161(c)). This program is also clearly mandatory, both in the requirement for the disbursement of the entire appropriation, and the requirement that payments be made to the State from its allotment for its expenses in carrying out the State plan.[7]

F. Libraries:

1. *Library Services* (Title I of the Library Services and Construction Act). This program provides for payments to the States for the extension of public library services to areas without such services or with inadequate services. Section 102 requires the allotment of the entire appropriation. Section 103 requires the Commissioner to approve a State plan which fulfills the statutory requirements. Section 104 requires the Federal share to be paid to each State which has an approved plan.

Title III of the Library Services and Construction Act (Inter-Library Cooperation), Title IV, Part A (State Institutional Library Services), Title IV, Part B (Library Services to the Physically Handicapped) each have allotment formulas and payment provisions similar to those in Title I. I conclude that all these library service programs are mandatory both with respect to the allotment of the entire appropriation and with respect to payments to States which have approved plans and incur expenditures in accordance with those plans.

2. *Construction of Public Libraries* (Title II of the Library Services and Construction Act). This is a State plan program for the construction of public libraries. Section 202 requires the allotment of the entire appropriation; Section 203 requires the Commissioner to approve a State plan which fulfills the statutory conditions; and Section 204 requires the Commissioner to pay to the State an amount equal to the Federal share of projects approved under the State plan. This program is also clearly mandatory in all respects.

G. Education for the handicapped (Part A of Title VI of ESEA). This program is for the purpose of assisting States in financing programs and projects for the education of handicapped children. Section 603(a) requires the allotment of the entire appropriation. Section 603(c) provides that the amount of a State's allotment which the Commissioner determines will not be required for a particular fiscal year shall be available for a reallotment. Grants under this program are made to States with approved State plans (§ 604). Section 605 directs the Commissioner to pay from the amounts allotted to each State an amount equal to an amount expended by the State in carrying out its State plan.

Again, this program is also mandatory both with respect to the allotment of the entire appropriation and with respect to payments to be made to the States to match expenses incurred by the States in carrying out their State plans.

II. PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAMS

A. Hill-Burton construction grants (Title VI, Part A of the Public Health Service Act). This is a program of assistance to the States for the construction and modernization of medical facilities. The allotment formula in Section 602 requires the allotment of the entire appropriation. Any State desiring to participate in the Hill-Burton Program must submit a State plan, and the Secretary is required to approve a State plan which meets the statutory requirements (§ 604). Applications for project grants must be submitted to the Secretary through the State agency (§ 605). If the application meets the statutory criteria, the Secretary must approve it if sufficient funds to pay the Federal share of the cost of the project are available from the allotment to the State (§ 605(b)). Payments must be made upon certification by the State agency that the construction work has been performed (§ 606).

The Hill-Burton Program is clearly a mandatory program both with respect to the allotment of the entire appropriation and with respect to payments for approved projects. Approval cannot be withheld of a project which meets the statutory requirements.

B. Community mental health center construction grants (Part A of the Community Mental Health Center Act). This is a program for grants for construction of public and other non-profit community mental health centers. Section 202(a) provides that the Secretary shall make allotments to the States "from the sums appropriated under sec. 201." There is provision for readjustment of the allotments, including transfer of a State's allotment from this part to Part C of Title I (grants for construction of facilities for the mentally retarded). The rest of the statute is similar to Hill-Burton in that it provides for a State plan which must be approved by the Secretary if it complies with the statutory requirements (§ 204); and for approval by the Secretary through the State agency of applications for a project which meets the statutory criteria, if sufficient funds to pay the Federal share of the cost of construction are available from the allotment to the State (§ 205).

This program must, however, be distinguished from Hill-Burton, in that Hill-Burton requires the allotment of the entire appropriation. The community mental health centers program merely requires the Secretary to make allotments from the sums ap-

---

[3] H.R. 13111, as passed by the Senate, appropriates "not to exceed $352,836,000" for Part B. Although Part B is a mandatory program, the use of the language "not to exceed" would provide authority to the Commissioner to allot less than the full $352,836,000 for this program.

[4] $10,000,000 is appropriated by H.R. 13111, as passed by both Houses, for Part H. Because the appropriation language is ambiguously worded, it could be argued that the phrase "not to exceed" which is used in connection with the amount appropriated for Part B is also applicable to Part H. I believe, however, that the better interpretation is that the fixed amount of $10,000,000 is appropriated for Part H.

[5] For the same reasons as stated in footnote 4, it is arguable that the $40,000,000 appropriated by H.R. 13111, as passed by both Houses, for this program, could be interpreted to mean "not to exceed" $40,000,000.

[6] No specific reference is made in the appropriation language to funds for Part C. However, as noted in our discussion under Part B, Section 102(a) provides that from the amount appropriated and allotted to each State, 90% shall be available for purposes of Part B and 10% shall be available for purposes of Part C.

[7] For the same reasons as stated in footnote 4, it is arguable that the $20,000,000 appropriated by H.R. 13111, as passed by the Senate, for this program could be interpreted to mean "not to exceed" $20,000,000.

propriated. In my judgment, this leaves room for the Secretary to withhold from allotment part of the appropriations so long as the requirement in Sec. 202(a) is met that no allotment to any State for any fiscal year may be less than $100,000. Once the funds are allotted, the program is a mandatory one, and projects meeting the requirements of the statute must be approved.

C. Grants to the States for public health services (Sec. 314(d) of the Public Health Service Act). As in the case of the community mental health center construction grants, allotments for this program are also to be made "from the sums appropriated." (Sec. 314(d)(3)). Again, there is no requirement that the entire appropriation be allotted. Subsection (d)(1) provides that the appropriated funds shall be used for making payments to States with approved State plans for the provision of public health services. However, I do not deem this provision to be a requirement that all of the sums appropriated must be used in making such payments to the States. Payments to States are required to be made for the Federal share of expenditures incurred under an approved State plan.

I conclude, therefore, that while this is a mandatory program in the sense that payments have to be made in accordance with the State plan after the allotment is made to a State, there is no requirement that the entire appropriation be allotted. The only limitation is in Subsection (d)(3), which provides that no State's allotment shall be less for any year than the total amounts allotted to such State under formula grants for cancer control, plus other allotments under this Section for the fiscal year ending June, 1967.[8]

D. Health professions student loans (Part C of Title VII of the Public Health Service Act). Under this program the Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements for the establishment and operation of a student loan fund with schools of medicine and other schools for the health professions. Section 742(a) authorizes appropriations for the purpose, *inter alia*, of making Federal capital contributions into loan funds at schools which have agreements with the Secretary under this program. Section 742 (b)(2) provides that if the total of the amounts requested for any fiscal year in applications by schools exceeds the amount appropriated for that fiscal year, the allotment to the loan fund of each applicant school must be reduced in accordance with a prescribed formula. Thus, it can be clearly inferred from this provision that it was the intent of Congress to make the entire appropriation available as needed. Section 742 (b)(4) provides that allotments to a loan fund of a school shall be paid from time to time by the Secretary in such installments as the Secretary determines will not result in unnecessary accumulations in the loan fund at the school.

I conclude that the Health Professions Student Loan Program requires the entire amount of the appropriation be made available for the program, and that no part of the appropriation may be withheld.

E. Nursing Student Loans (Title VIII, Part B of the Public Health Service Act). This program is similar to the Health Professions Student Loan Program. Section 825(a) requires the Secretary to allot to each school with which the Secretary has entered into an agreement for the establishment and operation of a student loan fund to be financed in part by Federal capital contributions, an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount appropriated as the number of persons enrolled in the school bears to the total number of persons enrolled in all nursing schools (§ 825(a)). In other words, this provision requires in terms the allotment of the entire appropriation for the program. There are several provisions on reallotment. Section 825(a) provides that funds available for payment to schools which are in excess of the amount appropriated for a particular fiscal year shall be reallotted. Section 825(b)(2) has a provision to reduce the payments to the loan fund of each school if the total requests made by the schools in a State exceed the amount of the allotment of such State for that fiscal year. If the total requests by schools in a State is less than the amount of the allotment of the State for a particular fiscal year, the Secretary may allot the remaining amount to other States. I conclude that it is mandatory to make the entire appropriation available for allotment and to make payments of Federal capital contributions under this program.

III. SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE

Development of programs for the aging: Title III of the Older American Act of 1965, as amended (Grants for State and Community Programs on Aging) provides for formula grants under Sections 302 and 304. Section 302 provides for the allotment to the States of the entire appropriation for that section. Section 303 requires the Secretary to approve a State plan which meets the statutory requirements. Section 302(e)(3) requires payments to be made from the allotment of any State for grants to pay part of the cost of projects in that State approved by the State in accordance with the State plan. Section 302(b) provides for the mandatory reallotment of a State's allotment which is not required for carrying out its State plan.

The formula grant program under Section 304 is for the planning, coordinating and evaluating programs under the Older Americans Act and for administering the State plan. It requires the entire appropriation to be allotted, and provides that the allotment of any State shall be available for payments to State agencies for authorized purposes. Section 304(c) has a mandatory reallotment provision.[9]

It is clear that both of these formula grant programs are mandatory programs.

To sum up, except for two of the Public Health programs discussed above, and except as indicated in the discussion of the other programs, I conclude that there is no authority to impound or withhold the appropriations for the formula grant programs discussed above.

In three of the mandatory programs, the Health Professions Student Loan Program, the Nursing Student Loan Program, and the Section 302 program under the Older Americans Act, the precise amount of the appropriations are not set forth in the Appropriation bill. Generally, in such situations, I understand that it has been the practice to determine the amount appropriated for the program from the Budget requests, and from the reports of the Appropriations Committees. It can be argued that in the absence of a specific amount appropriated for a formula grant program in the Appropriation bill, the Secretary, in establishing the amounts "appropriated" for such programs, can reduce the amounts earmarked for such programs in the Budget or in the Committee reports on the bill.

31 U.S.C. 665(c)(2) is sometimes cited as authority for the impounding of appropriations. This Section provides in pertinent part:

"In apportioning any appropriation, reserves may be established to provide for contingencies, or to effect savings whenever savings are made possible by or through changes in requirements, greater efficiency of operations, or other developments subsequent to the date on which such appropriation was made available."

In my judgment, this Section cannot be given such sweeping effect as to negate the mandatory character of formula grant programs. My conclusion is buttressed by the purpose of this Section, as stated by the Committee on Appropriations, which attached this provision as a rider to the 1951 General Appropriations Act, is "to require careful apportionment of all types of funds expended by Federal agencies and efficient administration of the Government's business." (H.R. Rept. No. 1797, 81st Cong., 2d Sess., p. 9).

There remains for consideration the constitutional question raised by the Congressional mandate that the funds appropriated for the formula grant programs be spent.

This question cannot be answered in the abstract, but rather must be considered in the light of the type of activity which the Congress directs the Executive Branch to administer. In my judgment, there are four types of activities which the Congress might conceivably direct the Executive to administer and for which it might mandate the expenditure of appropriated funds. These include (1) activities such as grants-in-aid to States for essentially State or local education and health programs, areas over which the Federal Government would have no jurisdiction except by virtue of Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution which authorizes the Congress to provide for the general welfare; (2) areas which are confided by the Constitution to the substantive direction and control of the Executive, such as the national defense; (3) areas in which there is dual jurisdiction in both the States and the Federal Government; and (4) essentially ministerial functions in which the Executive is given little or no discretion except to make payments to designated beneficiaries, such as bonuses to war veterans.

With respect to the first category, since the Executive Branch can engage in such activities solely by virtue of the authority given to Congress under the general welfare clause, Congress, in the legislation which it enacts, could control the degree of discretion it places in the Executive Branch to administer these activities, and, if it so desires, could direct the Executive Branch to make payments in accordance with formulas prescribed in the legislation. The several mandatory grant-in-aid programs discussed in this memorandum clearly fall into this category, e.g., the programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, in which the Federal Government is acting in aid of local activities. I, therefore, see no constitutional question in Congress mandating the expenditure of funds by the Executive Branch for the formula grant programs discussed above, and limiting the degree of discretion in the Executive Branch in the administration of these programs.

I would also find no constitutional conflict in the Congress directing the Executive Branch to take action of an essentially ministerial nature, such as the disbursement of

[8] This program has been considered to be a mandatory program under which the entire appropriation had to be allotted. My predecessor, in a memorandum to Mr. Kelly, included this program in a list of programs which he deemed to be mandatory (Memo, Willcox to Kelly, November 3, 1967).

[9] H.R. 13111, as passed by the Senate, appropriates $36,250,000 to carry out the Older Americans Act of 1965 and initial expenses of a White House Conference on Aging, "including not to exceed $4,000,000 for State planning and other activities * * * in accordance with the provisions of Section 304 of the Act of 1965, as amended." As stated in footnote 3, the use of the language "not to exceed" would provide authority to allot less than the full $4,000,000 for Section 304 purposes.

payments to war veterans. *Kendall* v. *United States*, 12 Pet. 524 (1838) clearly supports this conclusion.

Particularly since it is not necessary for purposes of this memorandum to make any judgment with respect to the second and third categories listed above, I would reserve judgment on whether the Congress can direct the Executive Branch to spend appropriations for activities in these categories and thereby limit the discretion of the Executive to act in these areas.

ROBERT C. MARDIAN,
*General Counsel.*

---

FORMULA GRANTS—POSSIBLE SAVINGS FROM AMOUNTS APPROPRIATED

The SECRETARY:

In my memorandum to you of this date discussing the authority to impound funds appropriated for formula grant programs, I expressed the opinion that the entire amount of the appropriations for two public health programs, Community Mental Health Center Construction Grants and Grants to States for public health services, is not required to be allotted to the States.

The appropriation bill, as passed by the Senate, includes $36,200,000 for Community Mental Health Construction grants, $7 million more than requested in the President's Budget.[1] The statute for that program (42 U.S.C. 2682) requires that each State receive a minimum allotment of $100,000. Subject to that requirement, I see no reason why any increases in the appropriations for this program over the amount requested in the Budget may not be impounded.

In the program for grants to the States for public health services (§ 314(d) of the Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 246(d)), the bill, as passed by the Senate, appropriates $100 million for this program, $10 million more than requested in the Budget. The Conference report also provides $100 million for this program. The statute requires that the allotments be made on the basis of the population and financial need of the respective States except that no State's allotment shall be less for any year than the total amounts allotted to that State under formula grants for cancer control, plus other allotments under Section 314 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967. Subject to these requirements, I see no reason why any increase above the request in the Budget need be allotted for this program.

In my memorandum, I noted that several formula grant programs in the Office of Education included discretionary authority in the Commissioner to make reallotments from any State's allotment which the Commissioner determines will not be required by that State. In fiscal year 1969, $4,410,000 was reallotted under Title II of the National Defense Education Act (loans to students in institutions of higher education). In fiscal year 1970, I have been informed that increasing loan demand has reduced the amount that may be expected to be available for reallotment. Thus far in fiscal year 1970, $688,000 has been reallotted under this program, but little or no further reallotment is expected in this fiscal year. In fiscal year 1969, $582,869 was reallotted under Title V, Part B, Subpart 2 of the Higher Education Act (grants for attracting teachers to meet teacher shortages).

It appears, therefore, that by not reallotting all the funds available for reallotment in those programs where the Commissioner has discretionary authority to reallot, some savings may be made.

Additional savings may be made in those programs in which a fixed amount has not been appropriated for a particular formula grant program. Thus, as noted in my memorandum, the Senate appropriated "not to exceed" $352,836,000 for Title I, Part B of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, and the House voted "not to exceed" $357,836,000 for that program. The House increased the Budget request for Part B by $127,500 and the Senate increase was $122,500. The conferees did not agree on a figure for this program. Similarly, the Senate appropriated "not to exceed" $4 million for Section 304 of the Older Americans Act. In both instances, it is my opinion that the Secretary has authority to reduce those amounts in making the allotments to the States.

As I also noted in my memorandum, the appropriations for the Health Professions Student Loans Program, the Nursing Student Loan Program, and the Section 302 program under the Older Americans Act, are not stated in precise amounts in the bill but are included in larger amounts appropriated for those and other programs. In these instances, it is my opinion that it is at least arguable that the Secretary is not obligated to allot the amounts by which it is indicated in the Committee reports that the appropriations have been increased over the President's Budget. I would want to further examine each apporpriation for these programs before rendering a definitive opinion on this matter. The House increased the Health Professions Student Loan program over the President's Budget by $4,781,000 and the Senate increased that program by $12,781,000. The increase in the Conference Report is $8,781,000. The House increased the Nursing Student Loan Program by $5,500,000 and the Senate increased it by $8 million. The increase in the Conference Report is $6,750,000. The Senate bill includes $20 million for Title III of the Older Americans Act of 1965 including the "not to exceed" $4 million for section 304 discussed above. The $20 million figure represents an increase of $7 million over the amount requested in the President's Budget.

ROBERT C. MARDIAN,
*General Counsel.*

Mr. QUIE. I also place in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, the statement of the General Counsel as to the number of programs that are mandatory, except impacted aid, which will require the local school to make the expenditure before June 30 of this year.

The statement referred to follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
*January 28, 1970.*

Subject: Expenditure of Federal educational assistance by local educational agencies.

To: Mr. Creed Black, Assistant Secretary for Legislation.

Under the formula grant programs administered by the Office of Education for the support of elementary and secondary education, in which a State agency allocates Federal assistance among local educational agencies (for example, titles I–A, II, and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and title III of the National Defense Education Act of 1958), amounts allotted to States under the pertinent formula remain available for State obligation for the fiscal year for which they are appropriated. 18 Comp. Gen. 969 and decisions therein cited. Therefore, in a program such as that of Financial Assistance to Local Educational Agencies for the Education of Children of Low-Income Families, title I–A, ESEA, unless the State Agency has approved project applications from local educational agencies for a given fiscal year in an amount that exhausts the sums appropriated by Congress to fund the entitlements of those agencies, we would understand the balance of such sums as not required by the State to meet a bona fide need of such fiscal year. 33 Comp. Gen. 57, 61; 38 Comp. Gen. 628. The unobligated amounts would therefore be returned to (or, more accurately, no longer be available for expenditure from) the Federal Treasury.

Upon State agency approval of a local educational agency's title I–A project during a fiscal year for which funds are available, the local educational agency is required by title I regulations (specifically, 45 CFR § 116.46 (a)) to obligate the Federal funds made available for such project by August 31 of the succeeding fiscal year. The regulation is amply supported by the analysis contained in 20 Comp. Gen. 370 and, since 1967, § 405 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967.

With reference to the funds appropriated in connection with the programs above referred to, the experience of our Department is that the local educational agencies do obligate and do expend the funds appropriated during the fiscal year rather than lose the obligated funds.

ROBERT C. MARDIAN,
*General Counsel.*

Mr. QUIE. You know what happened before with reference to the educational programs when the money came late in the school year, there was not time enough for the schools to make adequate plans. One example was the year of title I of ESEA, this resulted in some unwise purchase of equipment since some schools evidently could not think of anything else on which they could spend the money.

I have seen reports from some areas which indicate that at some schools the equipment still is not uncrated. We can really get a black eye in the field of education if we thrust upon them more money than they can use. The only way we can spend more money for education than the budgeted amount equitably is to have an understanding between the administration and the Congress on the amount of money that will be spent this year. The administration seems to be saying they will agree to meet us part way and if they agree to $450 million over the budget at this late date for 1970, it is pretty good.

Some of you are concerned about vocational education, as am I, because I am convinced that in vocational education we must spend, in fiscal year 1970, $70 million more than the budget request. I have received the assurance from the administration that they will make that expenditure; $70 million over the $279 million for vocational education in the budget is necessary in order that basic grants will not be reduced below 1969 levels.

With the assurances for education for 1970 fiscal year, which is already 7 months behind us, I believe we should sustain President Nixon's efforts to control inflation. This I believe is the best we can do for education.

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS).

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I do not know why the President has vetoed

---

[1] The precise amount of the appropriation for this program is not stated in the appropriation bill, but rather is included in a larger amount appropriated under the heading "Mental Health."

funds for education. I do not know why the President has assigned such a low priority to education as is evidenced by the education budget that was submitted to the Congress.

I do know that the veto of this bill will not halt the forces of inflation. It will only deny educational opportunities to millions of American schoolchildren.

In recent days I have shared with you the results of surveys I have taken since the first of the year with respect to the beneficial effect of one of the largest Federal elementary and secondary education programs, title I of ESEA.

I have also placed in the RECORD information I have received from State-operated vocational education programs which are supported by funds directly affected by the veto.

I have also brought to your attention information furnished me by the colleges and universities throughout the country with respect to the urgent need for student financial aid programs.

Also submitted for the RECORD have been reports from 35 States with respect to the remarkable gains that have been made in remedial reading programs funded under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

This afternoon I invite Members to face squarely with me the issues presented by this veto.

The major point which the President has tried to make in justifying his action in denying these funds to education throughout the Nation is that the $1.2 billion additional funds for education and health programs is inflationary.

I do not pretend to be an economist, and I doubt that there are many in this Chamber today who would claim to be experts in this field.

But as Members are called upon to analyze the Federal budget and to vote on issues coming before the House, I think we have an appreciation for the cost of Government and for dealing with the budgets and figures of the various agencies as they are presented to us both in the authorization and appropriation processes.

First, let us put these numbers in their proper perspective. The approximately $1 billion extra for education and health about which the President has complained with reference to the total Federal budget is about 1 penny out of 200 pennies. In terms of our national economy, we are talking about 1 penny out of 1,000 pennies.

We should be spending this year in support of education programs at least the full amount of existing authorizations which would be in the neighborhood of $9 billion rather than the $4.2 billion which this bill provides. Mr. Speaker, on this point, I think that it is extremely significant that the report of the President's own Task Force on Urban Education which appears in the January 20 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page 156, recommends full funding of existing education authorizations and in addition an expenditure of $14 billion annually for urban education alone by fiscal year 1975.

This Congress has acted responsibly to curb the forces of Government spending. In this regard we have, when all of the appropriations bills are considered together, trimmed the President's request for appropriations by $5.6 billion. In other words, we have cut the President's own appropriations requests more than the total amount provided for all education programs under the Labor-HEW appropriation bill for 1970.

As I have said, the amount in question is too small to have any appreciable effect on the economy. The President's own economic adviser, Herbert Klein, only 8 weeks ago observed that a shift of $28 billion in the Federal budget had surprisingly little effect on the national economy.

Perhaps the President feels that this austere action may influence less spending in other areas. If this is his thinking, why single out education for the symbolic gesture? Why should the Nation's schoolchildren be the sacrifice on the altar of controlling the forces of inflation?

To me the education of our children and the continuing education opportunities for adults should command this Nation's highest priority. The strength of our country to meet any of the tests that confront it lies in its people. Without trained and educated people we would be no match for any hostile adversary. Without an educated people, as Jefferson put it, we would not be able to preserve the democracy.

But, yet, the President has singled out education as the only Federal program which shall bear the brunt of this misdirected effort.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no other field of endeavor where so much has been expected with so little financial support. We would not expect our airplane designers to furnish us with a million-dollar aircraft on a $300,000 budget.

But that is precisely what we have asked our school people to do. We have designed programs to meet the urgent needs in our Nation's poorest schools, and our best evidence of the cost was an estimate of something over $3 billion.

We have yet to provide one-third the amount of money authorized to do the job. Yet all criticism of the program is predicated upon the allegation that, since these programs are not reaching all of the children in need, Federal legislation is ineffective.

If it is not doing the job that Congress asked, it is because we have not lived up to our commitments to provide funds for the programs we have authorized.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, to say that the programs which Federal funds have financed in education have not been effective to the extent that the Congress has appropriated money for them, would be to ignore the overwhelming weight of evidence. Since its passage in 1965, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has created broad education opportunities for children in all the Nation's school districts.

Today, the special educational needs of handicapped children are being met in areas where, before, such educational services did not exist; thousands of school libraries have been established in elementary and secondary schools where there were none before; the impact of title I programs and the influence of other federally supported programs has markedly reduced the dropout rates.

Not only does the question of the veto involve funds for these important programs, but also funds for guidance and counseling services, library construction, and student financial aid.

As to vocational education, let me remind my colleagues that in 1968, the House of Representatives unanimously passed the vocational education amendments authorizing increased vocational education support, from an authorization of $280 million annually to $766,650,000 for the current fiscal year. The $488 million provided in H.R. 13111 does not begin to approach fulfillment of the commitment made when this body so overwhelmingly recognized the great need to strengthen vocational education programs throughout the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should analyze this matter very carefully. Let us look at each of the areas where the will of the Congress differs from the President's request. By doing this, we will see the veto in its true light—that is, an attempt to economize in an area which cannot be economized if we are concerned over the America of the 1970's and 1980's—as the President in his state of the Union message asked us to be.

The record compiled during the first session of the 91st Congress contains overwhelming testimony as to the effectiveness of title I of ESEA. The most recent survey, conducted within the last 2 weeks, provides still another record of accomplishments. The recent testimony of hundreds of school officials and the statistical data showing increases in achievement levels for title I students supplied by State departments of education within just the last 2 days are part of the record which cannot be challenged.

The effectiveness of title I has been limited by one thing and one thing only—and that is related to financing. If one is to indict title I for lack of accomplishment, it can only be because of untimely and inadequate funding. The question then today is whether this Congress will allow further deterioration in title I programs and services; whether we are going to allow still more remedial reading programs, counselor programs, and programs of summer help to be closed down; and whether we are going to tell more disadvantaged students that there is no room in the program for them.

Again, let us not be deceived by those who wish to characterize the bill as one providing an increase. As was stated during our first debate on this bill in July, in fiscal year 1968 we provided $210 for each pupil who qualified under ESEA guidelines. If we do not override the veto and, therefore, provide funding at the level requested by the President, we will only be providing $170 for each such pupil. This is a backward step which the country cannot and must not take.

So, too, we are not talking about an increase for the library and textbook pro-

gram carried on under title II of ESEA. Here again, it is a matter of restoration—restoring the program to the 1969 level which was, I might add, less than one-half of the amount appropriated in 1968.

The 1969 appropriation of $50 million provided for the purchase of about 9 million books and film strips, or about one book or one film strip for every participating child. The number of volumes needed to bring school libraries up to standard is estimated to be 425 million. The question is today then—do we simply ignore that deficit, as does the President's appropriation request, or will we again make an effort to reduce this deficit in needed resources?

As was the case in title II, the appropriation bill represents a restoration of funds for the title III program of supplemental educational centers. The $116 million requested by the President for title III is just about enough for continuation of funding of already existing projects. By providing an additional $48 million, the bill recognizes what the President fails to recognize—that less than 10 percent of all local school districts have received title III money for projects to help solve the major educational problems and needs peculiar to their community.

Turning now to the elementary and secondary school programs carried on under the National Defense Education Act, the issue is again not one of increase but one of restoration. For the guidance and counseling program, the appropriations bill provides $17 million—the same amount as was appropriated in 1969, but $7.5 million less than appropriated in 1968 and in 1967. Annual reports from the States demonstrate that the guidance and counseling program is having a catalytic effect in the State and local programs, as evidenced by the doubling of State and local funding from $135 million in 1963 to $274 million in 1968. The President's request—that is, his failure to request funds for title V—does not merely fail to recognize this effect of the program, but it ignores entirely the well documented critical need for a substantial appropriation for guidance and counseling. More than 85,000 additional counselors are needed in our Nation's schools and communities today.

The NDEA program of equipment grants can be viewed similarly. Seventy-eight million dollars was appropriated for this program in 1969, and this resulted, when one takes into account State and local matching, in projects which totaled $190 million. Regardless of the stimulus, the title III program offers in the ever-continuing task of providing necessary instructional equipment, the President has not seen fit to fund the program. The appropriation bill corrects this error by restoring the program to the 1969 level.

Turning now to higher education, as we evaluate and study the financing of higher education we see two conflicting trends. On the one hand we see costs spiraling upward, while on the other hand Federal funds are going down. In a letter I received from the student financial aid officer at the University of Missouri just yesterday the predicament is outlined.

> Enrollments are increasing at the University of Missouri by approximately 1,000 students this year.
>
> Tuition and fees have increased sharply at the University of Missouri by 25 percent this year.
>
> Federal funds have been curtailed. At the University of Missouri the National Defense Student Loan funds thus far for 1969–70 are $139,000 less than for the previous year.
>
> Federal funds are desperately needed. At the University of Missouri 400 additional worthy students are in need of approximately $150,000 in student loans which the university does not have available for the second semester.

The difference between financing of the NDEA student loan program as determined by the Congress, and financing of the NDEA student loan program as suggested by the President, is considerable. But let us not talk about the dollar difference—let us talk about the 100,000 or more students whose continuation in college may be terminated if additional funds are not made available by overriding the veto message. For 16,000 students attending private business schools and technical institutes there is no "maybe" about it. Their eligibility and participation is contingent on an appropriation in excess of $190 million and the President's request is some $30 million shy of that figure.

Financing of the Higher Education Facilities Act is involved in this controversy. Quite frankly, it is almost embarrassing to discuss this matter, because if there is any place in this bill which might be interpreted as tokenism, it is in connection with the Facilities Act. Construction needs in higher education, particularly in connection with the junior college movement, will go virtually unattended even with approval of the appropriations bill. Here the appropriation bill does not even restore funding to the 1969 level. With the appropriation in 1969 of $83 million—$7 million more than in the current bill—the Federal Government participated in the financing of slightly over 500 building projects on college campuses. Taking into account increased costs of construction and the fact that the pending appropriation is less than last year's, Federal participation will be even less than the minimum undertaken last year. More importantly, if we are talking about inflation, the longer we delay in providing facilities which must be built, the greater will be the costs we will have to bear.

In this connection, let us not overlook a recent report of the Office of Education which shows that colleges and universities will need an additional $21.6 billion worth of academic and residential facilities, in order to keep pace with a projected increase in enrollments by 1977. The report further states: "There is an urgent need to begin the long overdue job of rehabilitating and converting their substandard academic facilities in many institutions." In the face of these projects and documented needs, one cannot argue with a restoration of $33 million, as against a need of over $21 billion.

Like the facilities program, the college library program is not even restored to the 1969 level. The appropriation bill, while it provides $8 million more than the President's request, is still $4 million below the 1969 investment of $25 million in the very heart of a college campus—the library. Other library programs such as library services and library construction are brought up to the 1969 level.

As provided in the appropriation bill, schools benefiting from the impacted areas legislation will receive 90 percent of their entitlement.

A small increase is provided for special education programs so as to strengthen and improve educational opportunity for handicapped children. No one should quarrel with that increase.

A small increase is provided for programs carried on under the Education Professions Development Act. Here, too, there should be no quarrel since the success of every education program is dependent on the competency of teachers and other school personnel. Even with the small increase provided, the appropriation is, in my judgment, far less than what is needed.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, let us turn to vocational education. At first glance, it seems as if there is a substantial increase being provided. The President requested $279 million, whereas the appropriation bill provides $488.7 million, an increase of almost $210 million. But let us see exactly where this money will be going. Much of it is involved in newly authorized programs. Forty million dollars will be for vocational programs for students with special needs and $34 million will be for needed vocational education research. For basic grants the funding will be increased from $234 million appropriated last year, the identical amount requested by the President for this year, to $354.7 million. Why is such an increase necessary? Again, let me turn to a very recent survey, the results of which I included in the RECORD last week. Many of the returns from State vocational educational agencies explain quite clearly the need for increased funds.

From Maryland:

> Counties have been told that unless additional Federal money is appropriated they will be cut one-third from what they received last year on their Federal reimbursement.

From Kentucky:

> The 40 percent set aside have made it necessary for Kentucky to spend $1,911,000 less than was spent on regular programs last year.

From Ohio:

> At the present level of funding—1969—Ohio is cutting back in construction, supplemental, equipment, training programs for vocational personnel and adult vocational programs.

Mr. Speaker, these statements tell us what we know to be the case, the crisis in vocational education is the funding of ongoing programs. It will be recalled that the 1968 amendments to the Vocational Education Act required State grants to be employed in several instances in new directions. With these requirements and no additional funds as is the case with the President's request, many essential ongoing programs will have to be cut back.

The vocational education survey reveals one additional matter upon which I will close. The question has been raised whether the educational community in the middle of the academic year will be

able to effectively utilize any additional funds. Let us listen to what vocational educators have to say:

From Georgia:

If $488 million is available the state will have no difficulty in committing the funds this fiscal year.

From Massachusetts:

If $488 million is available Massachusetts can allocate funds in this fiscal year for projects that are already on hand.

From Texas:

If $488 million is available Texas will have no difficulty in committing funds.

From North Carolina:

North Carolina can use the Federal funds that will be available this year if the $448 million is appropriated.

These statements from vocational educators conform with the comments received from local school officials that not only can they utilize but they desperately need additional title I funds.

I am confident that every dollar contained in this bill will be effectively utilized in proving and expanding education at every level.

Let me remind my colleagues that the President has signed the continuing resolution, which provided appropriations for education programs at the rate provided in H.R. 13111, with respect to almost $1 billion of the additional funds.

School districts have programed and planned and made arrangements for the expenditure of these funds in good faith. Moreover, many of the programs funded are scheduled for the summer.

Let me also remind my colleagues that school systems are not without justification in committing program activities in the expectancy that the funds will be forthcoming. Thus, for the fiscal year June 30, 1967, the funds were made available not until the last week of December of that academic year. In fiscal year 1968, the funds were released after the midpoint of the academic year—January 16, 1968. And in 1969, they were not released until 2 months after the beginning of the academic year.

Failure to override the veto, let me assure my colleagues, will result in the shutdown of many programs.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL).

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to override the President's veto and will vote to sustain.

I am sure that most of my colleagues are aware of my strong support for education, and I will continue these efforts to achieve higher priority for education and to find solutions to the ills affecting the schools of our Nation, especially those ills compounded by urban blight.

I disagree with Chairman PERKINS re inflation. The crisis of inflation is now so serious, so devastating to every family in this Nation, and even to the schools themselves, that controlling it must supersede other considerations.

If the budget calls for $x$ amount of education, we sometimes have the tendency to outdo each other in proving the degree of that concern.

If the budget calls for $x$ amount of education dollars, we can always call for more—and the other body can call for even more.

It is a little like leapfrog.

In the process we can lose sight of some of the hard realities.

Recognizing the necessity of this veto does not preclude continuing efforts to shift the education priority upward.

The very school districts with which we are concerned today have suffered a serious blow from inflation—and they will be similarly large beneficiaries when inflation is controlled.

As the President pointed out, inflation continuing at the present rate would wipe out $2.25 billion of effective education spending—more than twice the amount we are discussing now.

We also know, that there must be some adjustments made in the impact aid program.

The startling inequities of this well-intentioned program are too often overlooked when our attention is narrowly focused on our own congressional districts.

I supported the Joelson amendment when it was still time for the most efficient use of such education funds.

We know that such late-funding increases, at this late date however, cannot be spent as well as those which have had deliberate planning and well-thought-out programing.

In testimony supporting the advanced funding concept a few years ago, a spokesman for the American Association of School Administrators stated before the education and labor committee:

When appropriations come late, very often they lead to unwise use of the funds, because there is an attempt to spend quickly what should be spent carefully over an entire school year.

Though the context differs somewhat today, the fact remains the same.

If the educators who have come to Washington this week could be completely candid, they would probably agree that these add-on funds cannot be spent efficiently.

One other compelling reason for sustaining the President's veto, Mr. Speaker, is not directly related to education—but is intrinsically involved with many of these same problems: That is, the restrictive mandate which removes from the OEO the flexibility to perform the innovative function necessary in seeking solutions to the problems of poverty.

Reconsideration of this legislation will give us an opportunity to review this vital point—and hopefully, restore to OEO Director Rumsfeld the financial flexibility he requires to do his job right.

In substance, Mr. Speaker, my vote will not reflect a clearcut decision, but rather an assessment, a weighing, of all the factors involved.

In my opinion, the weight of argument shifts the balance in favor of sustaining the veto, and I urge my colleagues to cast their votes accordingly.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago at Houston, Tex., I spoke before the National Association of Independent Colleges, and indicated my intention to vote to override the President's veto of the HEW appropriation. I said then, that I felt the issue was one of national priorities—and I say that again today.

That is why, since coming to the Congress, I have fought to achieve maximum funding of our Nation's educational needs each time the issue has come up. I strongly believe education has to move up the list of national priorities.

But, the budget facts we face today are tough and unyielding. That is why we cut the present defense budget by nearly $6 billion. It is why we cut the foreign aid budget by nearly a billion dollars. It is why we cut the space program.

So, we have had to cut Federal spending back all across the board. It is not easy, it is not pleasant.

But, it is necessary—and each and every area of the budget must be trimmed—whether we like it or not.

Now, the vote today is not a vote for or against education. Every man in this Chamber is for education—however he votes today. And, education in this country will continue to thrive under either version of this bill.

Further, it is certain that if the President's veto is sustained, a reasonable and adequate compromise amount will be agreed to—and signed into law.

And so, while I feel great pain in having to reduce the HEW bill—I believe at this time, and under these circumstances, it has to be done.

The President has made a judgment that this is one of many painful cutbacks that must be made. So like it or not, the chips are down and the country is watching, and our action today will trigger secondary effects all across the economy that go far beyond education.

Should the President lose—that will be the signal to all the inflationary forces that the door is wide open, that the President has lost fiscal control, and it is every man for himself. And, the inflationary stampede will continue.

But, if the President's position is upheld, then the message is just as clear the other way. That there is a limit to what we can afford to do, that we have reached that limit, and that we have the courage to say so and to stand firm.

And that is the issue here, whether now, at the 11th hour, we can hold the line at a reasonable and prudent level.

The President has laid it on the line, and I am going to support him.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL).

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, approximately 2 weeks ago I decided I would vote to override the anticipated veto of H.R. 13111.

As one of the first 23 Members of the House of Representatives who signed a letter early in 1968 urging Richard Nixon to seek the Presidency of the United States, and as a strong supporter of the President for many years, it was with a great deal of reluctance that I reached the decision to do so.

My decision to vote to override this veto was not, I must confess, reached after calm deliberation. It was reached in anger and frustration. I could not, and still cannot, understand how our Gov-

ernment can insist on continuing unchanged the obnoxious package of corrupt and wasteful programs operated under the direction of the Office of Economic Opportunity on the one hand, and single out for carping criticism, and such labels as "pork barrel" and "a joke," the one part of the education program I have supported and fought for every year since I came to Congress in 1953, the aid to federally impacted area schools.

I want to make it abundantly clear, Mr. Speaker, that I recognized the necessity for deep cuts in expenditures in order to balance the budget and curb inflation. I also realized that these cuts will, of necessity, have to be made in places where it is politically unpopular, and I certainly wanted to support the President in exercising the political courage necessary to accomplish this objective. My objection to the veto, however, was that I felt this administration was not going nearly far enough in cutting expenditures, and was using programs for education as the one area singled out for substantial cuts. Even in this one area I could support the President if his demand for cuts were not being made for programs in which more than 4,000 communities have for 20 years adjusted local budgeting in anticipation of the annual Federal appropriations they receive.

I agree with the President that some of our education programs are wasteful and ineffective. In fact, I opposed some of the programs when they were originally authorized, as I felt that by their enactment the Congress was entering a field outside the Federal responsibility and that by and large they were untried, untested and costly experiments that the Federal Government could not afford to finance. But having authorized those programs and asked the local communities to gear their activities accordingly, it seemed not only unfair to cut off funds without notice but it could cause devastating consequences in the orderly management of local school systems across the Nation.

Much to my dismay, the President himself described impacted aid as a wasteful and unfair program which favors the wealthy communities over the poor. But this program was never intended to take from the haves and give to the have-nots, nor was it ever intended to alleviate poverty. It was, and is, an acknowledgment on the part of the Congress that the Federal Government has an obligation to the communities in which it operates similar to that of any private industry operating to the same degree in a community. It was a formula by which the Federal Government could make a payment in lieu of taxes to communities.

I might say at this point that my own communities in northern Virginia would fare much better financially if we could merely assess and tax all the federally owned property in our communities on the same basis that it could be taxed if it were private industry operating in the same way. The impact aid programs enable the Federal Government to pay part of the cost of educating children of employees who live or work on these tax-free properties. But it falls far short of meeting the full obligation the Federal Government, as an employer, would assume were it privately owned and operated.

It is unfortunate that after this obligation has been assumed and recognized for so many years it should be described by some administration spokesmen as a dole or handout that discriminates against the poor of the Nation. Those of us in the Congress, and there are many, who know it is payment in lieu of taxes and can be considered in no other light, made a grave mistake back in 1965 in not fighting much harder to prevent the lumping of impact aid in with the so-called Elementary and Secondary Education Act, many of whose provisions have proven both wasteful and ineffective, as the President has said.

While I sincerely believe the President has been inconsistent in demanding cuts in education and, at the same time insisting on $2 billion for continuing the wasteful corrupt war on poverty, he may, in spite of his veto message which indicates that the amount available for OEO is not at issue, have offered us one more opportunity to exercise political courage in that area. This program has already cost the taxpayers more than $7 billion, and even its most ardent proponents have difficulty in finding any of the poor it has helped, while every member of this House knows of the corruption which has resulted in support for hoodlum gangs whose avowed purpose is to overthrow our Government. Perhaps the President and Congress working together can, if we sustain this veto, make cuts across the board rather than singling out education programs alone.

Since I originally decided to vote to override this veto, the President has offered a compromise to those of us whose districts would be so harshly treated by elimination of impact aid funds. We are now told we can expect 95 percent of what we received last year. While I cannot agree with the President's evaluation of this program, I believe we should meet him halfway and try again to convince this administration of their obligation to the communities in which they operate. I am today introducing a bill, which I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting, to provide for Federal payments to our communities in lieu of real property taxes for property owned by the Government. Enactment of this legislation should remove once and for all the question of the purpose and equity of payment of these funds.

On careful reflection, Mr. Speaker, I have become convinced that our economic crisis is too grave for each of us to insist that we be satisfied on our own individual list of priorities for cutting expenditures, or that our individual parochial interest be completely accommodated. Any reduction of expenditures is going to cause all of us some political difficulty. But when this battle against inflation is finally won, and we pray it will be in the near future, I do not want the RECORD to show that the Representative of the people of the 10th Congressional District of Virginia lacked the courage and the commonsense to stand up and be counted in this hour of economic crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I shall vote to sustain the veto.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN).

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent days, the President of the United States has made a determined effort to convince the American people that he is a courageous fighter against inflation. And, as we all know, his courage has led him to veto the Education and Labor appropriation bill.

In attempting to justify this most questionable and wrong action, the President has shown a complete disregard for the priorities necessary for us to succeed in the fight against inflation and at the same time carry out needed programs such as the education of our children.

One of the alternatives the President might have turned to instead of vetoing the education bill was provided him by the Congress of the United States just last December. This is title II of Public Law 91–151, a bill to lower interest rates and fight inflation; to help housing, small business, and employment; and to increase the availability of mortgage credit.

Title II of this legislation grants the President the power to determine when any form of credit is being extended in so excessive a volume as to require regulation by the Federal Reserve Board in order to prevent or control inflation. In exercising this authority the President can direct the Federal Reserve Board to decide what types of loans can be restricted because of their inflationary impact. This would include such credit as that granted for stock market speculation, unnecessary building of inventories, the funds to be used for acquisitions and mergers, and credit used for gambling casinos and other nonessential purposes which add to inflationary pressures.

The Federal Reserve Board under the direction of the President could also determine the maximum size of various types of loans, the minimum downpayments required for the purchase of various types of goods and services, maturity periods and the rates of interest to be charged for such loans.

This is a broad grant of power to prevent the unwarranted use of the kinds of credit that are a principal cause of inflation and spiraling interest rates. Why has the President ignored this broad grant of power recently given to him by the Congress, when he professes to be the No. 1 champion fighter against inflation? To use this authority would be an effective way to fight inflation while not damaging high priority items in the budget such as the vitally needed funds for education.

I hope the veto is overridden.

In his veto message, the President admits that high interest rates are one of the prime budgetary problems in this administration.

The veto message states:

> Since I submitted my budget estimates in April, interest on the public debt has increased $1.5 billion.

Including this increase, the Federal Government will pay nearly $20 billion in interest on the national debt this fiscal year—a sum roughly equivalent to the entire appropriation for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare.

This huge $20 billion outlay for interest is a direct fault of the Republicans. When they took over in 1953, they broke the low-interest policies of the Democrats and forced interest rates up. If the rates prevailing under the Democrats had remained in force, the interest payment on the national debt would be only about $8 billion a year rather than $20 billion. In other words, we are paying $12 billion in excess interest costs—more than enough to pay for the entire budget for education.

If the President had resisted the big banks and forced a halt in the consistent increases of interest rates, he would not need to send up veto messages against the schoolchildren of the United States. The increases in the interest on the Federal budget just since last April exceed all of the extra money voted by the Congress for HEW. Yet, we hear no Presidential vetoes of the bankers who are raising these interest rates. It is easier to veto education.

Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that there have been six increases in the prime interest rate since the election of President Nixon. He has not uttered a single word of complaint against these increases. He goes on national television to criticize spending for education and he will not issue even a mimeographed press release criticizing the banks for six prime rate increases.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASEY), a member of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations, such time as he may consume.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I opposed the Joelson amendment to the Labor-HEW appropriations bill, which was the primary cause for the President's veto of this bill, and by the same token I agree with the President that the earmarking of funds for OEO makes the program less flexible.

It is true that the formula for impacted aid funds should be changed. But until the law is changed, school districts throughout the country, including the school districts of my congressional district are dependent upon these funds. To cut them out now could place an undue hardship on these districts in finding necessary funds to adequately operate schools. There should be adequate notice of the reduction of these funds so that they can make proper reductions in expenditures for their operation or increase local taxes to make up the difference.

I disagree with the President that the amount appropriated in excess of his budget request is mandatory for him to spend. Impacted aid funds are mandatory, but the balance of the appropriations which he objects to may be withheld by him partially or completely at his discretion.

I share his concern on inflation, and I agree with him that better programs must be developed in our educational system. But our schools, both elementary, secondary, and higher educational institutions, cannot now be penalized pending the development of new legislation which may be slow in coming.

I repeat, the President has the power to withhold most of the funds in this bill of which he complains.

Included in this bill are the funds for medical research in which our medical center has a vital interest. Also included are student loans and grants which are being used by students at Rice, Texas Southern, San Jacinto, St. Thomas, and the University of Houston.

I am interested in seeing that these students continue to receive the necessary assistance.

This has been one of the toughest votes for all of us here in the Congress. Frankly, I believe there are many other places where money could be saved to fight inflation, other than to place our whole educational system under the gun. For these reasons, I intend to vote to override the President's veto.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH), a member of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, all year long Members of this body have been falling over one another proclaiming their great affinity and friendship for education and for health; but in the end, self-proclamations are really no substitute for money.

Money, to be sure, will not in and of itself provide educational opportunity, and there is some money in this bill that will not increase educational opportunity. In fact, I will admit the so-called Joelson amendment was lopsided. We cannot justify 90 percent of the maximum authorization for impact aid and only 50 percent in the same bill for needy children under title I and ESEA; but, the dispute over apportioning funds involves only about $300 million out of a bill for $19.7 billion.

I also agree with the President that impact aid needs reform. The formula is based upon neither need nor fair per capita distribution of the Federal resources. It is a Jesse James in reverse. It takes from those who need it most and gives some of it to those who need it least.

But while I agree that the President should spotlight the situation, we are 7 months into the fiscal year and for the reason the chairman stated and that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASEY) stated, for those very reasons, the situation could better be handled by withholding. The money for the items in dispute can be withheld, so the President could withhold some of those funds and shape up the package or balance out funding levels between programs a little more to his liking, and for those programs that he believes should have more, there could be a supplement appropriation passed in short order.

There are other funds in this bill that are very important and they are needed now. There is student aid in this bill—registration is this week and next week—and the students need the loans and the money. There is a shortage of student loan money.

Also, there is money for Rubella vaccinations.

The immunization programs are going on throughout the land this day and they need that money now. There is also other money in the bill for health, for libraries, the elderly, air pollution, the poverty program, and other items that are in need now and without delay.

So, Mr. Speaker, what it really amounts to is that there comes a time to fish or to cut bait—and bait in this case is money—so I urge that we vote to override the veto so we can start work on the 1971 budget and reforms.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS).

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the question is: Are we men of principle, worthy of the confidence the people placed in us in sending us here to speak and act for them? Or are we, as we are sometimes pictured: just ordinary politicians, not willing to make the hard but necessary decision but ever ready to do that which seems politically expedient?

The question is, Mr. Speaker: Do we have the political courage our President displayed when he vetoed this bill because it would add fuel to the fires of inflation already consuming the substance of our people?

I am confident we have such courage. I am confident that, putting first things first, the Members of his body will put country before any political consideration. I am confident this House will vote to sustain the President's veto.

We are confronted with a multitude of domestic problems—crime, pollution, population, transportation, health, housing, welfare, education, and a number of others—all interrelated and interdependent—each taxing our ingenuity and our pocketbooks for solution.

But there can be no solution to any of these problems unless we first stop the inflation spiral.

To bring inflation under control and to stabilize the dollar must be our first consideration. Health, education, and welfare needs can never be met so long as health and education costs continue to rise month by month and year by year. Nor can we meet other essential needs, not even for our national safety, if costs loom larger and larger.

A vote to sustain the President's veto is not a vote against education or against health care and medical research. It is in truth a vote for better education and better medical care for it is a vote for curbing the relentless increase in the cost of education and the cost of medical care.

All of us have a deep abiding interest in our youth having the very best in educational opportunities. The youth are our future. But what kind of a future will they have if we betray our trust and they inherit from us an economy so inflated that the cost of education is beyond their

capacity to obtain without complete reliance on the Federal Government?

The proponents of the $1.3 billion addition to the HEW appropriation bill would, if they could, have the general public believe that education has a low priority status in the Federal budget. The fact is that in this current fiscal year the Federal Government will spend over $10 billion for education—more than we spent last year and the year before, or at any time in our history.

It cannot be said that the health, education, and welfare needs of our people are being ignored or sadly neglected. I wonder if many of us realize that with this $19.7 billion appropriation and including the trust fund disbursements by HEW, this single Department will spend in this fiscal year $12 billion more than all the profits after taxes of all the corporations in the United States.

As the President has pointed out, the $1.3 billion addition—four-fifths of which go for education—is not only excessive; it is wasteful. It goes for programs in need of reform. It goes to school areas where it is not needed. And with the fiscal year ending on June 30, there will be inevitable waste in the spending of a full year's appropriation in these remaining 3 or 4 months.

It is, as President Nixon well said in his televised speech to the American people: "The wrong amount for the wrong purposes and at the wrong time."

The safety and well-being of our country depends upon our winning this war against inflation. The difficult situation confronting us is the result of successive unbalanced budgets over the last several years. In the last decade we spent $57 billion more than we took in, and these deficits contributed to a 25-percent rise in prices.

It will take time and patience and sacrifices to reverse this trend and stabilize our economy. The first step is to cut Government spending and to keep our budget in balance. This can be done if we eliminate or defer that which is not basically essential.

I am sure this House will join with the President in this objective and will vote to sustain his veto. I am also sure that this action will have the overwhelming approval of the people of the districts we represent.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN).

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Democratic steering committee of the House unanimously passed a resolution, unanimously rejecting the President's veto of the Health, Education, and Welfare legislation, which I read to the Members:

Whereas the President has vetoed the Labor-HEW appropriations bill on grounds that it is $1.26 billion above his budget request;

Whereas Congress has acted responsibly in the fight against inflation by reducing the Administration's appropriations budget for Fiscal 1970 by $5.6 billion;

Whereas the President has refused to utilize the new anti-inflationary authority provided by Congress last session;

Whereas adequate funding of programs to meet our nation's pressing education and health needs must be given top priority;

Whereas a majority of Republicans as well as four out of five Democrat Members recognized the priority needs of education and health by voting in support of the increased funds disapproved by the President;

Whereas a reduction in these funds would be especially detrimental to the educational needs of American children, college students, health research and would also necessitate school closings or local property tax increases in many jurisdictions; therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Democratic steering committee strongly urges that the veto of the President be overridden.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI).

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to a table appearing on page E361 of yesterday's RECORD. I would like each Member to be able to see for himself what will happen to the school districts in his own congressional district if this veto is sustained. I would like the Members to study this RECORD.

There has been a great deal of oratory here today about how the White House will take care of you on the B category money and how it will be retained and returned if the veto is sustained. You have no assurance that the White House can deliver on this promise. All I can tell you is this: There are 4,235 school districts in America that may have to curtail services or close their doors before this school term ends if this veto is sustained today. Think about that and then decide which way you want to vote.

The administration has been passing the word around here that if you vote for the veto, they will send along a recommendation to take you off the hook on this B category.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) has made it clear that this money is already budgeted by school districts all over America. I want to remind you that the continuing resolution ends Friday. Any new formula for distribution of B category money must first be approved by the authorizing committee and you know it is impossible for the Education and Labor Committee to do this on such short notice. Obviously, we will need hearings and more time to effectuate any major changes in the impact aid program.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the President's veto of H.R. 13111 demonstrates the philosophy of his administration better than any other act he has performed since taking office a year ago. It demonstrates a philosophy which, I am glad to say, is not shared by an overwhelming majority of this body—a fact demonstrated by the vote on the Joelson amendment and upon final passage of H.R. 13111. I need not remind the Members of this House that the bill was passed by a vote of 261 to 110 in the face of a threatened veto. This philosophy aimed at creating a useless surplus at the expense of our schools and hospitals, and the young and the sick, is not favored by a majority of my constituents. Nor is it approved by a majority of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, our educational and medical institutions are caught in the same financial bind which has affected other segments of the economy. They are faced with an increasing number of students and patients as our population grows. The movement of our population from rural areas to urban areas has caused an ever-increasing strain upon those institutions located in and supported by our cities. New facilities must be built, by money borrowed at inflated rates of interest, with materials purchased at inflated prices. Also the salaries of those who provide these vital services have had to be increased to keep up with the rising cost of living.

A great majority of the Members of this body recognize that the educational needs of our children and health of our Nation have not been met. As a minimal, and I stress minimal, step to provide for these needs, in the face of increasing costs we added $1.3 billion to the President's budget request. At the same time we were able to make a net cut of $5.6 billion in the President's requested budgetary authority for fiscal year 1970.

In a curious exercise of economic metaphysics, Mr. Speaker, the President has stated that this increase in health and education funds will be grossly inflationary. He has told the Nation that the spending of an additional one-tenth of 1 percent of our gross national product for the purposes of developing human resources and healing the sick amounts to fiscal irresponsibility. Mr. Speaker, the President's own Task Force on Urban Education recommended increasing appropriations for education up to $14.5 billion more per year by 1975. The task force stated:

Without adequate funding, there is no hope for effective education in the cities. The current need for funds is as desperate as it is massive.

Without the educational funds provided by H.R. 13111, some schools will be required to close, thousands of additional students will be required to attend double sessions; over 100,000 college students will be denied loans; and bilingual assistance will not be available to over 50,000 schoolchildren. Without the health funds provided by this bill the shortage of doctors will be aggravated; major research programs for cancer, and other killing and crippling diseases, will be halted; and perhaps thousands of patients will needlessly die.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the opinion of the following health, education, and labor organizations: American Association of Junior Colleges, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, American Association of University Women, American Federation of Teachers, American Industrial Arts Association, American Library Association, American Vocational Association, Association for Children with Learning Disabilities, Association of American Law Schools, Committee for Community Affairs, Council for Advancement of Small Colleges, Conference on Large City Boards of Education, National Association of Secondary School Principals, National Association of State Boards of Education, National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, National Commission for Multihandicapped Children, National Education Association, National School Boards Association, AFL–CIO, Urban Coalition

Action Council, American Association of American Medical Colleges, American Cancer Society, American Heart Society, American Tuberculosis Society.

I agree with the President that something must be done to halt inflation, but not at the expense of the young and the ill. Especially, Mr. Speaker, at a time when banking and corporate profits, personal income and employment, and production, are at an alltime high. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am voting to override the Presidential veto of H.R. 13111.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I join those who are responding to an area of critical need in our country by supporting H.R. 13111, and who will vote to override the President's veto.

Education is vital to assuring the best possible uses of our most valuable resource—our people. There are many of us who feel this is not the place to take cutbacks to ease inflation. Human growth and development must have the highest priority.

We should take a more critical look at spending in areas such as foreign aid, space and defense cost overruns before we jeopardize educational opportunities for our people.

In the President's veto message, he seemed proud that America spends more for education than any other country in the world. However, let us not applaud ourselves too loudly until we look at a few comparative figures.

According to the latest figures available, in the United States, public expenditures for education were 6.5 percent of national income; in Belgium, 7.1 percent; in Canada, 8.5 percent; in the Netherlands, 7.5 percent; in Sweden, 7.3 percent; in Finland, 7.4 percent; and in Denmark, 7.4 percent. Are we really the country most concerned about educating its people?

I think you will find interesting a comparison of defense spending as well. According to the latest figures, in the United States public expenditures for defense were 9.2 percent of the gross national product; in Japan, 0.8 percent; in Belgium, 2.4 percent; in Canada, 2.5 percent; in the Netherlands, 3.9 percent; in Sweden, 3.8 percent; in Finland, 1.8 percent; in Denmark, 2.3 percent; and in the United Kingdom, 5.3 percent.

I have received many letters from my constituents requesting my support of this bill. As a program coordinator at the University of Missouri wrote:

> I cannot overemphasize the critical need for passage of the proposed budget. Its failure to pass will most definitely prove a major detriment to the development of much needed educational programs and to the continuance and expansion of already proven successful established programs.

And, from a Missouri medical student:

> I am very concerned about the potential veto of the HEW appropriations bill. I am almost completely dependent on the Federal Health Professions Act for school expenses except for a small Guaranteed Bank Loan and savings from a summer job. Obviously it is not conducive to the health of a physician-short nation to place undue financial hardship on the progeny of the middle class "Silent Majority" citizens and, of course, the poor students who are trying to better themselves and learn so as to help their fellow Americans. The field of medicine has too long been peopled by the sons and daughters of the wealthy.

Many of our leaders have expressed the need for careful consideration of our priorities and goals in the seventies. The President is among those who have placed a high priority on improving the quality of life in America.

We are already in the 1970's, and it is up to the Congress to assure the American people we intend to work toward these goals. With this vote to override the President's veto I reaffirm my support and determination to begin the 1970's with legislation that will set the course for placing our priorities in the best interests of the American people.

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to comment regarding the 1970 Labor-HEW appropriations bill.

President Nixon requested $1.65 billion for HEW appropriations for the 1970 fiscal year, a 13-percent increase over comparable appropriations for the 1969 fiscal year. These suggested increases totaling $1 billion, were primarily in various funds for education and health services.

In consideration of the President's veto of the $19.7 billion Labor-HEW appropriations bill, due to the $1.3 billion increase over the administration's budget request for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I think the present "spending momentum" or inflation should receive priority consideration. We cannot, in good conscience, add to the cost-of-living crisis of the old, the sick, the disabled, and others on low or fixed income.

Deficit spending by the Federal Government in the past decade was the primary factor in the 25-percent price increase that occurred during the sixties. The effect of a $1.3 billion "multiplier" at this time on our economy and the threat of further deficit spending would fuel the fires of inflation and further erode the value of the consumer's dollar.

Another important consideration is the recipient of additional appropriations. I feel much of the increase is for marginal or misdirected programs which need to be overhauled rather than expanded. One primary example of this is the inclusion of an additional $400 million above the President's request of $200 million for "federally impacted school districts." In fact, in 1968 this program provided $5.8 million to the richest county in the United States, while paying a total of $3.2 million to the 100 poorest counties across the Nation.

I support the expenditure of adequate funds to meet today's bona fide educational needs, including the administration's proposed record high expenditures for education in fiscal year 1970. I support fresh ideas on education, and I plan to support the President's veto.

This problem that we are facing today would not have happened if the Senate had acted promptly, but they chose to take their time, and the pushing that is going on today should have been taking place last summer and fall.

I want to add that if the veto is sustained, I know that immediate attention will be given to complete congressional action on a revised appropriations measure that will provide for the needs of the Nation in education and health.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the President has vetoed the Labor-HEW appropriations bill as he apparently feels it is the wrong amount at the wrong time in the wrong place.

I respect his views, but I feel that the Members of this body by a vote of 293 to 120 and a vote of 251 to 110 displayed much more compassion and much more wisdom by increasing the appropriations for education and medical services.

The President is correct when he says that the question is not who is for education or who is against education. But neither is it a question of who is for or against inflation. I am confident that no one in this body is against education or in favor of runaway inflation.

The issue before us today is in what area will the taxpayer's dollar do the most good. The Congress decided that the military budget should be less than the amount requested by the administration; the Congress had decided that the amount of foreign aid should be less than that requested by the administration. In total, the Congress cut the administration 1970 appropriation requests by $5.6 billion. The Congress felt that education and medical services should receive more money than that amount requested by the administration. In effect, we felt that the taxpayer's dollar would be more beneficial to the country if we put that money in education and medical services instead of foreign aid.

The President stated that he was vetoing the HEW bill because he wanted the taxpayer to have more money at home. I, too, want the taxpayer to have more money at home. For this reason, I supported the tax reform bill which gives a greater measure of tax relief to the low and middle income citizen than that recommended by the administration. One might well be concerned over the President's lack of consistency.

The administration's 1970 budget requests for the California Office of Education totaled $189,423,435. The Congress has approved funds totaling $310,916,970 for California. In 1966, California had an average daily attendance in the public elementary and secondary schools of 4.2 million students. Under the administration's budget, this represents approximately $45 per student. The amount allotted each student under the congressional appropriation is $74 per student. In 1969, California students in the public elementary and secondary schools received approximately $69 per student. The administration's budget represents a reduction from 1969 of approximately $24 per student. The results of this loss in funds could prove critical for both the local taxpayer and the school districts.

Currently, the Federal Government pays approximately 7 percent of the costs of education while the local tax dollar covers approximately 70 percent of the costs. I feel that the Federal burden should be greater in this area, thus alleviating the pressure on the local taxpayer.

Many school districts are dependent

upon Federal funds in order to continue the quality of education that I feel our children deserve. Many school districts cannot go to the local taxpayer for additional funds.

The Los Angeles City School District is presently taxing at the maximum legal rate. If the veto is sustained the school districts in Los Angeles County stand to lose approximately $35 million in Federal funds.

To replace the Federal funds, the city of Torrance would have to raise local taxes by 0.06 per $100. Los Angeles City school districts would be forced to raise taxes by 0.17 per $100.

The Long Beach schools will be forced to drastically cut back on many programs or eliminate others if they lose the $1.4 million due to the veto. To replace this money, Long Beach would have to increase taxes by 0.11 per $100.

Redondo Beach, in order to continue funding at the present level without the Federal funds, will have to increase taxes by 0.06⅔ per $100.

Compton Elementary School District would be the most adversely affected by upholding the veto. This district is already paying the highest tax rate in Los Angeles County and in order to continue funding at the present level without Federal money, the Compton Elementary School District would have to increase taxes by 0.25 per $100. I have been advised that without Federal money, the Willowbrook Elementary School would have to close. This district simply cannot continue to operate without the $400,000 they would lose by a veto.

Due to the total appropriations reduction of $5.6 billion for 1970 already made to the administration's budget, this measure cannot be termed inflationary unless the administration now also feels it presented to the Congress an inflationary budget. On the contrary, education, in effect, pays for itself. Those with an adequate education become productive citizens and, thus, taxpayers. Even in the short run, studies show that cooperative vocational education programs actually pay for themselves through the taxes paid by the students in the same year they are expended.

Yet the administration proposes to reduce vocational education assistance by $209.5 million.

An adequate education can reduce many of the ills of our society. The relief rolls are filled with people who did not attain an adequate education. Many of those who have turned to crime could not find employment due to a lack of education.

The HEW appropriation bill also contains funds which would hopefully not only reduce the cost, but also provide more adequate medical services. Programs which assist students in their medical education will help meet the shortage of health personnel which has driven medical costs so high. More hospital beds should ease the pressure on our hospitals. Greater knowledge and the prevention of diseases would reduce the need for medical services. We should place greater emphasis on these programs.

In conclusion, I do not consider this bill as being inflationary and, further, I feel that we should spend these tax dollars for education and medical services. We can do no less for the future of our youth and our Nation. To do less will result in a poorer quality of education unless this burden is assumed by an already overburdened local taxpayer.

Therefore, I urge that we, today, vote to override the President's veto of the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill.

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, politics has been called the art of the possible, the art of compromise, and several other appellations. I would like to add my own definition that it is the science or art of weighing alternatives.

Usually the scales are easily read. Less often they are very finely balanced. Such is the case today as we debate one of the more important issues the 91st Congress has yet to face—whether to sustain President Nixon's veto of the 1970 appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare.

What makes it so difficult is that the issues are not so clearly delineated as many would have us believe. Some have said, as the President indicated in his veto message, that the issue is whether we are for education and health or whether we are against it.

The record of this Congress, the record of this administration, the record of this Nation clearly indicates the priority and commitment we have made to education.

I submit that the question is as President Nixon stated two nights ago:

> How much can the Federal Government afford to spend on these programs this year?

I also think we should explode the myth that voting to sustain the President is going to deny Federal funds for education. For 7 months now education has been funded at last year's level. I think it fair to say we will see a new bill that will meet, fairly and adequately, the educational needs of all of our citizens.

Having answered the question of "what priority does education have in the United States," I think we would do well to address ourselves to the question of how high a priority are we going to assign to fighting inflation.

The public concern over the high level of inflation is obvious. The effects of inflation are seen everywhere—high prices, high interest rates, and high taxes. Critical needs of our citizens are being deferred to an indefinite future because of the high level of inflation. The real take-home income of Americans is not rising—for some it is declining—because of the increases in the cost of living.

I do not want to assign blame for the specter of inflation. We do know, however, that the chief culprit was the $57 billion deficit the Federal Government incurred over the past decade. President Nixon has made abundantly clear his intent to control inflation. Congress joined him when last summer it imposed a ceiling on Government expenditures, but apparently it now has decided to forget its good intentions in the hope of making political hay.

I trust this is not the case because inflation is clearly the most pressing and immediate domestic problem we face. It eats away at every citizen's earning power and destroys our ability to improve all the programs necesary for the Nation's well-being.

With specific reference to education, I believe increases in the cost of living have eaten and are eating away far more of the funds Americans invest for education at every level of government than can be compensated for by inclusion of the $1.26 million above the President's requests.

Over the past fortnight we have been besieged by mail and personal visits of those soliciting support for the $19.7 billion figure. In all fairness, however, we would fail the public interest if we did not consider the arguments of other educators who submit that inflation is the most pressing problem.

The January 1970 issue of School Management contained an article by Orlando F. Furno and James E. Doherty which sheds some light:

> Inflation is roaring through education's fiscal forest like a fire blazing out of control. Dollars spent in books, buildings, salaries and services are going up in smoke. Local districts are attempting to douse the blaze by pouring more money into education. But very substantial portions of the increased spending are being consumed in the flames.

The article also supports President Nixon's action:

> While many administrators complain bitterly these days about the adverse effect on education of the Nixon Administration's tough, anti-inflation measures, the CEI (Cost of Education Index) itself is far more damaging than any of the attempts to bring it under control.

I can also offer some statistics on inflation's impact on the educational system of my district, the great State of Wyoming. The total education budget for Wyoming in 1968–69, not counting most Federal expenditures, was $61,427,748. The 6-percent rate of inflation the Nation suffered over the period effected destroyed $3.69 million of that total—far more than the extra Federal funds Wyoming stands to gain if the President's veto is overridden.

I also oppose overriding the President's veto for a second reason. He stated he was vetoing the bill because it increases spending for old programs which have been found wanting. When increases in funding for education is made, it should be made to implement the urgent new programs that are desperately needed to right what is really wrong with our schools, not to continue what is wrong.

Furthermore, the increases are ill-timed. Already we are more than 7 months into the fiscal year. To pass the total appropriation at this time would, as President Nixon stated, "force us to spend the money it appropriates and spend it all before June 30."

In the light of this abundant evidence, I have a clear obligation to support responsible fiscal education policies by voting to sustain the President's veto.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Presi-

dential veto of Congress appropriations to the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare. The President's contention that the appropriation is in the wrong amount, for the wrong purposes, and at the wrong time is inconsistent with the Nation's priorities.

The President contends that Congress appropriation will inordinately exacerbate the continuing rise in inflation. I disagree. We are not spending the type or the amount of funds in such a way that will pump so much money into the economy as to cause a rise in prices. Moreover, these are funds critically necessary to continue existing programs for which there is an immediate demonstrated and crucial need.

The amount to which Mr. Nixon objects constitutes an increase of $1.3 billion in a $200 billion Federal budget in a trillion dollar gross national product economy. The $1.3 billion constitutes one-tenth of 1 percent of our trillion dollar economy and one-half of 1 percent of our $200 billion budget.

A member of the President's own Council of Economic Advisers, moreover, does not believe that such an increase would result in increased inflation. Dr. Herbert Stein stated in November 1969:

> I have the impression that many people now see a magical significance in a shift of a few billion dollars in the budget position, especially if the shift crosses the line between surplus and deficit. In a trillion dollar economy this is hard to understand, especially after our recent experience with the limited significance of the budget shift between a $25 billion deficit in fiscal 1968 and a $3 billion surplus in fiscal 1969. *Preoccupation with small changes in the budget position leads to bad forecasts by the private economy and bad policy by the Government.*

But more important, the $1.3 billion increase does not represent an increase over and above the budget proposed by the President.

Even if the reduction of Federal expenditures was an effective means of fighting inflation—and Congress has made available to the President other more effective fiscal and monetary increases—the $1.3 billion increase is more than offset by the $5.6 billion the Congress has already cut from the fiscal year 1970 budget.

Furthermore, the budgetary-reduction policy followed by the President will do nothing to lower the price of consumer needs which have gone up due to scarcity such as hospital facilities, medical care, and housing. Nor will it affect the price of those consumer goods or credit which may be controlled by highly concentrated industries or government.

Moreover, the President has failed and in fact explicitly refused to utilize the anti-inflationary authority provided him in 1969 by Congress in H.R. 15091. This bill was approved and signed by the President.

The HEW appropriation may in fact be anti-inflationary in that it would decrease the pressure for higher property taxes which pays for education, lower the cost of health care and provide for increased human productivity.

It seems apparent that the inflation argument will not hold water, that it is merely a delusion to make it appear that the administration is doing something about inflation when in fact the veto is irrelevant to the attack on high prices.

The President himself explicitly stated when he was campaigning for office:

> When we talk about cutting the expense of government—whether Federal, State or local—*the one area we can't shortchange is education.*

I agree with Mr. Nixon's earlier position.

Nevertheless, the President still contends that the amount appropriated is the wrong amount, that it is too high, that education and health deserve less money than thought necessary by the Congress which has held lengthy hearings and conducted exhaustive investigations in both Houses.

We have a State by State breakdown of the actual 1969 spending, Mr. Nixon's 1970 budget requests and the 1970 actual appropriation. It appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 19, 1970, on page 22.

In my State of New Jersey the amount of increase does not represent a boondoggle, it represents an increase based on a real need developed as a result of increased enrollment, higher costs, and new programs developed to solve problems we never thought we could solve or never had before. These problems were testified to by New Jersey officials as well as my own constituent mail.

Mr. Nixon also contends that the money appropriated is for the wrong purposes, that it is "merely more dollars for the same old programs." It strikes me a little late in the year to come forward with such a contention. The Congress has certain responsibilities in the development of Federal programs. The President ought not take unto himself the authority to dictate to Congress now, long after the proper time for such proposals should have been made, the terms upon which he will accept an appropriation. He had an earlier opportunity to veto these programs and he did not. He had an earlier opportunity to come forward with the so-called education reform to which he alluded in his January 26 broadcast. He did not. I cannot conceive that the President can develop such a reform in the few short weeks of negotiation he envisages should the veto be upheld. It is a false promise and cruelly raises false expectations of a cheap chicken in every education pot.

If the administration indeed had developed an education reform program, it should have been brought forward at the proper time. If one only recently has been developed it can properly be given adequate consideration with the 1971 budget and if it is effective I will support it. I am also willing to support a reasonable reform of the impact aid provision when the President or anyone submits a careful criticism and a proposal which provides the school districts with adequate protection.

I, for one, do not enjoy the position of obstructing my President. I respect a Presidential mandate and am willing to cooperate and in fact am willing to support reform in the areas of education which admittedly require them. But I cannot submit to what amounts to an attack on congressional prerogatives. Too much is at stake.

The President also contends that our bill requires the money to be spent at the wrong time. Indeed, what time is the right time? Our children's growing education needs will not disappear for a year nor will our children remain any younger. A year delayed in a child's development is a year lost.

What indeed is the right amount, the right time and the right purpose. In New Jersey, is $1.6 million too much to spend on school library materials? The President's budget would have provided nothing. Is $553,000 too much for guidance counseling and testing? Is it too soon to spend an additional $7 million for educationally deprived children and if so how long will the children wait? Is $3.2 million for work-study programs for the wrong purpose? How long will students wait for the education opportunities the program provides? Is any of the 38 separate educational programs funded in part by the Federal Government in New Jersey for the wrong amount, the wrong purpose, at the wrong time? I do not think so. The New Jersey educators do not think so. And judging from my mail, my own constituents do not think so. The fact is they do not want to see their educational programs retrenched or their schools closed. Nor do they want their property taxes increased.

Education is a cumulative investment; a dollar withheld this year may require two dollars next year. And, completely apart from the financial issue, education requires us to consider the human issue: dollars can be made up; years cannot. The child who is 15 today will be 16 a year from now, and no amount of dollars can restore the opportunities he loses in the next 12 months.

In the area of education, there is no such thing as catch-up spending. Though the textbooks scheduled for delivery in 1970 may appear in 1971, this year's reader will not be there to read them.

It does the starving man no good to be told that grain is being planted. The same holds true for educational services and materials. You simply cannot make up for their absence today by promising to deliver them in abundance at some future undefined date.

Mr. Nixon was right when, during his campaign, he pledged that his administration would "be second to none in its concern for education." Moreover, the commissions he has appointed to advise him agree with the earlier view he expressed on his campaign.

Mr. Nixon's own Task Force on Urban Education stated in their report—printed in the RECORD last week by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN):

> Without adequate funding, there is no hope for effective education in the cities. The current need for funds is as desparate as it is massive.

This report goes on to say that—

> Significantly increased levels of funding are needed for urban education *far exceeding what current appropriations—even authorizations—now make possible.*

A report by the Commission on Instructional Technology entitled "To Improve Learning" released just last Friday calls for massive Federal spending to promote use of instructional technology in the Nation's schools. It recommends another $415 million needed in the first full year of operation to finance research, development, and classroom applications plus creating a "library" of educational and training materials. The Commission quotes President Nixon himself as having proposed during his 1968 campaign a National Institute for the Educational Future.

Last week, the National Advisory Committee on Dyslexia and Related Reading Disorders reported that about 15 percent of the Nation's otherwise capable youngsters are laggard readers and called for Federal outlays totaling $52.3 million over 3 years to mount an attack on what it called "one of the most serious educational problems confronting the Nation."

And Dr. James E. Allen, Jr., U.S. Commissioner of Education, in an article in a recent issue of the New York Times stated:

> We must see to it that our educational system is provided with adequate human, material and financial resources.

And I agree with Mr. Nixon's Commissioner of Education.

Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller has urged Presidential approval of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bill in a letter saying:

> I fully understand and share your concern that Congressional actions substantially increasing Federal expenditures might impede your efforts to curtail inflation. Human resource programs, especially for education must be regarded, however, as of the high highest priority for Federal expenditures, as they have been in New York State. If it appears that total Federal spending will have an inflationary impact, other lower priority areas should be looked to for adjustment to allow needed expenditures for education.

He goes on to say:

> In order to insure sound investment in our nation's future which funds for education represent, I urge you to approve this appropriations measure.

I agree with Mr. Nixon's friend and fellow Republican.

Mr. Nixon himself also said in one of his campaign speeches:

> When I look at American education, I do not see schools, but children, and young men and women young Americans who deserve the chance to make a life for themselves and ensure the progress of their country. If we fail in this, no success we have is worth the keeping.

How can I disagree with any of this? And none of these people are part of an education lobby.

I am perplexed. I find myself strongly supporting my President's earlier statements on the importance of education, his state of the Union message on the "quality of life," and the recommendations of his carefully selected advisers. Why must I stand up opposed to a veto of these very programs and issues? Why must I rise to make right an unkept promise?

The HEW budget cuts proposed by the President affect not only education but health programs as well. If the administration's budget were passed we would lose, for example, the additional $10 million to make effective the Rubella vaccination program, we would not be able to increase the number of hospital beds and thus lower the cost of medical care; we could not increase the number of doctors and nurses—we now import 2,000 foreign trained doctors a year—and the air pollution control increase would be lost.

The New Jersey College of Medicine would lose $76,901 in student loan and scholarship allocations, The New Jersey College Dental School will lose $35,862.

We will also lose current programs in heart disease and cancer research. How long can sick people wait for a breakthrough in cancer research? Would we also have been willing to be waiting today for a breakthrough in the polio vaccine? I do not think so.

I am in full sympathy with the President's war on inflation. I supported the multi-billion-dollar budget cuts made by the Congress from such bills as public works, defense, and naval vessel appropriations. All these represented programs which could wait until next year. All of these cuts were opposed by the administration. And I also supported H.R. 15091 which gave the President authority as yet unused to end inflation.

Yet the President also opposed the Tax Reform Act and the Social Security Amendments of 1969. These measures aid most the very people the President recognizes are hurt most by inflationary prices.

I am most willing and anxious to support the President's war on inflation. But I will not submit to such a war fought with the bodies of children, the aged, and the sick.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I will vote today to override President Nixon's veto of the Health, Education, and Welfare bill.

President Nixon seemed determined to veto something—but I feel that he made a poor choice.

If this veto is sustained, Cleveland schools will lose over $6 million of Federal help. At a time when Ohio leads the Nation in school shutdowns, other schools in this area will suffer the loss of important programs. The veto will cut back medical and health training programs at this time when we are critically short of doctors and nurses. Three thousand northern Ohio college students may have to "drop out" this spring because of the shortage of student loan funds.

And $19 million will be cut from cancer research at the very moment when we are on the verge of a breakthrough; $17 million will be cut from heart research.

I cannot reconcile the President's veto of health and education money with his willingness to spend $5 billion on the supersonic transport program, $4 billion on a new merchant marine subsidy, and a multibillion dollar Safeguard antiballistic-missile system. It is cruel to single out education and health as the victims of an attack on inflation.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote to override the President's veto of the appropriations bill for the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Labor.

I completely reject the President's suggestion that this bill will be a cause of inflation. The clear facts of the matter are that Congress has already made cuts of over $5 billion in the administration's requests for money. In other words, Congress has approved reductions in Government spending which exceeded by $5 billion the reductions which the President takes such pride in. This is an important point because it shows that Congress is just as interested as the President in the relationship between Government spending and inflation. We have acted very responsibly in this area.

Inflation is not an issue here, and the President does a disservice to the people when he suggests that it is. The arithmetic is unmistakable. Overall, Congress gave the administration nearly $6 billion less than it wanted to spend and in the process Congress decided to add $1.3 billion for a variety of health and education programs. We made a decision on spending priorities, and we did it responsibly.

If the President was really concerned about inflation, he would not have fought so hard for added funds for the ABM, the C–5A and other costly defense and weapons projects. Some of these items certainly could have been postponed, in the fight against inflation, without jeopardizing national security.

If the President was really concerned about inflation, he would have joined with Members of Congress, like myself, to support our limitation of $20,000 on the agricultural subsidies paid to wealthy farmers for not growing crops and cotton. In the framework of priorities, this issue is very important, and the White House provided no aid and comfort whatsoever to our effort to reduce this kind of Government spending.

Nor was the President heard from when funds were placed in the foreign aid bill, with the support of the Republican leadership in the House, for the purchase of unrequested jet aircraft for Nationalist China. I voted consistently against this added $55 million, but the President did not speak out or work with us against inflation.

The plain fact of the matter is that the President has threatened Congress with a veto once too often, and now he has to make good on this threat. He said he would veto social security increases and the congressional tax reform bill. In both instances, the President backed away. Having threatened again, he has chosen to make his stand in the field of health and education. I submit that there is no issue here other than the political necessity for the President to close the credibility gap between his words and his deeds. It is of no consequence that health and education programs are at stake.

For a long time lipservice has been paid to the need for reordering our national priorities. For myself, I have tried to vote against items which I thought we could do without for a little while in order to make funds available for other items which I think are very important.

For example, Congress provided about the same amount of money for grants for hospital construction as was made available last year, about $250 million. The President wants to reduce this figure by $100 million, and I feel that this is extremely shortsighted. The availability of Federal funds for hospital construction was an issue in my 1968 campaign, in connection with the plan to build a hospital in the northern part of Onondaga County, and if the President's veto is sustained, the possibility of Federal funds for this effort becomes even more remote.

If the veto is sustained, nearly all of the medical research activities of the National Institutes of Health will be reduced, and I am opposed to this. We need more research into cancer, heart disease, and all of the killers and cripplers of people. This becomes a basic question of priorities.

I happen to agree with the President that more be done with the total dollar for education by improving and updating some programs and by making others more responsive to current needs. No one is opposed to this. However, if we are going to devote less and less of our national resources to education and health, as the President is suggesting, and more and more for costly weapons, it is ludicrous to harp on the need for improvements in education programs when education itself is being shortchanged.

In Onondaga County, there will be reductions in educational expenditures as a result of the President's veto. The Syracuse schools would have to make reductions in a variety of programs financed under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. In addition, Syracuse has a stake in the impacted areas funds because the bill which the President vetoed contains approximately $111,000 for Syracuse schools, according to the Office of Education. Should the veto prevail, the funds will not be available. North Syracuse Central School District No. 3 has approximately $62,000 at stake. It has been estimated that taxpayers in North Syracuse can count on an additional $1.50 or so on the tax rate if the impacted areas program is ended. What the President is doing, of course, is shifting the financial burden from the Federal Government to the States and localities.

Figures provided by the Office of Education indicate that the President's veto will cost New York State $76.5 million in Federal funds for various education programs.

The President desperately needs a scapegoat to blame for the total failure of his campaign to halt rising prices, and unfortunately, all that is left to him is the bill which provides money for health and education. All of the other appropriations bills are approved.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the President has now claimed on prime time that overriding his veto of the Health and Education appropriation will be inflationary. Its an interesting justification for opposing needed funds for health and education. It also happens to be a highly inaccurate assessment.

Let us just for the moment put aside the many compelling arguments for adequately funding needed health and education programs. Inflation has been made the paramount issue. Although the President raised the question, he has given it a most tortured interpretation and it must not be allowed to go unchallenged.

Just exactly what is at issue—what prompted the President of the United States to veto the appropriation? Unquestionably, the President is upset over the fact that Congress has given him $1.2 billion more than he requested to spend on America's health and education. Is this additional appropriation inflationary? The ruminations and posturing of the President aside, the answer is a flat no.

Apparently, the President has not been informed that Congress has cut $5.6 billion from his total budget requests, including the HEW appropriation. I suggest such substantial budget cuts are anything but inflationary.

What, in fact, has really unbalanced this administration has been Congress' successful attempt at restructuring priorities. We have cut the budget. With the remaining funds, we are redirecting expenditures to the areas of greatest need. To disguise his pique with the Congress for having the courage to restructure priorities, the President appears in the cloak of the inflation fighter.

The very specific appropriation we are dealing with is not inflationary. The tragedy of the President's obvious political maneuver is that the real substance of the appropriation is being obscured.

If the ugly prospect of inflation is involved, it is only because the President's veto has itself created a serious set of economic circumstances. Consider the facts. School districts throughout the Nation have made commitments from their general funds based upon their expectation that the Federal Government would continue, as it has for the past 18 years, to adequately fund impact aid programs. If the President's veto is sustained it will mean many school districts will be faced with the hard reality of deficit financing.

There are only a few alternatives available to a district faced with a deficit. For schoolchildren and their parents, the most damaging alternative is closing the schools early. CBS, in a documentary aired last night, dramatically related what can happen to a community when this alternative is selected. Yet, faced with voter opposition to higher property taxes, the main source of revenue for schools, and a sharp reduction in Federal support many school superintendents are giving the alternative of school close downs serious consideration. With financial support being reduced from every side, we are narrowing the real choices local communities can honestly make.

The second alternative local districts approaching deficits from loss of Federal revenue have is obtaining short-term, high-interest loans from banks or other sources in the money market. Anyone with a minimum understanding of the conditions in the economy realizes that this is the most inflationary course available. Such borrowings, at the highest interest rates in history, will have a considerably more disastrous impact on our tight money economy than the increased appropriation. Short-term borrowing may become the easiest alternative to implement. And with dozens of districts forced to compete for immediate short-term funds, the constricting money market and resultant inflationary pressures will play havoc with all rational attempts to bring rising costs and interest rates under control.

This forced borrowing is the most serious implication of the President's veto. Its inflationary impact is far more damaging and more real than the administration's strawman of rising expenditures. As I pointed out earlier, expenditures in fiscal 1970 have been cut back $5.6 billion and this fact makes the President's argument hollow.

The third alternative, in light of present realities is the most untenable. If the President's veto is sustained, local communities will have to fall back on increased property taxes—the traditional source of most revenue for school financing. Property taxes, especially in California, are already much too high. Voters have consistently rejected revenue raising proposals which would put an added burden on homeowners. It is going to be difficult to reconcile an argument which tells the property taxpayer that in a year when Congress was able to cut the budget by $5.6 billion and grant sweeping tax relief, we are reducing support for education. The property taxpayer will have to make up the difference with higher property taxes. This is what the President is really telling the American people.

Inflation pressures must be a consideration in every congressional debate involving money. On this appropriation, the issue has been blown up way out of proportion to its importance.

Supporting the appropriation should be based upon whether one believes education and health should be adequately financed. This is the issue, and it is to answering this proposition that Members should turn their attention.

Skillful management of the media may have turned our attention, and the attention of many voters, from the real issues. This does not reduce our responsibilities to deal with these issues.

At this point, I would like to include some telegrams that I have received on this issue:

LONG BEACH, CALIF.,
*January 26, 1970.*

Congressman RICHARD HANNA,
*Washington, D.C.:*

Thank you for your support H.R. 13111 to this date urged that you request that you vote to override the Presidents veto of HEW appropriation bill when it comes on the floor Los Alamitos School District stands to lose $250,000 if this bill is not authorized the impact on the community both educationally and economically will be disastrous the school district has already called a tax overwrite election for next year of 75 cents because of the potential loss in that budget however there was no such opportunity in the current budget and reserves of the district have been depleted in a freeze in current expenditures has been authorized. We look forward to noting your vote in support of overriding the veto.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
*Los Alamitos Chamber of Commerce.*

GARDENGROVE, CALIF.

Congressman RICHARD HANNA,
*Cannon Building,*
*Washington, D.C.:*

Your support urgently needed to over-ride Presidents veto. We are desperately in need of the funds he has cut from this district. Children will suffer unless help is forthcoming.

DAVID H. PAYNTER,
*Superintendent Gardengrove Unified School District.*

---

ANAHEIM, CALIF.,
*January 24, 1970.*

Representative RICHARD T. HANNA,
*Cannon House Office Building,*
*Washington D.C.:*

Urge full support of HEW bill failure means 79,000 dollars deficit for our district.

DEL SMELTZER,
*Superintendent Savanna School District.*

---

ANAHEIM, CALIF.,
*January 26, 1970.*

Hon. RICHARD HANNA,
*Cannon Building,*
*Washington, D.C.:*

The trustees of this school district are concerned with President Nixon's intended veto of the Education Aid Bill that is currently in the hands of your Congressional body. We most strongly urge your best efforts to override such a veto if it occurs.

Respectfully,

JOHN BARTON,
*President board of trustees Anaheim Union High School District.*

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I have made a decision to support the President's veto of the $19.7 billion Labor-HEW appropriation bill. It is based on my belief that the action of the Congress on this measure can have an all-important effect on the effort to check inflation. The entire Nation and the world will be watching.

An override of the veto would tend to indicate that this Congress is unwilling to face up to the economic realities of the seventies and that despite the efforts of the administration, there is no real intention or commitment to do something about the deficit-spending addiction that has dominated our country for the last 10 years.

If the Congress sustains the veto, it will serve notice that the administration, working with a responsible nucleus in Congress, has truly decided that, even in very difficult areas, it will lead the fight to reverse the inflationary psychology that has gripped the country through the last several years. Sustaining the veto will be a blow for credibility for the economic and fiscal policies of the Nixon administration.

Nevertheless, for a number of reasons, my decision has not been an easy one. In the first place, I have long supported Federal aid to education measures, and I expect to continue to do so, through support of authorizations and appropriations and through a progressive revenue sharing plan diverting to the States and local governments some of the funds—tax revenues—the Federal Government has preempted. Superior education has obviously been prominent in America's progress. However, we must recognize that the danger of inflation to our educational system is as great as, if not greater than, that to almost any other operation of our Government or function of society. This is true because education payments are largely for services and in the providing of facilities and because of the built-in additional needs inherent in the additional pupil load still to come. As it has already, the effect of inflation can be seriously disruptive to education programs and, especially harmful to public opinion, causing a reaction of many communities toward the need for additional funds to continue America's leadership in the field of public education.

We must also recognize that there are many school districts where reliance upon Federal assistance has been built into the program locally by the nature of the Federal program. There is a Federal responsibility to attempt to alleviate the immediate additional burden that will be caused by reductions in Federal funds.

It is my hope that new legislation can be enacted at the earliest possible date, providing a specified minimum percentage floor of last year's Federal aid funds. This might do much to help those districts which have, correctly or incorrectly, based their operations and planning on federally authorized, but not appropriated, funds for education programs. At the same time, we should start the wheels in motion more rapidly to correct or phase out a program which has admittedly, in some instances, diverted Federal funds to richer districts, while depriving poorer districts with little relation to the actual economic impact of the Federal presence upon the community in question.

We should also weigh the merits of legislation, which I plan to reintroduce, to provide appropriations for Federal education programs not later than May 1 of the year preceding the beginning of the fiscal year for which such funds are authorized to be appropriated so that State and local educational administrators can adequately plan for the wise and effective use of such funds.

Thus, I see the current challenge as being a twofold one which must be met responsibly on both counts. First, through sustaining the veto and supporting the President in his fight for fiscal responsibility, and second, for providing at the earliest possible date appropriate corrective legislation along the lines that I have suggested.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, one cannot note without a certain amount of dismay the promise from the President's chief aide for the Congress, Bryce Harlow, to the effect that if the House will not override the President's veto, the White House will support an effort to restore impact aid funds. To the naive, it would seem that Mr. Harlow had not heard the President cite this very category of aid as the chief example of "the wrong amount at the wrong time" in his veto message over nationwide television.

The hypocrisy of the administration on this question is shocking, for the position when shorn of rhetoric is, simply stated, that if the Congress will eliminate the additional funds for deprived children and those in need of vocational braries, and student loans, and hospital construction, they will restore the least useful form of educational aid, the aid to federally impacted areas.

This means that wealthy counties such as Montgomery County in Maryland and Arlington County in Virginia will receive Federal aid, while disadvantaged children and those in need of vocational training throughout the Nation will be penalized in the name of inflation.

The tragedy of this position will not appear in the budget, but in higher crime, in higher unemployment, in higher welfare. For it is the disadvantaged who are more susceptible to unemployment, who are more likely to commit crime, and more likely to seek welfare relief.

Consequently, rather than investing in the equality of a new generation, we are constructing a social gulf. Rather than bringing the Nation together, we are planting the seeds of violence and division. Rather than fighting crime, we will instead merely fill the jails.

This is the tragic import of the administration's veto strategy.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 13111, the HEW appropriation bill for fiscal 1970 and to urge my colleagues to override a veto which was unjustified and unsound.

The President has told the American people that this bill will increase the cost of living. That is "kindergarten economics" and must be rejected. A balanced budget is not the issue here because there are many other places where the President can reduce spending—the SST, the military budget, the space program, just to mention a few. This Congress has already cut the military budget by $5.6 billion and the foreign aid program by about $1 billion.

Unless this bill is passed, New York City schools will lose an estimated $36 million, research on heart disease, cancer and stroke will be curtailed and we will have abandoned our role in setting new priorities for America.

In light of these facts, the President's veto indicates a shocking distortion of our domestic priorities. We have an opportunity to get the Nation back on the right course by overriding the veto and assigning a top priority to social programs.

We cannot talk about our concern for improved education and quality health care out of one side of our mouths and then vote against funds for these programs by talking about the cost of living out of the other side of our mouths. That kind of political masquerade will just not fool anyone. Spending for education and health will add to our economy and not detract from it by way of inflation. An educated and healthy population are taxpayers and not tax users.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as President Nixon said in his televised report to the Nation, his decision to veto the controversial appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare was a most difficult one—and now we Members of Congress must face the equally disturbing question of whether to vote to sustain that veto. Certainly all of us recognize the continuing need for quality education for our children, for adequate health care for all ages, and more diligent efforts to secure a decent standard of living for all families.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations—which held over 3 months of hearings on this very legisla-

tion—I am particularly sympathetic to all of these needs. Our subcommittee went over every item in this bill line by line and, as the seven volumes containing over 8,000 pages of printed hearings indicate, we conducted a very thorough investigation of the requests presented. I feel—as the President does—that these programs all have worthy goals and objectives; and it would be wonderful, indeed, if we had unlimited resources to deal with all of them at once. But, unfortunately, this is not the case, so as a committee we had an obligation to set what we felt were sound priorities in the best interests of all the people. We had to decide how much the Federal Government could reasonably afford to spend without, as the President cautioned, "spending ourselves poor."

In all candor, let me say that in my judgment the bill reported by our committee was realistic and acceptable in a budgetary sense and still provided more funding for these programs than ever before in our history. Although we did recommend an additional $156 million for urgently needed assistance to public and school libraries, educational guidance, counseling, testing, and equipment, we tried to stay close to the budget recommendations of both the Johnson and Nixon administrations without jeopardizing worthwhile programs. When the bill reached the House floor, however, almost a billion dollars more was added by amendments. I opposed these amendments—not because I did not favor the programs they sought to aid—but because in my judgment it is irresponsible for the Congress to vote an annual spending limitation on one hand and ignore it on the other. After action by the Senate and the conference committee, the bill sent to the President was $1.26 billion more than he had recommended.

By adding over a billion and a quarter to the bill with mandatory spending provisions, we would in the President's words "win the approval of many fine people who are demanding more spending by the Federal Government for education and health—but be surrendering in the battle to stop the rise in the cost of living—a battle we must fight and win for the benefit of every family in the Nation."

As I see it, unless inflation is halted, more and more of our dollars will continue to buy less and less education, less and less medical care, and fewer of the other necessities of life. In other words, as more and more is spent in Washington, there will be less and less to spend at home. School Management magazine has stated that "until inflation cools down, school districts that increase spending will—in effect—simply be spinning their wheels." School spending reached record heights in the 1968–69 academic year, but inflation virtually wiped out any accrued benefits. To offset this trend, it is vital that Congress do its part to insure a budget that at the very least will not stimulate inflation through more deficit spending.

If the line against inflation cannot be strengthened, all costs—including those of schools and health services—will continue to go higher.

In my judgment, the fiscal policies which have prompted the Federal Government to spend some $57 billion more than it has received in taxes over the past 10 years have been a major contributor to the inflationary spiral which is of such great concern to everyone today. Those who have followed my record know that I have consistently opposed such spending policies.

President Nixon has attempted to set priorities and he has indicated that if the bill were allowed to stand as sent to him by the Congress, he would be obliged to delete funds from those sectors of the HEW budget where he retains the discretion to do so. This means that such high priority programs as medical research, health services, air pollution, rehabilitation services, and other vital activities would be curtailed. Furthermore, the Department would have to curtail any further discretionary loans or grants. Yet, because of the mandatory requirements of the legislation about $1 billion would be thrown into school programs and must be spent in the remaining 4 months of this fiscal year. Experience has shown that when money is spent in a hurry a great deal is wasted and, in addition, the impact of this and other increased Federal spending would be felt by every household in America.

I support the President in his veto because I feel that we have reached the moment of truth. If we are to improve the quality of education, of medical care, and life in general for all Americans as we hope to do, then inflation must be controlled—the rise in the cost of living checked. We must face reality—there is no other way. I am for education and for quality medical care and I supported the many worthy programs this bill contained—but I am also for doing something about the rising cost of living which makes the attainment of these other goals more difficult.

If the veto is sustained, President Nixon has said that he will immediately seek appropriations which will assure the funds necessary to provide for the needs of the Nation in education and health. Contrary to what has been claimed by some, no school would be forced to close—no child would go uneducated—programs would go forward—and all of this would be done within the framework of an anti-inflationary budget.

In any discussion of the President's veto of the Labor-HEW bill, I feel it is important to note that he has also made a reduction of over $4 billion in the Defense Budget—he has deferred 75 percent of all new Federal construction projects, and he has reduced Government employment. This shows that President Nixon is determined to balance the budget in order to hold down taxes, prevent further inflation, and protect the interests of all the American people. I support his efforts and will vote to sustain his veto.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in our consideration today of President Nixon's veto of the Labor-HEW appropriations bill for fiscal year 1970, there is, in my judgment, an extremely critical issue at stake: whether or not we shall provide quality education for the children of our Nation.

The President has chosen to veto this measure which provides $1.3 billion more than his budget request for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the name of further halting inflation. There can be no question that the Nation's economy and the challenge of eliminating inflation has been the primary concern of each of us during the past several years. For this reason we in the House and our colleagues in the Senate considered with extreme care each of the appropriations proposals for the current fiscal year and made expenditure cuts of $5.6 billion in the President's budget requests.

I believe that further trimming of Government expenditures is vitally necessary—particularly in those areas where spending has been unrealistic, and out of line with our Nation's priorities. I do not feel that education and medical research expenditures are in any way unrealistic. I do feel that it is the responsibility of Congress to see that programs to meet our Nation's pressing education, health, and other domestic needs are adequately funded.

The future strength of our country depends on the young people of today. It is imperative that we do everything possible to instill in our students a respect for knowledge and the desire to be fully informed. We must therefore insure that our young students have the very finest education and are fully prepared to assume responsibility for our continued progress as a nation. Indeed, if there is any one area that deserves to be at the top of our priority list it must be education.

The following editorials from the Miami Herald and the Miami News illustrate the sound thinking through the country in favor of our support for education and medical research funds:

[From the Miami Herald, Jan. 18, 1970]

RESEARCH PENNY SAVED IS DOLLAR LOST IN LIVES

An ad hoc committee of educational and medical groups has importuned President Nixon not to veto the bill providing funds in the current fiscal year for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. As we have said before, the argument has merit—and critically so.

If the HEW bill is dismantled, education and medical research will lose some $1.3 billion in funds. At the school level the so-called impacted area institutions (areas where there are numerous federal employes, such as military personnel, and sparse local revenues) would suffer heavily.

The principal threat, however, is to medical research and medical training.

The United States is far behind the other large nations, particularly the Soviet Union, in the training of doctors. Some figures show that Russia produces from five to seven times as many a year. An important federal program in this field would have to go.

Research is nearly as vital. To the average citizen today it is probably even more important. For at long last some breakthroughs are coming in the fight against killer diseases.

Heart attacks strike down 7,000 Americans a day and take 500,000 lives a year. The fatal incidence of cancer is only less serious.

In both areas important discoveries are being made with federally-aided research

facilities. Evidence increases that viruses may cause cancer in humans, and this is based on research with mice. Experiments also suggest eventual immunization from leukemia.

These are a few of many, many medical advances in which government has been a partner. That partnership should not be dissolved for apparent purposes of economy.

We have encouraged Mr. Nixon many times in recent months to put the knife to excessive spending. He is doing this effectively, we believe, but he knows as well as anyone else that there will be exceptions to every budgetary rule.

Surely education, medical training and medical research are such exceptions. Without them government would be in default to the very people it is supposed to serve.

---

[From the Miami News, Jan. 22, 1970]

NIXON SHOULD SIGN EDUCATION BILL

Even before he reveals his budget today, President Nixon has the opportunity to indicate whether he will be a statesman or a politician in the election-year session of the 91st Congress.

The Congress has virtually completed action on the $19.7 billion HEW bill, which contains some $1.2 billion more than the President requested. He indicated he will veto the legislation, called the increased money for education and welfare "inflationary."

Advocates of the funding, which puts more money into school districts affected by federal activity, insist the issue is not inflation but national priorities. What the critics are saying is that while military commitments overseas are being reduced by the Administration, the military budget is as great as ever. And, they add, domestic general welfare continues to play a secondary role in the thinking of the President.

The argument over Mr. Nixon's priorities is going to be extensive, especially because of the continuing inflation and its effects on domestic policies. The lobbyists who want educational commitments raised argue that the President never mentioned the word inflation when he urged expenditure on billions of dollars on an anti-ballistic missile system. But, they say, talk about spending an extra $1 billion on sorely needed school and health programs and the President is quick to cry "inflationary."

Much of the argument over the HEW bill centers around funds for the Office of Education. The Administration sought $3.1 billion, the conference committee agreed on $4.2 billion. Most of the increase is marked for elementary and secondary education; for the "impacted" area program, the project that gives aid to schools with large numbers of children of government workers (Homestead is a local example); for vocational education; and community library services.

The Administration uses the threat that a raise in education funds means a reduction by the same measure in health and welfare. At a time when the quality of education is under attack and when new demands are heard for reform of the social welfare approach, either choice would be unfortunate.

Mr. Nixon will present a budget of $200 billions to the Congress. Surely, somewhere in the morass of military expenditures, extra funds might be found for education. We hope Mr. Nixon would reconsider his threat.

There should be no veto for education.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I will today vote to override the President's veto of H.R. 13111, the Labor-HEW appropriations bill for fiscal year 1970, and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting quality education and a realistic reordering of our national priorities.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, in 1968 Presidential Candidate Richard Nixon told the American people:

When I look at American education I do not see schools, but children, and young men and women—young Americans who deserve the chance to make a life for themselves and ensure progress of their country. If we fail in this, no success we have is worth keeping.

But now President Nixon has vetoed the HEW appropriations bill which attempts to give them this chance he said they deserve. The reason for this reversal, he has told us, is the need to control inflation.

In economic terms, he has chosen one of the least promising means of attacking inflation. Inflation may be defined as too much money chasing too few goods and services. Of course, any cut in Government spending takes a certain amount of money out of circulation and thus is anti-inflationary. But in the case of a high-demand commodity such as education, a cut in Federal spending stimulates increases in State, local, and private spending, which wash out part of the effect of the Federal cut. If the Federal Government fails to live up to its responsibility, the people will do what they can to secure their children's education from other resources. A recent Harris poll showed children's education ranking behind only food, medicine, housing, and utilities on the American people's list of family budget items they would cut back last in time of austerity.

In contrast, the country would gain the full anti-inflationary benefit of a cut in defense spending. If, for example, we were to cancel the ABM deployment program, private citizens would not rush out to buy ABM's of their own. In addition, there is no question that the very size of the defense budget—more than 18 times the size of the education budget—makes it a far more fertile field for anti-inflationary budget cutting.

Administration defenders will point out that the defense budget has been cut by several billion dollars. This is not the point. What matters is the comparison between what we need to spend and what we are spending. I suggest we are spending far more than we need to on defense, even allowing for the safety margin that is necessary when national security is involved. And even if we succeed in overriding the veto, we will be spending far less than we need to on education.

Much of the criticism of the education appropriation has centered around the program of aid to federally impacted areas. It is said this program channels money into middle-class school districts rather than into the impoverished districts which need it most. While there is considerable truth in this argument taken out of context, for the following reasons it does not justify the President's position:

First. While many of the districts benefiting from impact aid have a high per capita income, their tax base may be low because many of their well-to-do citizens are Federal employees living on nontaxable Federal property. This is the reason for the program's existence.

Second. Sustaining the President's veto will not help the poorer school districts; it will hurt them. Money cut out of impact aid will not go to impoverished districts; it will not be spent at all. Moreover, the President is attempting to cut programs other than impact aid, many of which are of considerable benefit to the poor. He would cut $25 million for bilingual education to $10 million; $50 million for library resources would be cut entirely; vocational education would go from $489 million down to $279 million.

Mr. Nixon said on television Monday night he was vetoing the bill in part because it "provides more dollars for the same old programs without making the urgent new reforms that are needed if we are to improve the quality of education and health care in America."

I agree; reform is needed, and I will be interested to see what new programs the President proposes for next year's authorization. But he cannot use lack of reform as a reason for vetoing this year's bill. He is not proposing new reforms for this year. He is not demanding that we restore some of the worthwhile progressive programs that, to my regret, we deleted from his original request. He is simply demanding that we cut the existing programs and replace them with nothing.

Third. Many districts have already made plans and commitments on the assumption that the previous pattern of impact aid would be continued; they will be in desperate straits if the appropriation is not forthcoming. If this program is to be radically reduced or altered, it must be done more gradually and with more advance notice. Mr. Nixon should not have waited until December 19 to announce his intention to veto; he should have done it last July when the appropriation first passed the House. I suspect his failure to do so was at least in part due to the incongruity of opposing education and pushing for ABM at the same time.

Fourth. Under no circumstances can impact aid be considered money poorly spent. While the impacted districts may not need Federal help as badly as do some others, they need it badly and will put it to good use. Education is one of the most basic and essential services a government can provide for its citizens, and is so considered by the American people.

According to the Harris poll, Americans regard aid to education as the most underfinanced of Government activities. Fully 60 percent said education should be the last item of Federal spending to be cut. Now the President has made it the first.

I suspect that, had Mr. Harris confined his poll to the urban ghettos and the depressed rural areas, the results would have been even more striking. It is most hypocritical to veto education funds in the name of protecting the poor from inflation, when the veto itself deprives them of their best hope of climbing out of the gutter.

And if we condemn millions of Americans to lives of little hope, there is no doubt that many will lash back at the society that has abandoned them, and others will turn to lives of crime as the only way out of poverty. Two of the points most heavily emphasized in Mr.

Nixon's state of the Union address were the "war against crime" and the need to control inflation so as not to burden the next generation with our debt. But at the same time he pursues educational policies that create the criminals and welfare cases of tomorrow to burden our children. With friends like this, the next generation does not need enemies.

Cuts have also been made in the health programs that benefit us all. Mr. Nixon would cut hospital construction funds from $254 million down to $150. Medical student loans would be cut from $24 million to $15 million—this at a time when our country, the richest in the world, does not even rank in the top 10 in terms of life expectancy or infant survival.

The President also proposes small cuts in such inflationary luxuries as heart and cancer research.

Mr. Speaker, education and health are not merely necessities for the individual and not merely obligations of Government to its citizens, although they are all of these things. They are matters of national prosperity and national security. In cultural, political, economic, and also in military terms, the most valuable asset a nation can have is an educated and healthy citizenry.

If this veto is sustained in the name of inflation control the President will have cut back on the programs and services the country needs most and which our citizens value most highly. But as long as he continues our inflated war budget, he will not control inflation with these cuts; the sums involved are too small and their deflationary effect is too weak. Moreover, his unsuccessful attempts at inflation control are heading us inexorably toward our first recession in 10 years. If we continue on our present course we shall have austerity, stagnation, and inflation all at the same time. This will be a memorable achievement, and one for which the voters will want suitably to reward the Republican Party this November and in 1972.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard it suggested that this Democratic Congress should sustain the veto in order to make political capital out of the consequences. I reject this reasoning. This veto, together with the further disordering of national priorities will follow if it is sustained, would be a disaster for the country. We must override it.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, billions for defense waste, but not 1 cent for what we are supposed to be defending. Is that the philosophy we want for America?

Is not it interesting that out of all the billions approved by Congress—$5½ billion less than the President proposed—the only billion the administration has found to veto is an education billion?

No objection from the administration to the use of tax money for the jet set's super airplane.

One is reminded of the town meeting debate over whether to build a new bridge or school.

An elderly gentleman arose and said, "The issue is whether 10 years from now you want educated citizens going back and forth across an old bridge or ignoramuses going back and forth over a new bridge."

Mr. Speaker, how shall we cross the Atlantic?

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, the President's veto of the $19.7 billion appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare has stirred considerable controversy on Capitol Hill and throughout the Nation. The bill in contention would appropriate a staggering $1.26 billion over President Nixon's budget.

Administration spokesmen point out that most of the money is slated for programs, the need for which has been questioned; $600 million voted by Congress would go to federally impacted areas. This is a $398 million increase over the President's budget. School districts in these areas receive additional aid from the Federal Government to reimburse them for educating the children of Federal employees. In order to qualify for impact aid, a school district must have a minimum of 3 percent, or 400 pupils, who are federally connected. More than one-fourth of all school districts in the United States receive such aid.

This program "reimburses" wealthy counties far out of proportion to their needs. Many are fully capable of supporting their schools from local sources. In many cases, the payments actually exceed the cost to the district of educating Federal pupils. Montgomery County in Maryland, for example, one of the richest in the Nation, received $5.8 million in 1968, while a total 100 of the poorest counties in the country received only $3.2 million. Because this program is something of an educational pork barrel, it may be difficult to induce Congressmen from the affected areas to vote against it. The Virginia counties of Fairfax, Arlington, and Alexandria, all rich "bedroom" school districts serving high-ranking Governmental officials, receive $16.3 million in impact area funds. Why should the taxpayers in Iowa subsidize the schools of such high-salaried bureaucrats?

The cost of education of index clearly demonstrates that schools are not exempt from the ill effects of inflation. They are just as susceptible to damage as any other budget, public or service.

The proposed additional funds would become available too late in the school year to be adequately implemented. By the time action is completed on the bill, distribution formulas computed, and grants actually made to the States and school districts, only 3 or 4 months would remain in this fiscal year. It would be too late to hire additional teachers or to alter teaching programs effectively. Nor could the money be held over until the following year. It would have to be spent by the end of the fiscal year—June 30, 1970. Most of the increases are in mandatory formula grant programs. Therefore, HEW would be obliged to distribute them automatically to the States according to predetermined formulas. Such late funding, with a full year's appropriation crammed into 3 or 4 months, would inevitably result in waste. Wild flings in funding make intelligent planning impossible.

For these reasons I will cast my vote to support President Nixon's veto.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I will vote to sustain the President's veto. I will do so because I have consistently voted to hold down Federal spending until inflation is brought under control.

In my judgment, this is not a question of being for or against education. I have stated many times that education should be a top domestic priority—but, I have said even more often that unless we bring inflation under control, all other problems will pale by comparison. Last year, spending per elementary school pupil increased by $51—and inflation burned up $25 of that. Even if the President's veto is sustained, as I hope it will be, the Federal Government will spend more than $10 billion for education in 1970—the most in our history, as the President has pointed out. But unless inflation is brought under control, real spending power and effective increases in aid to education will be wiped out by the rising cost of living. The fact of the matter is quite simple: until we stop inflation, we are simply spinning our wheels by spending more money.

I agree completely with a statement that appeared in the January issue of School Management magazine. On the basis of a survey of 1,000 school districts, the magazine reported:

> While many administrators complain bitterly, these days, about the adverse effect on education of the Nixon Administration's tough anti-inflation measures, the Cost of Education Index makes it abundantly clear that inflation itself is far more damaging than any of the attempts to bring it under control.

That last sentence bears repeating:

> It is abundantly clear that inflation itself is far more damaging than any of the attempts to bring it under control.

There is one other aspect of my decision to support the President's veto. All Government agencies must recognize that it is time to learn to spend more economically and effectively. The Department of Defense is only beginning to make this realization. Much of the objectionable spending in this bill represents the shortsighted appropriation of hundreds of millions of taxpayers' dollars for projects that could be effectively financed by other means or dollars appropriated so late in the school year they can only be used with marginal success. Late last summer I was sharply critical of the delay in Congress over the vital program of guaranteed loans for college students. Hundreds of thousands of students faced the start of the college year not even knowing if they were able to pay tuition. I make the same criticism now about the delay in the appropriations process for this bill in particular: school officials cannot plan efficiently if they do not know how large their share of Federal funds will be for the year ahead. In 1967, recognizing this problem, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 324, which instructed the House and Senate to "report to their respective bodies a bill or bills, appropriating funds for educational assistance programs, not later than May 1 of the year preceding the beginning of the fiscal year for which such funds are authorized to be appropriated."

I think there are two lessons to be

learned. First, returning the dollar to a sound footing requires not only restraint but some very hard decisions from all of us. And second, as a very important part of that restraint, the dollars this Congress does appropriate must be spent as carefully and as effectively as possible.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed unfortunate that the real issue at stake before the House today has been camouflaged as a result of charges and countercharges as to who is for or against education. The issue is inflation. Certainly, we are all for education—and quality education too. If I felt for one moment that the President's aim was to eliminate or even reduce proven quality education programs, I would not hesitate to vote to override the veto.

But, the Congress has enacted a massive education bill that is clearly inflationary. It is way out of proportion to the very ambitious, and I might add, generous, budget request made by the administration. In view of the tremendous inflationary spiral of the past 10 years, the bill in its present form presents a very real danger to the economy that is in deep trouble already.

Leaders of one political party have made it known that the President's veto and the vote here today will become a big campaign issue this fall. Forget inflation, they say, the issue is education. This is an oversimplification of a complex issue. It is also political demagogery. I vote to sustain the President's veto, not out of party loyalty to him or this administration, but our economy is going to collapse unless we start facing up to the deterioration of the American dollar. If this were a Democratic administration faced with the same dilemma, I would still vote the same way. Loyalty to one political party or another must never become so intense or dogmatic as to compensate for loyalty to the good of the people.

Inflation has become a silent thief that robs the economic livelihood of all Americans. I do not know of a housewife in America today who would state differently. For the past few years inflation has been a topic for much rhetoric but no action. Now, the President has addressed himself to this crisis, and as uncomfortable as it may be, the American people are going to have to make some sacrifices. The people are ready to do their part, but what about the Congress? Judging from the free-spending approach to this appropriations bill, it seems that Congress is not willing to make the sacrifice.

The original budget request submitted by the President is generous. Many economists argue that it is too generous. Quality education for our children will in no way be impaired by that request, but if we override the veto the economic security of every American, especially those on fixed incomes, will be jeopardized.

Mr. Speaker, during my political career I have dedicated long hours to the cause of education at all levels. I have written and introduced legislation to grant tax credits for those burdened with the costs of higher education and tax deductions to encourage savings for this purpose. I have supported and sponsored legislation to provide teachers with tax credits and per diem pay when they seek to further their own education. In addition, when plans were suggested to cut back, and, in some cases, reroute such outstanding programs as school lunch and milk, NDEA, and impacted areas, I fought to maintain them in their present form.

Certainly the Federal Government can play a vital role in education, but as in every phase of national activity, education must be accompanied by sound fiscal policies. And, let us remember that the whole concept of the American system of education is local control over our schools. We are witnessing right now what can happen when the Federal Government and the courts attempt to run local school systems. We all pay dearly for Federal education funds—which, of course, are our own tax dollars—with school busing and all the other ramifications of Government intervention in the educational process.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, there is no question in anyone's mind about how I will vote on the question of the President's veto of H.R. 13111; I am only surprised that members of the education lobby came knocking on my door again. They should have learned long ago that I cannot be hoodwinked or pressured into supporting waste of the taxpayer's money by voting for Federal aid-to-education bills.

This morning I received a copy of a very interesting communication from Mr. George Frain, of the Kalorama Citizens Association of Washington, D.C., on the subject of the President's veto and other matters. Mr. Frain has consistently supported measures in the Congress that would improve the lot of the residents of the Capital City, and because of his impressive congressional background, his words have particular relevance to the debate on the HEW appropriation bill.

In the course of his letter addressed to the gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman DONALD M. FRASER, Mr. Frain recalled his background as the first secretary of the Democratic Study Group. The current Democratic Study Group, headed by Congressman FRASER, comes in for some well-deserved lumps from Mr. Frain with respect to plans of the Democratic Party to spend more and more of the taxpayer's money irrespective of the real cost to the taxpayer.

The letter to the chairman of the Democratic Study Group is worth reading in its entirety by all those tempted to vote to override the President's veto and thus vote against the people and the war on inflation. However, there is one sentence in the letter that deserves special emphasis: it reads,

> Personally, as I review the record, I think the Democratic Study Group has changed and it is now voting with the special interest groups, and to hell with the people and inflation.

No one could have said it better nor more succinctly. The full text of Mr. Frain's letter follows:

KALORAMA CITIZENS ASSOCIATION,
*Washington, D.C., January 27, 1970.*

Hon. DONALD M. FRASER,
*Chairman, Democratic Study Group, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRASER: As you know, I was the first secretary of the Democratic Study Group, when it was originally set up by Senators Eugene McCarthy, Lee Metcalf, and George McGovern (when they were in the House of Representatives), and many House members.

I believe the reasons advanced by President Nixon are valid for vetoing the nearly $20 billion HEW Appropriation Bill. For instance, on the nation-wide TV networks last night he said, when he vetoed the bill that—

The bill provides $6 million for the one-half million people who live in the richest county in America (Montgomery County, Maryland), and only $3 million for the 3 million people who live in the 100 poorest counties in America.

Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson all criticized this program as being unfair. Yet the Congress in this bill not only perpetuates this unfair program but adds more money to it.

Since the Democratic Study Group would have followed Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, and President Johnson when he was in the Senate supported President Eisenhower more than many Republicans, why can't you rise above narrow partisanship and support President Nixon? Statesmanship and courage are needed now—if ever.

Vice President Spiro Agnew comes from Maryland, yet he supports President Nixon's veto, since he is clearly of the view that Montgomery County would suffer no irreparable harm if it didn't get the $6 million in impacted aid funds.

President Nixon said this vast bill would contribute to inflation. He has made many cuts, for instance in the space program and in public works, due to the inflation. President Nixon is right, inflation must be halted. Herblock in his *Washington Post* cartoon today totally ignores the cutbacks Pres. Nixon has made. I cannot see how the Democratic Study Group can ignore inflation and its causes. Yet the Democratic Study Group recently voted for a billion dollar freeway program in the Nation's Capital which President Johnson and the Department of Transportation under Secretary Alan Boyd opposed, as the *New York Times* made clear in several articles. Perhaps the Democratic Study Group doesn't believe that there is such a thing as inflation. Another thing wrong with the vote in support of the billion dollar road program in Washington, D.C. is that it will, according to *Newsweek Magazine* of November 3, 1969, displace 40,000 Blacks. Maybe the Democratic Study Group doesn't care whether Negro families will be displaced, but it should. And Herblock is quite willing to misrepresent issues.

Personally, as I review the record, I think the Democratic Study Group has changed and it is now voting with the special interest groups, and to hell with the people and inflation. It is worthy of note in this connection that an express bus and busway program to provide exclusive lanes for use of buses, and an extensive commuter railroad program such as the Senate Public Works Committee called for a year ago and which has not been implemented in the Nation's Capital, could have both been operating today for a cost of no more than $20 million. This would have been non-inflationary and would have saved $1 billion and would not have displaced 40,000 Negroes in the Nation's Capital. But the Democratic Study Group has totally ignored these proposals. Times have changed, but the Democratic Study Group has become the voting bloc for special interests. Clearly, the word "Study" in the Democratic Study Group stands for study to determine how best to serve special interests like these supporting impacted aid despite the stands of Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE FRAIN,
*Elected Delegate.*

P.S. Many DSG members also support the wasteful and highly inflationary Pennsylvania Avenue Plan which will destroy the

Willard and Washington Hotels. Fortunately, President Nixon is now reviewing this boondoggle. If carried out, it will cost $1 Billion.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I vote today in support of the President's veto of the HEW-Labor-OEO appropriation. I regret, Mr. Speaker, that the subject of inflation has come on this particular issue. Certainly all of us want the best education possible for our children and it is my personal belief that we should maintain last year's level of appropriation. I therefore, Mr. Speaker, consider my vote as a vote against an increase.

Mr. Speaker, I voted to reduce taxes and I voted against borrowing in order to pay our bills. I therefore, feel, Mr. Speaker, that having voted against higher taxes and against deficit spending I cannot in all good conscience vote to increase this appropriation.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's veto of the HEW appropriations bill provides clear evidence of a fundamental difference between the Republican administration and the Democratic Congress as to what the Nation's priorities must be in the 1970's. The President's claim that the $1.26 billion increase voted by the Congress is inflationary is without substance in fact.

The undeniable truth is that we of the Congress reduced the administration's overall budgetary request by some $5.6 billion. In the exercise of our prerogative as the people's elected legislators, we trimmed the fat from the President's proposed military expenditures and foreign aid programs. We merely shifted priority considerations to programs designed to meet the health and education needs of our people. By providing the additional $1.26 billion, we were still appropriating $5.6 billion less than the total administration's budgetary request. How can the President say that congressional appropriations are inflationary when his own budget requests exceeded what Congress appropriated by $5.6 billion?

Clearly, the real issue is not inflation. It is a question of national priorities. Mr. Nixon evidently places the health and education of our citizenry at a lower level of consideration than does the Democratic Congress.

I shall vote to override his veto.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, since last December, considerable attention has been focused on the appropriation bill containing funds for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare because of the President's announced intention to veto the bill if the Congress insisted on retaining the inflationary increase of more than $1.2 billion over the amount he recommended for the Department for the fiscal year which ends on June 30, 1970.

Educational interests have attempted to portray the issue as a reordering of priorities, and as for taking a position to override or sustain a veto, those interests have viewed it as a vote for or against education. As a special interest group, the educational lobby was naturally expected to build as strong a case as it could for the additional funds, but I, for one, supported the President in the interest of all the people and voted to sustain the veto, recognizing that the fundamental issue is one of inflation.

For your benefit, the following are the considerations I made in voting to support our President, some of which are a re-emphasis of the President's veto message of January 26.

First. President Nixon's budget for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was $2.1 billion higher than the Department's budget for the last fiscal year and $700 million more than former President Johnson requested in his last budget. It certainly cannot be said that the present administration is antieducation, but quite obviously, education interests support the massive $1.26 billion increase in principle, regardless of its impact on rising prices or the impossibility of spending the money this year.

Second. The vetoed bill calls for funds in the current 1970 fiscal year which ends in less than 6 months, June 30, 1970. It would be a virtual impossibility to absorb this massive infusion of funds without incurring unacceptable waste of tax dollars. It might be added that as both Houses of Congress are Democrat-controlled, the majority party, whose members control all committees and the scheduling of legislation, must stand accountable for this inexcusable delay.

Third. Almost one-half of the increase is earmarked for school districts declared to be Federally impacted areas; that is, school districts that include or are close to Federal installations on which schoolchildren reside with their parents or on which their parents are employed. While popular because of the "no strings" feature of the program, it is highly inequitable as revealed by the President when he noted that the bill provides $6 million for 500,000 in the Nation's wealthiest county—Montgomery County, Md.—and only $3 million for the 3 million people who live in the 100 poorest counties.

Fourth. The President has had very little cooperation from the majority party in the Congress in the development of long overdue reforms and improvements in the quality of education. It is a fact that the majority party unsuccessfully attempted to extend all major education programs for 5 years so as to put them beyond the reach of alteration of the present administration. With respect to the quality of education, you will recall in his veto message that the President said:

> I believe that when we consider how much we are putting into education in the United States, we are entitled to get more out in terms of better quality of education . . . In my education message which I will shortly be submitting to the Congress I will propose a new and searching look at our American school system.

It is indeed remarkable that millions of schoolchildren are still unable to read adequately.

Fifth. The real crux of the issue is the will of this administration to reverse the tide of rising prices. It is readily acknowledged that persistent budget deficits over the past several years are the single largest factor contributing to the inflationary spiral we are still experiencing. The 5.4 percent increase in the Consumer Price Index in 1969 was the highest since the Korean war. In terms of dollars and cents, it means that goods and services that cost $10 in 1957–59 are now at the level of $13.13. More significantly, the statistics published earlier this month by the Bureau of Labor Statistics reveal that the average worker today can buy slightly less with his pay than he could have more than 4 years ago because of inflation and higher taxes.

It has taken this drastic action on the part of the President to emphasize that inflation must be controlled. No area of the Federal budget is immune from restraint, including education. Some have said that other programs—namely, defense and space—should be cut to allow for higher expenditures for education and other social programs. The fact of the matter is that the bulk of the $7 billion ordered cut by the President in the current fiscal year has been in the budgets for defense, space, and related areas. This does not mean that $7 billion additional are available for education or any other program if the result is nothing more than a question as to the magnitude of the budget deficit. The tax reductions provided for in the recent Tax Reform Act and the expiration of the surtax as of June 30, 1970, are even further compelling reasons why an increase of $1.26 billion for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare alone cannot be tolerated if the control of rising prices is to amount to anything more than so many words.

In my estimation, the artificiality of attempting to make the issue one of pro or con education is an obvious subversion of the real issue of inflation. Furthermore, claims by the education lobby of higher taxes if the veto is not overridden is an incredible insult to the intelligence of every taxpayer, recognizing that even those dollars allocated by the Federal Government are your tax dollars, too.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the President in his veto of the HEW-Labor appropriation bill.

I do so, quite frankly, with mixed feelings.

I believe education, job training, health care, and the work of OEO are high on our Nation's list of pressing problems.

I supported the Joelson amendment to H.R. 13111. I supported the House-passed bill, and I supported the conference report.

From the outset I have made it very clear that there were provisions in this bill which I seriously question.

For 3 years I have worked for basic changes in our approach to impact aid. It has become an expensive and, in too many cases, misdirected program. I oppose the increases in impact aid in the Joelson amendment and throughout our deliberations on this bill.

The title I, ESEA, formula presently used is inequitable. The program is designed for needy children yet nearly 90 percent of the operating school districts in the Nation receive these funds. Under the existing formula the wealthiest areas

in every State, with the best financed schools and the most expensive services for all the children, receive title I funds. The formula is imperfect and inflexible and needs to be changed. I have proposed changes, and I will continue to work for them.

The conference committee cut $1.1 billion in forward funding for ESEA in fiscal year 1971. This to me is penny-wise and pound-foolish. The $25 million requested for innovation in elementary and secondary education—to help us improve reading techniques, investigate ways to make schools more accountable for results, and improve educational methods—was deleted from the legislation.

These are shortcomings which I found glaring at the time this was considered.

Furthermore, in order to insure maintaining a balanced budget I voted on a number of occasions to reduce spending.

For example, during the first session I voted against the Department of Transportation appropriations bill, which contained the funds for the SST. I voted against the NASA appropriations bill in opposition to expanded space explorations. I voted against the legislative appropriations bill, because I felt it contained money which could be deferred or more wisely spent. I voted to cut $1 billion from the military procurement authorization bill for Navy ships. All of these measures were passed and approved.

I supported the conference report and hoped that the President would not find it necessary to veto the bill but because this bill was taken up next to last we find ourselves in an impossible predicament.

There are but two fiscal year 1970 appropriations bills waiting final approval—Labor-HEW and foreign aid. The Congress has already cut foreign aid by more than $1.12 billion over what was requested by the President.

Uncontrollable expenditures—driven upward by the inflation we are trying to control—forced the spending level more than $2 billion over the $193.9 ceiling which I supported in July of 1969.

The Labor-HEW appropriations will push Federal expenditures close to $198 billion.

The chairman of the House Appropriations Committee and the House leadership have said that they will do everything possible to have the fiscal year 1971 appropriations for Labor-HEW-OEO approved by the House prior to July 1 of this year.

Right now, however, we must face facts—if inflation continues unchecked, twice as much as the $1.1 billion increase we have provided for education will be swept away. In 1968, inflation burned up $25, or 49 percent, of the $51 increase in spending per elementary school pupil, and 1969 promises more of the same.

In the final analysis, inflation itself is far more damaging to the education system than any attempt to bring it under control.

The President has pledged that if the veto is sustained he will immediately seek appropriations which will assure the funds necessary to provide for the real needs of the Nation in education and health.

Thus, I will support the President.

I would like to mention, however, two particular programs in this bill which I feel should be supported at least at the conference report level and probably even greater. One is vocational education. The other is the Teacher Corps.

For the last 4 years the Teacher Corps has attracted dedicated and talented young people to careers in educating our most neglected children; some 1,400 interns began service in 1969, and another 9,000 applicants had to be turned away because there was no room for them. The funding we have granted for fiscal year 1970 will not provide support for even as many new enrollees as joined the Teacher Corps last year.

What makes this so troubling to me is that all of us speak constantly about the effective use of Federal tax dollars, and yet we have done nothing to reward a relatively tiny Federal education program which has tried with great earnestness—and success—to use its moneys wisely and well.

While I am not a member of the Appropriations Committee, I shall be among those members of both parties who will attempt to see that in fiscal year 1971 we support the programs which serve education well, and this includes teacher corps, vocational education, and research and evaluation.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today as we consider the President's veto of the Departments of Labor, and of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bill for fiscal year 1970, we are confronted with one of the most important and basic issues that will come before the Congress this session; namely, the issue of national priorities.

It is unfortunate that the education, health, and manpower programs money bill must serve as the initial watershed on which the test is made as to the ordering of our national priorities for the new decade. But I suspect there will be other tests of this nature until we resolve that we must move ahead with or without presidential leadership in meeting our Nation's basic needs. If this is to be the age of reform of which the President spoke in his state of the Union message, let the House by its action today lead the way in firmly establishing our Nation's sense of purpose. The very credibility of our National Government is being questioned as to its ability to meet these needs and to resolve the problems of our people in the 1970's. We have an opportunity here today to demonstrate forthrightly that we do indeed recognize our Nation's needs and that we are prepared to meet them.

There is no question that inflation must be curbed. Yet, I question the President's contention that this particular bill containing $1.2 billion more than he recommended will fan the fires of inflation. If that is the case, why did the President ask the Congress to add nearly $1 billion more to the foreign assistance program this year? Surely our domestic needs are every bit as important, if not more so, than the foreign aid program which, according to the latest figures, has $11 billion in various categories available for spending.

On the contrary, overriding the President's veto would be an anti-inflationary act because the funds made available in the bill would help ease the shortage of medical facilities and personnel. High medical and hospital costs are caused in part by the present shortage. A lower education budget would create pressures in many school districts for additional increases in property taxes. Such pressures would add to inflationary increases in the cost of living. Also, investments in human resources, which the bill provides, can have a kind of negative tax savings from lower unemployment compensation, social service, welfare payments, penal institutions, and other program costs for the unproductive.

The Congress shares the President's concern with the horrendous inflation afflicting our people today. This is why we cut $5.6 billion in the President's budget requests. In fact, for fiscal year 1969 congressional action produced a $3 billion budget surplus and the latest estimates for the current fiscal year, which ends June 30, indicate a budget surplus of $5.9 billion. Additionally, the tax reform bill which the Congress forged into law will bring $6.4 billion more in revenue during calendar year 1970 than in 1969. Also, the Congress in the last session enacted legislation granting the President authority to control interest rates and the inflationary use of credit. To date ,the President has not invoked that authority.

The President in his veto message raised two other points on which I would like to comment. The first involves the impacted aid program. As you know that program provides Federal assistance to school districts to help offset increased operating, maintenance, and construction costs because of the presence of a Federal installation in a given district. With increased student enrollments, the school districts are faced with finding additional funds to operate the schools. If it were not for the Federal assistance available to the school districts under the impacted aid program, can you imagine what the local tax rates might be? As a matter of equity to the local taxpayer, the Federal Government has an obligation to help offset those increased costs. As it stands, the amount of assistance available does not even meet those costs.

The second point involves the matter of timing. President Nixon suggested that because there were only 5 months left in the fiscal year the money could not be spent wisely. I am certain that many school districts in view of the strong congressional commitment that was made last year have incurred obligations in anticipation of these funds being made available to them. Furthermore, I am certain our schools have long-range plans for which the funds could be put to good use.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I urge my colleagues to vote to override the President's veto. Let us keep our commitment to our people.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I support the motion to override the veto of H.R. 13111, making appropriations for the Nation's urgent needs in education and health.

I do so with the strong conviction that any economy drive is misdirected when it centers upon our schools, our teachers, and our children.

In 1968 the President, as a candidate, recognized the priority Congress and the people have traditionally recognized in this field and said:

> Education is the area in which we must keep doing everything that is necessary to achieve the American Dream.
>
> When you cut expenditures for education, what you are doing is short changing the American future.

Now, by veto, the President moves to shortchange that future, by denying to education the funds lawfully authorized and appropriated by this Congress.

As a candidate, the President recognized the priority needed for health programs, and was critical of a cutback in efforts on mental health. As a candidate, he called emphatically for "additional funds under the Hill-Burton Act" for construction and modernization of hospital facilities—"to supplement State and local efforts."

As President, he has vetoed a bill which seeks to meet our Nation's responsibility in these and other health fields.

I believe the President's veto is ill-advised and totally inconsistent with his commitments to the people—commitments made as a candidate for our highest office.

I further believe additional delay in providing the funds we have authorized and committed in these fields will be injurious to our schools, our hospitals, our medical research programs, and our people.

For these and other reasons, I vote to override the veto.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have heard it said today by those who would override this veto that inflation is somehow a "phoney issue." They would have us believe that the only real issue here is whether we are for or against the education of our children. They would further have us believe that if this veto is sustained, our schools will have to close down and irreparable harm will be done to our Nation's youngsters.

Mr. Speaker, if these people would take the trouble to stop and think a bit about what they have said, they would realize just how ridiculous those charges are. Why, in an election year, would anybody want to manufacture an issue that would make them vulnerable to the charge that they were antieducation? Who seriously believes that those of us who support the President on this are using inflation as a cover for some sinister plot to close the schools and deprive our children of a decent education? If this were the case, we would certainly be among the lowest villains known to man.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is a more logical and reasonable explanation for our actions. We are supporting the President on this veto because we know that inflation is not a phoney issue. Perhaps, if it had been treated a little more seriously 5 years ago, it would not be an issue at all today. But every man, woman, and child in America knows just how real the issue of inflation is. They have borne the brunt of that inflation and continue to bear it. They have seen the cost of living rise 25 percent in the last decade and have watched helplessly as it consumed their earnings and savings. They know that the biggest villain of this whole episode has been the Federal Government, with deficit spending totaling $57 billion in the last 10 years.

They also know that for the first time in 10 years we have a President who is attempting to check that inflationary spiral by holding down Federal spending and balancing the budget. It is not the most popular course to take at a time when so many of our domestic problems require additional Federal expenditures. It certainly is not the course of political expendiency with the fall elections just around the corner. But for those who truly understand inflation and realize that it is anything but a phony issue, this is the only prudent course to take at this time. We know full well that if inflation is allowed to proceed unchecked, any additional Federal outlays at this time will be wiped out by the cruel hand of inflation. At a time when there is a justifiable clamor over priorities, we know that our first priority must be the restoration of a healthy economy capable of coping effectively with the many pressing domestic priorities.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues and I say to the American people, that when we vote to sustain the President's veto today, we will be voting to curb inflation and to restore a sound economy. This is not a vote against education and our action will not precipitate the dire consequences which some have forecast. In his TV message to the American people, President Nixon gave us the following assurance:

> You can be sure that no school will need to be closed. No school child will be denied an education as a result of the action I take tonight. I will work with the Congress in developing a law that will ease the transition to education reform and do so without inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I think the President is a man of his word and that he will stand by that word. Let us vote to sustain his veto and then get on with the business of hammering out an acceptable bill which will provide for our educational needs without further fueling the fires of inflation.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, for the third time in this fiscal year the Congress must act on the HEW-Labor appropriations bill. And for the third time I am confident that the Congress will reaffirm its commitment to education, a commitment to our No. 1 national priority. Unfortunately, this priority is not recognized by the President, the same President, I might add, who during the last campaign said that in no uncertain terms that education must not be shortchanged.

In his nationally televised speech on Monday night, the President sought to rationalize this decision to emasculate the education budget under the guise that such steps were in the interest of all the people, and opposed only by politically motivated persons intent on firing inflation. I submit that the President is wrong on all counts of his indictment and am sure that well over two-thirds of this body will recognize the weakness of his argument.

As his first defense, the President stated that his budget for fiscal 1970 contained a larger request for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare than ever before. This is correct as far as it goes, but it is that his budget request for educational programs was $572.1 million below last year's appropriation.

The crux of this debate today is the congressional add-on for education programs, programs cut below the 1969 level by the President. Talking about the overall budget for HEW is adding apples and oranges. We must talk about education. Congress added the necessary funds that were stripped by the President. That is the argument pure and simple. At a time when the cost of education is rising, the President feels that its budget must be cut, and anyone opposed to such cuts is acting under politically inspired motivations in concert with some nefarious "education lobby." This attack disturbs me. I would hope the debate would be carried on its merits with a full exploration of the substantive issues. I do not impugn the motives of my colleagues in the House who are supporting the President. I am sure that they do not impugn my motives. I extend this courtesy to the administration and hope that they will reciprocate.

The President continued his justification by claiming that we have appropriated the wrong amount for the wrong purpose at the wrong time. This is nice phraseology, but a glib quip will not disguise the facts. If this is the wrong amount, it is wrong on the low side and not on the high side.

This 1.3 billion increase is but one-half of 1 percent of the Federal budget for this fiscal year—hardly a contribution to inflation as the President suggests. As the Joint Economic Committee has demonstrated, $1.3 billion can get lost at the Pentagon by a mere computation error in cost estimate.

As a citizen, and Congressman, I am as much concerned with the inflational spiral as any one in this Chamber. But I am unwilling to allow the President to cite an increase in educational spending of such a small magnitude as a contributor to inflation. In the first place, it is extremely doubtful that this increase of .005 percent of the budget will have any significant impact on the economy at all. As Gardner Ackley, formerly of the Council of Economic Advisors, has pointed out, the American economy does not respond to slight budgetary adjustments. This, of course, is to our benefit. The United States has a GNP approaching $1 trillion annually, and an annual budget in the magnitude of $200 billion. If, in fact, one billion plus or minus could make a difference we would experience violent economic surges on a continual basis. Such surges are not evidenced. A military cost overrun of $2 billion does not set off a ripple. The congressional cut of $5.6 billion in authorizations has not made a strong impact

as yet. How, may I ask, can $1 billion imbalance the present situation.

Furthermore, the President has thus far refused to use the many means at his disposal to seriously combat inflation. Soon after his inaugural the President announced that his administration would not intervene in wage-price determinations by recommendations, even on an informal basis. The President has also refused to use the great powers of his office, including administrative adjustments in stockpile releases as a means of slowing price increases.

In 1969 Congress enacted legislation giving the President credit control authority. The President signed that bill, but announced that he will not use this authority containing a number of fiscal tools which could exercise control over the economy.

Yet now the President claims that he is contributing to the fight on inflation by opposing a relatively insignificant expense. This reasoning is all the more confusing when we recognize that the Congress has already cut $5.6 billion in budgetary authority for this fiscal year—1970.

Finally, a cut in the HEW budget at this time will force many localities to absorb the decrease at the local level, in most cases by increased property taxes. I fail to see how pressure on local expenditures is an anti-inflationary device. An increase in local property taxes is certainly as much a burden on the individual as is inflation. Its impact is even more apparent as the tax bill becomes due. In Oakland, Calif., which I represent, the tax rate is at its maximum level now. This Federal supplement is absolutely essential for the basis educational services, not frills, not extra equipment, but for the basic tools needed by our own children. Yet such funds are inflationary?

The President also objects to the bill on the grounds that these funds are going for the wrong purposes. I will support any improvement in our educational programs. If the President has constructive suggestions, I will be right behind him. But I cannot see how a cut in the budget for this year will contribute to better programs in any way.

I would like to point out, however, that striking gains have been made by these programs derided by the President. For example, Project Read, a program for 1,500 school children in Oakland, has clearly shown that innovative techniques can and do work. I have received numerous letters from teachers in my congressional district all favorably commenting on Project Read which is funded under ESEA.

Title I of ESEA is also the focus of much criticism. Yet I can point to the report prepared by Dr. Allen W. Badal, of the Oakland Public School System, in which it was shown that significant improvement was made in reading skills. As one example, in each grade from grades 1 through 5, continued improvements were exhibited through junior high school. Obviously, improvement is always possible, but let us not refuse to recognize substantial progress merely because some wish to discredit existing programs.

The President states that he will soon make proposals for a new look at our educational system. As we are all now aware, the President was presented with such proposals by his own Task Force on Urban Education. Among the striking recommendations of this task force was an increase in spending to the amount of $7 to $14 billion per year by 1974 for urban schools alone, and an increase of $1 to $2 billion this year for those same schools. The President has refused to release this report. I ask, Why?

My next objection to the President's position is that it is too late in the school year for these funds to be spent intelligently. This argument is not responsive to the facts.

Each year the various school districts plan their budget on the basis of their realistic expectations of Federal funds. In the past years these funds have been appropriated, albeit often late. This year Congress ratified its decision to provide these funds on three occasions. The point is that the school districts have already committed the funds to be provided under this appropriations bill. In many cases school districts have borrowed to meet the commitments in anticipation of the Federal funding. In other cases locally derived funds budgeted for the end of the school year have already been spent in anticipation of forthcoming HEW funds. If this veto is sustained the result will not be a saving of unnecessary expenses. In many cases it will mean a short school year, as the operating funds will run out in April or May. It may also mean a default on promissory notes by the school districts. It will mean payless paydays for some teachers.

It is not to late, Mr. Speaker. It is not too late to save our schools. We must override this veto and restore the needed funds to our educational system. We must get our priorities on the right track now.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, during the 1968 presidential campaign, just over a year ago, Mr. Nixon stated:

> When we talk about cutting the expenses of government—Either Federal, State, or local—the one area we can't shortchange is education.

I agree completely with this statement and wonder what caused the President to change his mind.

On Monday evening, President Nixon addressed the American people in explanation of his veto of the appropriations bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

At this time, he stated:

> Most of the proposed increases (in the HEW bill) go to marginal or misdirected programs which need to be overhauled, not expanded.

In truth, can we believe that funds for mental health centers, the National Institutes of Cancer and Heart Disease, education for the handicapped, and vocational education are marginal, misdirected, and of low priority.

During the past few years, primarily under Federal guidance and financial support, our schools have instituted many progressive and innovative programs.

As we all know, the initial expense in establishing a program is often the greatest cost.

Is it in the best interest of our economy to cut back in funds for vocation education and thus force more unskilled workers on the labor market? Is it in the best interest of our economy to shut off aid to medical students when we are in desperate need of doctors?

Mr. Nixon also claimed on Monday evening that the increase appropriated by Congress is inflationary. At this point, let me quote Dr. Herbert Stein, a member of his Council of Economic Advisers:

> I have the impression that many people now see a magical significance in a shift of a few billion dollars in the budget position, especially if the shift crosses the line between surplus and deficit. In a trillion dollar economy, this is hard to understand . . . Preoccupation with small changes in the budget position leads to bad forecasts by the private economy and bad policy by the government.

That is what this veto is, bad policy, Mr. Nixon's own Task Force on Urban Education has stated that "The current need for funds is as desperate as it is massive," and recommends increasing the educational funds by more than $14.5 billion in 4 years.

We are told that the HEW bill must be vetoed "to protect the consumer from higher prices and the taxpayer from additional taxes." But is it really inflationary to try to eliminate ignorance?

Is it really inflationary to try to find a cure for cancer, a disease which already is responsible for one-half of the deaths in this country each year?

Can we afford to ignore the progress we have made in the last few years? Can we afford the projected closing of schools if funds are not forthcoming? Every Member of Congress is aware of the serious economic situation which we find ourselves in at this time. Certainly the Federal budget must be cut to some extent. The question is again one of priorities. Are we to cut needed funds for Health, Education, and Welfare, or rather should we cut appropriations for the SST, questionable foreign assistance programs and a host of mismanaged costly military follies?

An uneducated citizenry is a dangerous weapon which we cannot in human consciousness subscribe to.

Mr. Speaker, these questions cannot be overlooked. Last summer a Harris poll showed that 60 percent of the American people feel that aid to education should be the last place to cut Federal spending.

We can even quote President Nixon in the 1968 campaign:

> When I look at American education I do not see schools, but children and young men and women—young Americans who deserve the chance to make a life for themselves and insure the progress of their country. If we fail in this, no success we have is worth the keeping.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in overriding the Presidential veto.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, there is no decision which has been more difficult for me to make than the one which I face now. After working for years to help elect a Republican President to serve in the White House, and faced with an overwhelming desire to contribute to the success of this administration in all of its programs and undertakings, it is little

short of distressing to find myself in disagreement with the President in his veto of the appropriation bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Labor, and other Federal agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I have weighed carefully and thoughtfully the President's words as contained in his veto message, as well as in his public appearance before a nationwide television audience. What the President has said in both of these statements was related substantially in an earlier communication which other Members of the Congress and I received from the President's counselor, Bryce Harlow. Immediately after receiving Mr. Harlow's communication, I composed a reply in which I set forth compelling reasons why the President should forgo such a veto. The pertinent portions of my letter dated January 8, 1970 are as follows:

A principal basis for this intended veto appears to be the appropriation of funds for impacted school aid.

I must take sharp exception to the claim that the impacted school funds are a factor contributing to inflation—and I question seriously whether a Presidential veto will have anti-inflationary effect whatever. While the formula for providing aid to public schools affected by Federal installations, requires review and revision, it would seem most unjust to cut off funds under the existing program prior to developing a revised formula. Schoolchildren and teachers will be the primary victims of a Presidential veto.

It is true that Lake County, Illinois (in my District) is a wealthy county, but funds for schools are not distributed on a county-wide basis. The loss of funds in Lake County will be experienced primarily by the North Chicago and Waukegan public schools which are in desperate need of these funds. A total of $1,708,573 was received by the 5 school districts in these communities in the prior year. The Conference committee report would result in lowering this figure somewhat. A Presidential veto would cause a serious loss.

Children from minority groups and from disadvantaged backgrounds will be the principal sufferers without the impacted school aid—and the educational and other opportunities which these youngsters require will be curtailed.

While Great Lakes Naval Training Center and other Federal installations located in Lake County provide numerous advantages, there is no direct benefit tc the school districts from these Federal installations. The sales tax revenues produced by the Federal personnel are payable to the state and municipalities, and are not distributable to the public schools. Also, revenues from the automobile license and gasoline taxes do not benefit the public school systems. Accordingly, the Federal impacted school aid is an appropriate contribution to the support of the affected public schools in Lake County.

I hope that you and the President will again review this subject very carefully before pursuing the intended veto referred to in your letter. It would seem to me to be a most unwise policy to take any such direct action in reducing funds for education.

I forwarded a copy of this letter to my distinguished colleague from Michigan, the Republican leader of the House (Mr. GERALD R. FORD.)

Other reasons which have been cited in support of the President's veto of this measure are:

First. The long delay in acting upon this appropriation measure with the result that much of the school year has now passed. With regard to this arugment, I wish to point out that the delay was not occasioned by the local school administrators nor by the children whom they serve. Accordingly, the schools and schoolchildren should not be those who should suffer from this delay. It was reported to me several months ago that the delay on the part of some was deliberate in order to try to defeat the impacted school aid provisions of this bill. There would seem to be justification for this suspicion if, at this time, the delay in the passage of the bill is used as a basis for the Presidential veto.

Second. Another point has been made that a revision of the impacted school aid formulas is required in order to eliminate the inequities which exist under the present program. In this connection, some who are supporting the President's veto make reference to the so-called Battelle report. I have studied this 175-page document with a view toward determining whether the school districts in my congressional district deserved to be compensated in some manner other than the existing impacted school aid program. As I read the report, the school districts which receive the major portion of impacted school aid in Lake County, Ill., would continue to receive such aid under the recommendations of the Battelle report. Indeed, it is possible that increased aid of this type would be allocated to some of the affected schools.

Mr. Speaker, the provisions for impacted school aid funds and, indeed, the entire bill, H.R. 13111, were supported by a majority of Republicans in this House. The measure also received the overwhelming support of Republicans in the other body. When I supported the increase in impacted school aid funds, I did so with the firm conviction that these funds were needed in my congressional district and in other areas of the country in behalf of the education of our young people. I find no reason to conclude that I was wrong.

Notwithstanding my position, if the Presidential veto is sustained, I hope that adequate funds will be appropriated to meet the needs of those schools across the Nation which experience loss of local tax revenues as a result of the presence of Federal installations. On the other hand, if the veto is overridden, I will welcome the opportunity to support a revision of the existing law to remove inequities in the payment of impacted school aid funds to local school districts.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I realize the displeasure which my vote may cause on the part of some. I do not know how to avoid that. It would be my hope that they try to understand, even as I have tried to understand, the reasons and motivations which persuaded the President to issue his veto message and which has encouraged many others in the administration to support vigorously that action. In casting my vote to override the Presidential veto, I feel that I am doing what is best for my constituents in the 12th Congressional District of Illinois as well as for the welfare of all of the citizens of the Nation.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon, by vetoing the HEW appropriation bill, has made a gross error in judgment which the American people will not soon forget. The President cannot hide behind the issue of inflation. No longer must we ask the "real" Richard Nixon to come forward. He is now on his feet and all the Nation should take a good look at the man who tells us it is not in our best interests to invest in education and health at this time.

If we cannot justify spending money for the most vital needs of our people, how, then, do we live with the massive Federal expenditures for defense, space exploration, the SST, and the ABM? How does education, an investment in the futures of American lives and manpower, an investment which will surely return more to this Government in tax revenues than ever expended, become the villain in the inflation fight.

The 1970 budget allocates $400 per person for defense—and only $13 per person for health—and the President would have us believe that this health expenditure would seriously cripple the country through increased inflation.

The President has a strange way of fighting inflation. The Congress recently gave him the authority to control credit, slow interest rates, and help homebuilders and small business. The President signed the bill—but announced he will not use that authority. The President has not shown any interest in dissuading big business from continuing price increases. Instead, with every price increase and the demand then created for increased wage and salaries, the President imposes another freeze on Federal program spending—many which fall on vital domestic needs such as education.

The White House is fighting inflation by increasing unemployment—and they have stated that the rising rates in unemployment are encouraging. Banks are getting richer every day—and the administration approves these higher interest rates. Banks and big money lenders showed profit increases of from 5 to 55 percent or more in 1969—but the White House observes progress against inflation in the crumbling of the every day existence of the common man. Following White House reasoning on inflation to its logical conclusion, we can only assume that trumpets will blast forth on Pennsylvania Avenue when the average man on the street has holes in his pockets.

The President proposed to this Congress a budget which he claimed was not inflationary. This Congress has cut $5.6 billion from 10 of those 14 appropriation requests—taking into account the $1.2 billion added to education and health. The President then accuses Congress of inflation—in spite of our action to reduce his own proposed budget by this substantial amount. The real issue, then, cannot be inflation. The real issue is the right and/or responsibility of the Congress to redirect Government priorities which do not fit into the President's scheme of things. An amount equal to the net reduction of $5.6 billion was taken from proposed defense and military budget requests.

Over and above the issue of money, the President has taken issue with the vari-

ous education programs. The President says we should take a new look and revamp these programs. All of us who went through the Job Corps struggle know how this administration goes about revamping programs.

First, they wipe out the existing program as they did with 59 Job Corps centers serving 16,000 young people. Then, they tell us they will initiate new centers with new guidelines. And yet—8 full months since the Job Corps centers were abolished, only one new facility has been opened. It is located in Phoenix, Ariz., and serves only 50 girls. The St. Louis Women's Job Corps Center—which served a total of 600 women was wiped out last June—and the new proposed center, which will serve only one-third as many women, has yet to get off the ground. In spite of the existing facility in the middle city, the Department of Labor is still looking around for a more "suitable" site on the outer limits of the suburbs. In this way, this administration goes about "improving" programs.

I can only conclude, then, that given the chance, this administration would bring school money, school programs, and the schools themselves to a halt—and then try to figure out a way to do a job more effectively. The people of this country cannot afford such improvements if the children in the first grade are ever to make it to the third grade.

In 1968, Nixon said:

> When we talk about cutting the expenses of government, the one area we cannot shortchange is education. When you cut expenditures for education, what you are doing is shortchanging the American future. For our children to have a better chance than we had, we have to constantly spend more for education.

That was what Richard Nixon said when he campaigned for the vote of the people. Now, as President, Richard Nixon has taken ax in hand to cut the very programs on which the American future depends.

The President did not choose to use his ax on the Agriculture appropriation bill—even though this Government, in 1968, paid out over $1 billion in farm payments—a guaranteed income to rich farmers. In fact, he did not even raise a finger to help when Congress tried, this year, to set a maximum of $20,000 on farm subsidy payments. Where was his concern for inflation then?

For the State of Missouri, almost $72 million is at stake. This includes an expenditure of over $9 million in impacted area aid, the program which received such harsh comment from the President.

Here is another example of Presidential abdication of responsibility. The President has known about this program for a long time. He was a Member of Congress when the impacted areas program came about. These expenditures and the reasoning behind them are not new to the President. The money contained in the appropriation bill could not have been a shock to him. He has had many years to formulate a philosophy on impacted areas aid to education—and 1 full year to recommend a revision of the program. But like other revisions contemplated by this administration, the method is to abolish existing programs or to cripple them on the basis that they are bad—before they ever establish a feasible program which they believe and the Congress agrees to be better.

The schools in Missouri receiving this aid, like those in other States across the Nation—are budgeted to include impacted aid money. Last year, these schools in Missouri received $9 million from this program. We cannot tell them now, 4 months prior to the close of the school year, that the money they have spent on paper in budgeting their programs—will not be available.

Furthermore, the President has taken this program which he has portrayed as a political football—and used it as one by throwing it into the arena today as a means whereby to secure the sustaining votes for his veto. The President is not only playing politics with this issue of education and health—he is using what he believes to be the tainted football.

The President would make it seem as though Congress has added huge sums of money to an already bulging education and health budget. But consider only a few examples.

Last year, elementary and secondary schools received $50 million in appropriations for library resources. In his budget, the President asked the Congress to cut all funds for this program. The Congress, in its better judgment and in the judgment of educators and parents who flooded our offices with mail—restored that $50 million to school libraries. This is one of the increases which the President says is irresponsible.

Consider then, the recognized critical shortage of health personnel in this Nation. Tuitions are so exorbitant that nearly 50 percent of all medical students come from families in the upper 10-percent income bracket. Medical students from families who are not rich—are rare—for they must depend upon financial assistance. As a result, the medical profession has been reserved for the rich.

Out of the 9,000 graduating physicians last year, only 200 were black—and black communities go begging for medical services. The President, in view of these few and many more statistics revealing a crucial need for health personnel—recommended only $24 million in student loans—but the Congress approved $40 million, still short of the need. This is an increase which the President calls irresponsible. This is an amount the President says this Nation cannot afford.

The President recommended $85 million for the education of the handicapped programs—but the Congress voted $100 million. The President asked for $33 million in mental retardation programs—but the Congress voted $37 million. The President asked for $107 million in the community libraries and services program—but Congress, in its so-called irresponsible behavior, appropriated $149 million.

The President requested $279 million for vocational education programs—but the Congress passed an amount of $489 million. The President requested $600 million for higher education student aid—and the Congress deemed $656 million necessary. These, too, are amounts the President considers inflationary—in spite of the fact 76 percent of our college students come from families in the top half of the income bracket. Only 7 percent of our college enrollment comes from the lowest income levels. Student assistance is necessary if youth who are not rich or financially secure are to have a chance at college. Vocational education is necessary if these youth are to have a chance to prepare themselves for other kinds of useful productivity in a constantly changing society.

The list goes on—and so do the needs in education and health. And yet, we are still only spending at a level less than half of the amounts authorized for these programs.

The blame for inflation, if falsely attached to this budget, goes to the Chief Executive. We are well below his recommendation, $5.6 billion below the amount he requested from Congress.

The chance for American children and families to improve their conditions through education now hangs in the balance. When the President reviews his balance sheets, he should not overlook the column entitled "responsibility for the general welfare of the people." If he balances his budget—and does not pay heed to balancing that responsibility of Government—to the people and their vital needs, all will have been in vain. For Americans, who are instilled with the belief that through education, all things become possible, it may be difficult to swallow the word of the Chief Executive when he tries to tell us education is not worth the price.

I urge others to join me in casting a responsible vote to override the President's veto.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, it is almost inconceivable to me that we are assembled here today in the House in an attempt to override a Presidential veto of no less than a bill which would provide our children with the means to an adequate education. It is inconceivable to me that what we are debating is an attempt to erase funds for programs that would assist our mentally retarded children. It is inconceivable to me that what is at stake is the emasculation of several programs that vitally affect the health and welfare of millions of Americans.

The President has told us that these funds are "the wrong amount for the wrong purpose and at the wrong time." He has told us that his veto must be sustained if we are to win the war against inflation. I would submit that he is totally and unmistakably wrong on all three counts. I would further submit that the administration is vetoing the wrong bill for the wrong purpose at the wrong time. The President has further stated that this bill spends money "for the same old programs" without making the "urgent new reforms" that are necessary in American education.

It is distressing to note that the administration decided, finally, to make their stand against inflation, not on defense funds: for planes and rifles and bullets; not on public work funds for highways and dams; not on foreign aid: for money for several unfriendly govern-

ments, not on military assistance: for jets and missiles to be used by allies in name only. They have not taken a stand on any of these. They have decided to be obstructive in the one area that affects more Americans than any other—funds for our children's education.

I have heard all the arguments, on both sides, concerning impacted aid and I find much credibility on both sides. However, this is a question that should be resolved by legislation—not by a veto. The administration has said that while they are going to veto this bill, they will soon offer comprehensive legislation aimed at reforming our educational system. This smacks too much of the carrot and stick approach—"sustain the veto and I will provide better legislation."

Mr. Speaker, what I and many of my colleagues want to know is, where has the administration been for over a year? If they feel so strongly that reforms are needed in our educational system, then why have they not been offered? Where has the President been? Where has the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare been? Where have the Republican allies been? Why, after more than a year's time, have they decided that the only vehicle for reform is the veto? Why have they not acted before?

I am certainly amenable to reforming our system of education. I feel that there are several major reforms that ought to be instituted. But I do not think that they should be instituted at the expense of millions of school-age children today. I do not think that they should be instituted at the expense of emasculating several worthwhile programs.

Several times within the last few months the threat of a veto has come over several appropriations bills. It has, up until now, been an idle threat. But today, on the one issue that affects our future, perhaps more than any other, the President has decided to take a stand. The concept that every American deserves the opportunity to attain the highest level of education of which he is capable is not new. It is a tradition. Today, more than ever before, we must move toward the fulfillment of this ideal.

What the President is doing by vetoing this bill is negating the best investment that America makes: an investment in its youth. It has been said that "youth are the trustees of posterity." Certainly this veto does not speak well for our foresight.

Education is a national investment. The administration seems to have lost sight of the fact that education is a national investment. It yields tangible results—not inflation. What the administration is neglecting here is the fact that this money is being spent for a positive purpose. It is not being spent on war. It is not being spent to kill. It is not being spent to destroy. It is not being spent on a supersonic transport plane, a new submarine, or a missile system. This money, unlike the billions that the administration has sponsored and supported for other, less productive programs, will produce a highly marketable product—educated manpower. Missiles, rockets and planes produce no marketable product to absorb marketplace funds. Education does. So, which is inflationary?

One of the principal sources of this country's productivity is its educated manpower. It makes absolutely no sense to regard funds for education as being inflationary and funds for DOD not to be. When the budget for education, for health, and for welfare is discussed by the administration, it is always with the cautious whispers of inflation. Yet when they discuss the ABM, the SST, nuclear submarines, inflation is discounted. I wonder whether the administration regards $258.3 million for Hill-Burton hospital construction as being less important for our national welfare than $1.5 billion for the construction a new ABM system? Which is more important for our country—$1.4 billion for institutions of higher education, $488.7 million for vocational education, and a few millions for libraries and library equipment or new weapons systems costing more than $20 billion over contract figures in a Nation which already has three separate and independent nuclear overkill systems?

It is true that $5 billion will not buy very many aircraft carriers or supersonic bombers or nuclear submarines. But I wonder how often the administration has applied this figure to domestic programs? I wonder if they realize that this money would build a million-dollar school in every one of the Nation's 3,000 counties? It would build 500 hospitals costing $1 million apiece. It would provide scholarships worth $5,000 each to 100,000 students—and still permit a tax reduction of a billion dollars.

The success of our economy depends on the success of our educational system. The two are unmistakably related. The problems that we are confronted with can be solved with a degree of success only equal to the caliber of our governmental, education, and industrial personnel. The problems that our economic system is undergoing are serious. They must be dealt with quickly and firmly. But our educational system should not be the scapegoat. It should not be sacrificed with the rhetoric of inflation.

If a nation—

Wrote Thomas Jefferson in 1816—

expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be.

Those words were never truer, never more applicable, than they are today.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the Departments of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare appropriation bill has turned into a political tug-of-war, instead of a needed, cold, hard look at what is best for this Nation.

The fight against inflation cannot be won by cutting the budget for foreign aid and the Defense Department alone. In times like these, all departments and agencies must share in the need to put their fiscal houses in order. All must do their part to curtail spending, and restore the confidence of the American people in the fiscal integrity of the Federal Government.

An editorial which appeared in the Joplin, Mo., News Herald, prior to the President's veto, succinctly states the case for the rejection of the HEW appropriations bill.

The editorial follows:

EXPECTED VETO SHOULD STAND

Everyone is in favor of better education. Everyone is in favor of curbing inflation. These two universal drives have converged at the opening of this congressional election year, putting Congress and the President on seemingly unalterable collision courses.

The issue is the $19.7 billion appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare. The House tacked an additional $1.3 billion to the administration's request and the Senate approved. The President has announced his intention to veto the bill. And Congress, from all present indications will try to override the veto.

It would be easy enough to write off the actions of Congress as a cynical shirking of fiscal responsibilities in a quest for short-term political gain. Conversely, the President's anticipated veto can be attacked as a cold-hearted disregard of basic human needs, an accountant's approach to government. Both charges are oversimplifications.

The social needs are real. So is inflation. Both have political potential. The reality of the inflation cannot be used as an argument against all social, health and educational programs. But it does make it mandatory that the vast sums of money required in these areas must be spent wisely and well.

In the case of the $1.3 billion in dispute, the bulk of it would go for increased funding of educational programs. Half of this would be spent on an increase in grants to schools in federally impacted areas. This is to help school districts shoulder the cost of educating children whose parents lived and worked on federal property.

Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson tried in turn to trim impacted area aid and ran into the political reality that the aid is funneled to some 400 congressional districts, none of which was or is anxious to give up the income. Appropriations have been steadily increased.

The time has come to reverse the trend, to accept the urgency of inflationary crisis and to start phasing out impacted area aid. It must be realized, too, that the other programs involved are, for the most part, not going to be materially improved by an increase in funding at this late date. Qualified teachers cannot be found, constructive educational programs cannot be instituted during this school year. And the money would have to be spent in the next few months, before the end of this fiscal year.

The proposed increase in spending fails to meet the requirements of urgency and effectiveness. The Senate should have declined to follow the House's lead. Failing that, the President should veto the measure. And the veto should stand.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, in his state of the Union message, the President called upon us to participate in a "new American experience." It is with considerable irony, that his first major executive action to follow that message was the vetoing of the Labor-HEW appropriations bill. If this signals the beginning of the "new American experience," there will be few Americans responding to the President's summons.

The vote on the Labor-HEW appropriation is an issue which separates the Democratic Congress from the Republican administration that distinguishes those with a new vision of the American future from those wedded to ideas of the

past. One must invoke a curious logic to prove that we do not need funds for educating our children while we do need money for the construction of a supersonic transport. Since when have Americans valued planes more than people? One further offends logic when he tries to show that subsidies to shipbuilders have a higher priority than assistance for our beleaguered hospitals. While we are already a leading power in the world, a dozen countries put us to shame for our second-class health program. Our infant mortality rate, to say the least, is the envy of no civilized country.

And while we have landed men on the moon, we have yet to develop a cure for the common cold—let alone for cancer or heart failures. Similarly, we have advised the technology to build majestic skyscrapers but our urban schools are rotting from fiscal neglect. The President's own Task Force on Urban Education has recommended that education appropriations be increased up to $14.5 billion more a year by 1975. Congress appropriated $10 billion less than this and the President still calls this action inflationary. The upgrading of American health care and education warrant and require full funding—not Presidential vetoes.

President Nixon has contended that the bill "is the wrong amount for the wrong purpose and at the wrong time." But this is not the case. The amount involved is less than 45 percent of what Congress originally authorized, an amount based on an assessment of the Nation's education and health needs. The amount of the bill is actually $87 million below the President's own budget request; albeit, this reduction can be largely accounted for by cutbacks in advance funding. In any case, the conference report would appropriate far less than the Nation needs. Again, the Task Force on Urban Education called for dramatic increases in educational expenditures and concluded:

> Without adequate funding, there is no hope for effective education in the cities. The current need for funds is as desperate as it is massive.

Apparently, the President is not sensitive to the crisis in our Nation's schools; whereas Congress knows that it is time to deal with this crisis in a manner that is fiscally responsible.

Neither is this the wrong time to utilize the appropriation which the Congress would make. For one thing, some of the programs obligate moneys, without requiring that they be spent. Hence, The President could still defer certain expenditures if he deemed this necessary to combat inflation. But what of the charge that the appropriation bill is inflationary? When Congress has reduced the Federal budget in other areas, most notably defense, by $5.6 billion, it is groundless to charge that reallocating funds is fiscally irresponsible. Clearly, the Congress has charted new priorities for this country. This is the right time, not the wrong time, to deflate a swollen defense budget and rechannel the funds into education and health care. It is the right time to heal the paranoia of the cold war and fight the "enemy within": illiteracy, hunger, disease, and poverty. When schools close down next spring and when more urban schools deteriorate, the American people will remember Richard Nixon's educational philosophy: cut and run.

Nor can I believe that this appropriations bill funds the wrong programs. Increases in student loans afford more young Americans, our future leaders, the opportunity to prepare for a meaningful future. Additional assistance for vocational training guarantees that we will have more skilled hands to build a strong America.

The figures speak for themselves: the difference between the conference report and the budget request in Chicago alone is $10,776,000. President Nixon claims that money is inflationary. But I know what the people of Chicago think. They know that a $10 million cut means that Chicago schools will regress, rather than advance; have more dropouts, rather than fewer; and have fewer teachers rather than more.

The argument that increased funding for education and health care causes inflation just does not wash. The reverse is true. Increased medical and hospital costs stem from a shortage of facilities and personnel—a problem that the appropriations bill seeks to relieve. Investing in education is not a spur to inflation but a sure way to guarantee national growth. Failing to invest in education is an equally sure way to national disaster.

Repeated studies have shown that the purely economic rate of return at nearly all levels and in nearly all parts of the country on educational expenditures is over 10 percent. This compares favorably with the rate of return the Federal Government requires on its irrigation and reclamation projects. Moreover, this is purely economic return, and does not even include any value we place on education in terms of its noneconomic contribution to improvement of our society and ourselves as individuals.

Instead of repeating Buchanan's 1859 veto of an education bill, I would have hoped that the President would have remembered his own words of this century:

> When I look at American education I do not see schools, but children, and young men and women—young Americans who deserve the chance to make a life for themselves and ensure the progress of their country. If we fail in this, no success we have is worth the keeping.

Saving money on education and health care is like not fixing a leaky roof or not going to the dentist. Eventually the work must be done and the bill paid; but in the meantime the damage done may be irreparable. I urge my colleagues "to fix the roof and go to the dentist." Overriding an imprudent veto will demonstrate to America that Congress does want a New America—even if the President does not.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I am casting my vote today to override President Nixon's veto of the HEW appropriation bill, as I indicated again and again during my 2-week tour of our district earlier this month that I would do if a veto developed.

Nobody has worked harder in this Congress to support the President in his great fight against inflation. To be specific I led a successful drive to cut $100 million of unnecessary spending from the Defense budget and came close in an effort to chop off still another $100 million. I also led a fight that now appears likely to enable us to avoid wasting $45 to $60 million on an unnecessary and elaborate extension of the west front of the Capitol.

In fact this 91st Congress, even including the education bill now before us, has sliced more than $5 billion from President Nixon's last year's budget, precisely in order to keep the budget in balance and to halt inflation.

But the people of our upstate district—which includes 10 colleges—have repeatedly indicated to me, in questionnaires and by other means, that for them education should be our No. 1 domestic priority in America. I strongly share that view. And so this past session I supported the clear-cut action which Congress took to reorder our national priorities by cutting back both the Defense and the foreign aid budgets by a total of $6.6 billion, and switching $1 billion of that sum to educational aid, and $600 million to our No. 2 domestic priority, the fight against water pollution, which President Nixon has so warmly endorsed.

Congress would be backing off from the clear leadership role we have thus asserted if we were to fail today to pass this HEW bill over the President's veto. Among other things this bill contains much needed and already long overdue funds to finance college student loan programs for the present school year. It contains funds for college libraries and college buildings. It contains desperately needed funds for all our elementary and secondary schools, funds that principals and administrators have been counting on. And the continuation of the existing impacted areas program at its present level is a matter of grave concern—I know as a fact—to many school boards and school superintendents in our district, especially in Montgomery County, Seneca County, and Ontario County, as well as in Schenectady and Albany Counties. A major cut in those funds could also seriously disrupt school budgets at the worst possible time of the year.

Therefore, for all these reasons I shall not only vote to override, but I hope the effort is successful. I support the fight against inflation. But I think we must cut somewhere other than in education.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, my decision to vote to uphold the President's veto did not come easily. Indeed, I voted, along with the overwhelming majority of House Members, to support this very bill in December. In the course of arriving at my decision I acquired a mass of facts and figures on Federal aid to education and the impact of H.R. 13111 on the fiscal year 1970 budget. While reviewing this data and the correspondence I have had from a large number of educators, taxpayers, and budgetary authorities, a number of facts became clear.

First, the Nation has reached a critical stage in its fight against inflation. Economists have been warning that we

could face the seemingly paradoxical phenomena of inflation on the one hand and recession on the other hand. Thus, there is a need to lower interest rates and increase the flow of money. The Federal Reserve Board, which acts independently of the executive and legislative branches of the Government, has indicated that it will increase the supply of money only if the administration can deliver a balanced Federal budget. Congress has an obligation to demonstrate its serious concern about inflation.

Second, most of the funds appropriated in this bill must be spent. Typically the President can withhold what he deems to be excessive appropriations, but that is not the case with the Labor-HEW bill. Once appropriated, most of these funds must be spent. This is especially serious because Congress last year passed a bill establishing a ceiling for all expenditures. As a consequence the President has no option but to meet the mandatory expenditure provisions, while at the same time, under the spending cut, he must make substantial reductions. If the veto is overridden, these reductions, unfortunately, would have to be in programs which are essential and vital for health and other urgent public services.

Third, circumstances have changed since December when I first voted in favor of the bill whose veto I now vote to sustain. Uncontrollable Federal expenditures such as those for health insurance and interest on the national debt have turned what then appeared to be a $3 billion Federal surplus into what now appears to be a Federal deficit for fiscal year 1970. Among other things, the fiscal effects of the Tax Reform Act and the 15-percent across-the-board social security increase were not known in December.

Fourth, if cuts were to be made equally in all of the programs financed by this bill, it would only necessitate approximately a 6-percent reduction. This figure is not so significant that the important programs involved will be jeopardized. Most of them, in fact, would be financed at a level higher than that provided in last year's budget. Thus, the cuts which are being discussed are not really cuts. In most instances, they simply represent smaller increases.

An exception to what I have just stated deals with assistance to federally impacted school districts. Here the President wants to drastically cut the amount appropriated last year. This program means a great deal to the Second District of Colorado because of the high number of Federal installations found in the district. I have consistently supported this program and my vote to sustain the veto should not be viewed as an abandonment of my prior position. Conversations I have had with the numerous legislative leaders and administration spokesmen convince me that a satisfactory compromise can be worked out on this issue. In the bill which ultimately passes, impact aid for fiscal year 1970 will probably approximate the amount spent in 1969. In any event, I shall continue to work for a strong, equitable impact aid program.

Fifth, many people with whom I have talked seem to think that if the levels contained in H.R. 13111, are not approved, all of the programs financed thereunder will be left unfunded. This simply is not true. Congress will pass another bill, probably by the end of January. The next bill will contain a sufficient amount of money to maintain strong programs in the fields involved without violating the budgetary guidelines set out by the President. In the meantime, the affected programs will be financed at 1969 levels under a continuing appropriation resolution.

Sixth, contrary to the charges being made by some, education is not bearing the brunt of the President's efforts to balance the budget. Of the $7.5 billion reduction the President proposed in the 1970 budget, $4.1 billion came from the Defense Department budget. As I stated earlier, the President has actually recommended an increase over last year's Labor-HEW appropriation. It is just that this spending cannot increase at as fast a rate as some would like. At a time when all other agencies of the Federal Government are being required to tighten their belts, I think it is perfectly reasonable to slow the rate at which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is loosening its belt.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude these remarks by expressing the hope that the lesson of this year's appropriation experience will not be lost. The need to enact legislation to assure that appropriation bills be passed by the beginning of the fiscal year is critical. Numerous Members, including myself, have introduced one or more proposals to reform the way Congress handles the money bills, and I now urge that these reforms be implemented in time to facilitate the enactment of future appropriation bills by the beginning of each fiscal year.

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, voting to override a Presidential veto is not a task which I welcome, and I would not do so out of partisan motives. Nevertheless, I feel very strongly that the President was wrong in vetoing the Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation.

No one needs to be convinced that inflation is a serious problem and that some sacrifices have to be made to control it. My disappointment with the President is that a reduction of funds for health and education programs is neither necessary nor prudent.

The President tells us we cannot afford to spend an extra $1.3 billion on education. Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford not to. In "Through the Looking Glass," the Queen tells Alice:

> It takes all the running you can do to keep in the same place.

So it is with education and health expenditures. The rising costs of these programs make it necessary to surpass last year's appropriation just to sustain present programs at their current levels. As indicated by the following table, the Congress recognized this and attempted to fund the programs at a level which would allow some progress.

[In millions of dollars]

| Program | Administration's 1970 budget request | Congressional action | Amount lost if veto sustained |
|---|---|---|---|
| Educationally deprived children (ESEA, title I) | 1,226.0 | 1,397.0 | 171.0 |
| Impact aid | 202.0 | 600.0 | 398.0 |
| Education professions development | 95.0 | 107.5 | 12.5 |
| Vocational education | 279.0 | 488.5 | 209.5 |
| Libraries and community services | 107.5 | 149.0 | 41.5 |
| Education for the handicapped | 86.0 | 100.0 | 14.0 |
| Total | 2,737.0 | 3,729.5 | 992.5 |

If the President prevails on this issue we will regress. He budgeted $60.5 million less for elementary and secondary schools this year than the year before. The request for higher education was $20 million less. That for libraries and community services was $39.4 million less. While people were waiting in line to get into hospitals the President asked for $104.4 million less for hospital construction. Mr. Speaker, it is unconscionable to short change these vital health and education programs.

We heard no cries of inflation when the requests came in for funds to build supersonic and C–5A transport airplanes and antiballistic missiles. The President did not ask that these expensive programs be deferred to less inflationary times. The same can be said about his foreign aid requests.

Even if Federal expenditure cuts are the most effective means of checking inflation, the $1.3 billion could not be considered inflationary by the President's own standard. The Congress made a net reduction of $5.6 billion in the President's budgetary authority. This means, Mr. Speaker, that if the Congress had completely abdicated its prerogatives and enacted the President's budget right down to the penny, the total would have been greater than what he now calls inflationary.

If an administration asks for reductions in funds for programs as fundamental as education and health, it should have some very persuasive arguments in support. But, when we look at reality rather than academic economic abstractions we are struck by the ineffectiveness of the administration's economic policies. The past 12 months have been the most inflationary since the Korean war with the cost of living rising more than 6 percent. If that were not proof enough, we also have an economic downturn accompanying the inflation which is threatening to become a recession.

Raise the interest rates, the President's advisers say and less money will be loaned which will in turn put the brakes on inflation. So, the interest rates were raised. They were raised 36 percent in 1 year, but inflation, immune to economic theory, soared on. The banks loaned 15 percent more money than the year before producing terrific earnings for some of the big banks. But there were some losers too—the homebuilding industry, State and local governments, and the installment consumer.

This, among other reasons, is why I

cannot vote to sustain the President's veto. The battle against inflation must be fought. The President's record the past year vividly reflects that he has been waging the battle at the wrong places and with the wrong methods, bringing the wrong results. I think he has received bad advice and his veto should be overridden.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the President's veto of the Labor-HEW appropriation with its increased funding of education, library, and health programs is a clear example of how distorted our national priorities really are. In my view, there simply is no justification for spending billions on farm subsidies, public works, highway construction, the space program, and a supersonic transport plane when our school systems are struggling to provide quality education under the most critical financial handicaps.

Just as I cosponsored the Joelson amendment last year to provide the increased funds for our vital health and education programs, so shall I vote to override the President's veto. This vote will be a crucial test not only of our national priorities, but also of Congress' role in charting the future course of our Nation.

My reasons for voting against the veto are as follows:

ADDITIONAL FUNDS ARE NECESSARY

First. The rising costs of education and health needs make it necessary to surpass last year's appropriations in order to sustain present programs at their current levels. The President's requests for six major education and health programs, however, fell $572.1 million below last year's appropriations. The President requested $60.5 million less for elementary and secondary education, $20.1 million less for higher education, $319.1 million less for impacted areas assistance, $39.4 million less for libraries and community services, $28.6 million less for medical research, and $104.4 million for hospital construction. Thus Nixon requests would not only make it impossible for programs to operate at current rates, but would also make them fall far behind these levels.

Second. The total appropriation including the additional funds is still less than half—46 percent—of what Congress authorized based on its assessment of the Nation's education and health needs.

Third. The $4.3 billion appropriated by Congress for education falls way below the amount the President's own Task Force on Urban Education suggested was necessary to meet current needs. The report recommended increasing appropriations for education up to $14.5 billion more a year by 1975. The report concluded:

> Without adequate funding, there is no hope for effective education in the cities. The current need for funds is as desperate as it is massive.

Fourth. There is no evidence for the administration's argument that schools would be unable to spend the additional sums of money in the remaining half of this fiscal year. On the contrary, school officials, encouraged by the House's passage of the Joelson amendment last July, planned to operate and have been operating with those appropriations levels in mind. If the additional funds are withheld many schools will be forced to close early.

The administration's argument that the additional funds could not be spent contradicts their argument that appropriating the additional funds would be inflationary.

Fifth. The impact of the fund reduction which would result from a sustained veto demolishes the administration argument that the funds involved are "misdirected." Among the probable effects of a sustained veto are:

Schools in many jurisdictions would be forced to close their doors;

Almost 10,000 potential teachers would be turned away from training otherwise offered under the Education Professions Development Act;

Over 200,000 children, those most prone to dropping out of school, would be cut off from vocational education programs;

Bilingual assistance would be withheld from over 50,000 schoolchildren in need of this aid to learn in the school system;

There would be 3 million fewer books available for libraries and community services;

Some 115,000 college students would be denied loans to pursue higher education;

Some 50,000 unnecessary deaths would occur in the next 12 months for lack of funds to train personnel for coronary care units in hospitals;

The overall lack of facilities and personnel would cause thousands of patients to die needlessly;

The desperate need for doctors would be aggravated when several thousand potential medical students lose opportunities for loans; and

The quest to find cures for major crippling and killing diseases such as cancer and circulatory ailments would be set back needlessly. The reduction in the appropriation for the National Cancer Institute alone would mean that the National Institutes of Health would have to cut by 40 percent the number of research projects begun in 1966.

INFLATION ARGUMENT INVALID

First. Assuming that Federal expenditure reductions are the most effective means of fighting inflation, the $1.3 billion increase in Labor-HEW appropriations would still not be inflationary since Congress has made a net cut of $5.6 billion in budgetary authority in all appropriations for fiscal year 1970 as well as cutting $2.9 billion in budget outlays—expenditures.

Second. The need for the additional funds has been demonstrated. Hence, State and local financial support would be substituted for the Federal dollar in many cases. It is questionable whether substitute spending by the State or locality would be less inflationary than the Federal spending is claimed to be.

Third. The administration's argument that the $1.3 billion in mandatory extra spending would have an impact on the budget surplus that in turn would be inflationary is invalid. The difference in surplus amounts would have little if any impact on the overall economic picture, particularly with regard to inflation. This position is supported by a member of President Nixon's Council of Economic Advisors, Dr. Herbert Stein, who, on November 21, 1969, stated:

> I have the impression that many people now see a magical significance in a shift of a few billion dollars in the budget position, especially if the shift crosses the line between surplus and deficit. In a trillion dollar economy this is hard to understand, especially after our recent experience with the limited significance of the budget shift between a $25 billion deficit in Fiscal 1968 and a $3 billion surplus in Fiscal 1969. Preoccupation with small changes in the budget position leads to bad forecasts by the private economy and bad policy by the government.

This point is further illustrated by comparing the amounts of money involved in the argument. First, $1.3 billion is approximately .001 percent of a trillion dollar GNP, or only one-tenth of 1 percent of a trillion dollar economy, or one-thousandth of a trillion dollar GNP. A second way of putting this is—$1.3 billion is about .005 percent of a $200 billion Federal budget—or one-half of 1 percent of the budget, or five one-thousandths of the budget.

Fourth. On January 20, 1970 the Bureau of Labor Statistics released figures which cast serious doubt on the effectiveness of administration economic policies. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, consumer price increases continued rising in December to close out the most inflationary 12 months for this Nation since the Korean war. The cost of living rose 6.1 percent in 1969, the greatest in 18 years. An economic downturn accompanies this continued inflation.

Fifth. The administration's policy of fighting inflation by applying orthodox fiscal and monetary policy which includes a budget surplus and tight money is necessarily limited in its impact. The policy hits the "little guy" the hardest—the consumer, homebuilding industry, State and local governments and small business. Following are three types of inflation that this policy is ineffective in cooling down:

Cost-push inflation: The consumer is aware of the price increases on such items as cars, steel, tires, gasoline, and aluminum. This is caused by highly concentrated industries having discretion in determining prices and wages.

Credit inflation: The 26-percent increase in interest rates since the first of 1969 has harmed the homebuilding industry, State and local governments, small business, and the installment consumer. This is the result of increased bank lending of 15 percent this past year to business despite Federal Reserve choking of the money supply.

Supply-bottleneck inflation: Costs have gone up considerably for certain items such as hospital and medical care. A supply shortage has increased these costs above average increases.

Sixth. The President has failed to use the anti-inflationary authority given to him by Congress. H.R. 15091, which was passed by the House by a vote of 259 to 136, contained the following anti-inflationary measures:

Authorizes the Federal Reserve Board to impose reserve requirements and other controls over commercial paper and Eurodollar borrowings by commercial banks;

Liberalizes restrictions on mortgage lending by national banks;

Allows Federal home loan banks to provide additional funds to savings and loan associations for conventional mortgages;

Provides the President with discretionary authority to authorize the Federal Reserve Board to control expansions of credit, including bank business lending found to be unnecessary;

Extends existing authority for establishing maximum rates of interest that banks and savings and loan associations can pay on savigs ad time deposits;

Increases the maximum limit of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation insurance from the existing $15,000 to $25,000; and

Directs the President to release $70 million voted by Congress for small business activities to the Small Business Administration for lending to small business investment companies.

The President signed this bill into law, and at the same time announced he would not exercise the authority it gave him.

Seventh. Overriding the President's veto and passing the Labor-HEW bill would be an anti-inflationary action because:

High medical and hospital costs are caused by the shortage of facilities and personnel which the appropriations measure attempts to ease;

A lower HEW budget would create pressures in many school districts for additional increases in property taxes. Such pressures would add to inflationary increases in the cost of living for consumers;

Investing in human resources will have incalculable payoffs in the future. This investment will result in a kind of negative tax savings from unemployment compensation, social services, welfare payments, penal institutions, and so forth.

A study made regarding the investment value of a vocational education program in Arizona uncovered that the initial tax revenue impact of the vocational education Federal expenditures, plus the taxes paid by the senior high school student enrolled in the program actually reimburses the Federal Treasury in full by the time the student graduates and returns to the Federal Treasury twice the investment by the end of the third year.

Eighth. The President has made the issue one of priorities, and not just one of the priority of fighting inflation before educating our children. If President Nixon were truly concerned about fighting inflation by reducing Federal spending, he would have pared his defense budget requests as the Congress did by $6 billion, he would have cut his requests for funds for the expensive, nonessential supersonic transport—SST—as well as cut out ill-advised strategic weapons systems.

Congress, which is equally concerned about inflation has given top priority to adequate funding of programs to meet our Nation's pressing education, health, and domestic needs.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I face one of the most difficult decisions I have had to face since becoming a Member of this body in January 1967.

As one who supported both the Joelson and Cohelan amendments during the first session of the 91st Congress and as one who has long been an advocate of increased aid for education, it is particularly difficult for me to take the stand I feel I must take today.

Education is one of our Nation's most pressing priorities. It is an area which for many years was a victim of neglect. Caught in the wedge between the increasing roll of Federal involvement and the autonomy of State and local governments, education suffered the roll of the orphaned child. We all acknowledged the need for attention to this problem, but all too often we assumed it was the other fellow's responsibility. In recent years, we have begun to deal constructively with this issue. Through imaginative new programs we have forged a healthy partnership between local, State, and Federal governments to meet the challenge of contemporary times. To say we would be forfeiting the gains we have made in this field by sustaining the President's veto of the HEW appropriations bill is not accurate. It is not, as many contend, surrendering our priority commitment to this problem.

The President's position as he so accurately stated in his nationwide address Monday evening is not a popular one. But it is a responsible one, and one I, as a Member of the Congress, feel obligated to support.

Frankly, at first I had considerable reservation about the consequence of the President's action. Much of the reservation I initially expressed however, has been minimized by the compromise proposal put forth by the President subsequent to Monday's address. This counter proposal assures that no schools receiving Public Law 874 funds will have their operating budget reduced below 95 percent of their 1969 level. It further reinstates 50 percent of the category B funds which originally had been cut out of the appropriation measure.

I have consistently joined with the President in his attempt to fight the problem of inflation, a problem caused in large part by an overextended Federal Government. I heartily endorse his attempts to cut back on our Nation's defense spending. I strongly second his continuing attempts to eliminate unnecessary Government spending and duplication. I welcome his frontal attack on the Federal bureaucracy and his across-the-board attempts to hold the lid on Federal expenditures. To be responsible in this regard, the President has stated he has no alternative. He feels to grant an exception in the case of the HEW bill would be setting a precedent which would be severely damaging to the objectives he has set for the Nation in combating this problem.

Though I personally do not feel the true inflationary impact of this legislation can be accurately gaged, I yield to the President's decision on this issue. Our ship of state has one rudder and the President's hand is on the helm. To override his judgment would not be in the best interests of the taxpaying public who are the passengers on this troubled passage.

I am confident that the administration's anti-inflationary efforts will in the long term prove to be highly beneficial to education and to the Nation as a whole. For until we right the wrongs of our prolific spending policies of the past, we will not be able to vigorously and effectively combat the many ills besetting our country. With a sound dollar, will come sound programs.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, as the President has stated, there are no goals more important today than the improvement of education and health care. However, the issue before the Congress today is not whether we are for education and health or against it. The important question here is: What can the Federal Government afford to spend this year on these programs?

In April the President asked the Congress to appropriate 13 percent more funds for health, education, and welfare programs than it spent last year. The bill which ultimately passed the House, however, increased the President's request by $1,260,000,000; $1 billion of which is in the field of education alone.

The President feels, and I concur, that this is increase is not in the best interests of all of the American people. If the rise in the cost of living is to be halted, the Federal budget must be cut substantially.

The increased spending contained in this bill simply provides more money for the same old programs without making the urgently needed new reforms. The blatant unfairness of this bill is clearly exemplified by the impacted aid program. The richest county in the United States reaps the primary benefit here. These one-half million persons would receive $6 million while those 3 million persons who live in the 100 poorest countries would receive only $3 million. This bill not only sustains this unfairness, but adds additional moneys to the already inequitable program.

As we all know we are now three-quarters of the way through the school year. This bill would force us to spend every dollar appropriated before June 30. By the time final action would be accomplished, distribution formulas equated, and grants made to the States and school districts, it would be too late to hire teachers or to affect substantive teaching programs. This late funding exemplifies irresponsible Federal action when our goal should be sensible, constructive partnership between Federal and State governments.

In his efforts to balance the budget and to stop the rise in the cost of living he is determined to prevent further inflation, hold down taxes, and protect the interests of all Americans.

For these reasons, I support the efforts of the President and his veto.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, failure to override the President's veto of H.R. 13111 will create tremendous problems for many school systems. Even if a subsequent bill were enacted, the funding in most cases would amount to too little, too late; fiscal 1970, after all, is more than half over, and salaries and other expenses for this school year must be met by June 30.

But rather than speak in generalities, I would prefer at this time to detail some of the hardships that may ensue in my own part of the country, San Diego County in California.

In the words of a report prepared earlier this month in the office of the superintendent of the San Diego city schools, "this district will face immediate financial catastrophe if President Nixon carries out his stated intention to veto the omnibus appropriations for HEW."

San Diego schools have the largest impact aid entitlement of all districts in the county—$6.5 million. But the loss or drastic reduction of this assistance would be felt even more sharply in some of the suburban school systems, where the Federal impact is even greater.

Take the South Bay Union School District, in Imperial Beach. Of the 5,800 children enrolled by the district, 3,374 are federally connected. Loss of its $610,000 impact aid entitlement would force this particular district to raise the local property tax rate by $2.51 per $100 of assessed valuation to replace the Federal funds.

The situation is nearly as bleak in other jurisdictions. According to data compiled by the San Diego County Department of Education, impact aid is the equivalent of an additional tax of $2.25 in the Oceanside Union School District, $1.86 in the Coronado Unified School District, $1.18 in the National School District, $1.15 in the Vista Unified School District, and $1.04 in the Chula Vista School District.

All these systems are currently being taxed to the legal limit. They can only raise rates through the consent of taxpayers who already are carrying crushing burdens.

Impact aid is not a political football in the San Diego area. It is an essential form of assistance that even when fully funded pays only about a quarter of the actual cost of educating the child from a federally connected family.

There are in San Diego County more than 76,000 students eligible for this supplemental help. If we torpedo this proven program now, not one of the 39 identified communities in the county will escape some educational and financial loss—as I am sure is true in the constituencies of many of our colleagues.

A further complication for federally impacted school systems in California is a State requirement that schools be open at least 175 days a year to qualify for full State assistance. Districts falling short of that minimum have their State help reduced proportionately. Thus, the penalties threatened at the Federal level could, in California, become cumulative if, as seems highly likely, some schools are forced to close early this spring for lack of operating funds.

I hope this body will act at once to undo the damage if Mr. Nixon's veto is sustained.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, my record shows that I favor a balanced budget. If all Congressmen had voted as I have, during the last 10 years, the budget would have been balanced each year. Also, I have been consistent in supporting action to curb inflation.

However, the issue at stake here today is far greater than merely the outcome of this particular appropriation bill—it is a matter of giving priority to those programs which hold the greatest promise for our Nation's future.

In my judgment, it is inconsistent and a serious misalinement of priorities when the President vetoes a bill containing $210 million to provide vocational training for jobless Americans while advocating the expenditure of billions of dollars to guarantee a minimum income to citizens who need this very type of training.

Far better would be to reverse these priorities and invest billions in building a firm base of technical education to enable the workingman to support himself rather than killing his incentive with unearned handouts.

The education approach is more effective and in the long run, less expensive.

Only yesterday I voted against a $1.5 billion appropriation for foreign aid. I voted then to save more money than President Nixon did by his veto. I believe that most American citizens would prefer their tax dollars being used to promote education, especially vocational education, than for foreign aid, guaranteed incomes, or many other purposes for which the President has recommended spending.

I intend to vote this year to spend less money than the President recommends, but I feel it my duty to exercise a voice in determining the priority of programs and in determining which spending programs shall be approved and which shall be rejected.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I will vote to override the President's veto of H.R. 13111. I support the appropriations for the Departments of Labor, HEW, and related agencies, as passed by the Congress. And, it is my fervent hope that the two Houses of the Congress will overwhelmingly vote to override the veto.

Mr. Speaker, the President spoke to the Nation over national television on Monday night, expressing the reasons for his veto of this bill, and his veto message was delivered to the House yesterday. A careful reading of the two statements indicates that the President has selected this measure as the target for an anti-inflation campaign. It is most unfortunate that he has done so, for this bill represents financial support for many of the most important domestic programs our Nation has undertaken.

The President said the issue is not education and health. He said the issue is inflation. We all agree inflation is an issue. The difference is that the Congress gave a higher priority to education and health than to other needs which the President obviously considered greater as reflected in his own budget requests.

The Congress has acted prudently and wisely in its handling of the budget. The President inherited a balanced budget, and Congress cut over $5.6 billion from his fiscal year 1970 appropriations budget request alone. And, this budget cut takes into account the moneys contained in H.R. 13111.

The $1.1 billion increase in spending for health and education is not the reason for the greatly accelerated inflation. Let us look at the record. The President said the cost of living went up 25 percent from 1960 to 1970. This is true; but what he did not point out is that in the 8 years prior to his inauguration, the average increase was slightly over 2 percent per year. In the last year, 1969, the first year of the present administration, the cost of living increased over 6 percent, more than double the average in the previous years of the decade.

This veto action, if allowed to stand, will affect approximately a million children in various educational programs under title I, such as special education and vocational training. Other educational programs are also affected. Further, it is impossible to determine the damage that will be done to many very significant health research programs, according to some of the Nation's most eminent scientists. We are told that it can be very detrimental to cancer and heart research.

The President would have been wiser to have directed his attack on inflation in mid-1969, earlier in the present fiscal year. He could then have directed his attack on the ABM, on the supersonic transport, and many other programs that have a much lower priority than those which will be affected by his veto action on this bill.

I most strongly urge the Members of the House to act wisely and vote to override the veto.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, by approving a $1.3 billion increase in appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, Congress challenged the President to make an extremely difficult political decision and to, thereby, vividly demonstrate to the Nation his sincerity in fighting inflation in the interest of all the people. He has met this challenge courageously and responsibly. We can now do no less.

Over $1 billion of the total increase is for education. Of this, $398 million would perpetuate and augment the most inequitable component of Federal education assistance, aid to federally impacted school districts. Under this program, the Nation's 100 poorest counties received a total of only $3.2 million in 1968, while Montgomery County, Md., among the richest counties in the country, received $5.8 million. This wealthy suburb alone received $6 million in impact aid for the 1968–69 school years in comparison to $4.5 million for the entire State of Michigan. In many cases, payments exceed the costs to local schools of educating children of Federal

workers. In other instances the program enables wealthy school districts to levy lower taxes than other, often poorer, districts in the same State. I am discouraged by the direction this program has taken over the years and regret that we have not had a clear-cut vote on funding and continuation of impact aid. It is time for reform of this unfair distribution of badly needed Federal funds, not time for deepening the inequity.

The consequences of undercutting the President's anti-inflation program would be even graver. Every single American is now suffering the effects of nearly a decade of deficit spending by Democratic administrations and Congresses. As the President pointed out to the Nation last Monday, the Federal Government's expenditures during 1960–70 have exceeded tax revenues by $57 billion.

Upon entering office, President Nixon inaugurated a program for halting the steady erosion of the value of the dollar. A key element of this program was a proposed substantial budget surplus, and the cutbacks providing this surplus included large reductions in the defense budget. The President has given Congress a great opportunity to materially benefit every man, woman, and child in the Nation. It would be unpardonable to reject this opportunity by opposing the President's judgment that the Labor-HEW appropriations bill as it now stands is inflationary.

As a long and active advocate of expanded, innovative, and effective aid to education, I understand and appreciate the concern about the President's veto felt by the educators and parents whom I serve. I supported the increase recommended in the President's education budget and disagreed with many of the decreases proposed for education and library programs other than impact aid.

I feel sure that the President would have accepted reasonable increases in these areas. The ironic danger of unreasonable increases is that, by intensifying inflation, they raise the cost of education programs. The inflationary potential of such increases would be maximized by their being concentrated in the few months remaining until the end of the fiscal year on June 30. These are the harsh facts which all of us concerned about education must face. Education costs have already increased dramatically because of inflation. Cost-of-program increases are requiring greater outlays of money simply to maintain programs. The Nation cannot hope to substantially expand and improve these programs if it cannot win the battle against inflation.

The President made a firm commitment when he entered office to fight inflation. Congress knew this. Given this commitment and the prevailing view I share that higher appropriations for education and health are essential, Congress could have prepared for an early compromise on the issue. This compromise could have been achieved by planning cutbacks elsewhere in the budget to allow for increases in these high priority areas and by recognizing that such increases must be reasonable in terms of current distortions in the economy. Instead, the Democratic leadership and majority in Congress unconscionably delayed and protracted action and created a confrontation situation, largely for political purposes.

However, if we consider who has suffered from this shameless delay, I fail to see that the Democrats will get the political rewards they seek. For school districts around the country have been faced with harrowing uncertainty and lack of information on which to plan while nearly 5 months of the school year have gone by without the reasonable increases I advocate coming to them.

I am confident that the President's veto will be sustained. If the Democratic leadership will act without more delays, I know that the President will cooperate in reaching a compromise that will not further jeopardize either fiscal responsibility or vital education and health programs. I hope that a sufficient reduction in impact aid will be the cornerstone of a speedy compromise.

Prompt action should not stop here. A delay in fiscal year 1971 Labor-HEW appropriations like the unpardonable one we have witnessed would be intolerable. I hope and urge that when the next school year starts in September 1970, this appropriations bill will be a reality.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, in good conscience I cannot veto to sustain the Presidential veto of H.R. 13111, because once you start reducing funds for public education, health services, and medical research and loans for college students and desperately needed assistance to private schools struggling to survive, then paralysis sets in as we numb our sensibilities to what America is all about.

If we can temporize with our children's future, then I am sure the next budget cut will be even easier as we lose all sense of perspective. Indeed, if we cannot invest one-half of 1 percent of our Federal budget—for that is what the difference between the administration and congressional educational budgets equal—in schooling future generations, in reducing deprivation and eliminating despair then it is indecent for us to think people will continue taxing themselves for senseless priorities.

The public is choked with taxes, and vigorously supports—just as I do—the President's battle against inflation. But in this instance the burden of mounting property taxes and fiscal crises of local school boards must be relieved by the major tax-collecting strength of the Federal Government.

Let me cite just one example of this inflationary crisis in New York City that can only be stemmed by a large imput of Federal money. The city's plans call for starting construction on 24 schools this year, yet we are only building 15 because costs are cutting in our budget. A high school that costs $7.8 million 4 years abo to build, now costs $18 million.

Let me explain the fiscal plight of New York State. For the first time in three decades last year, the State reduced aid for public education as costs rose from $1.6 billion a decade ago to $4.1 billion this year. As local school boards attempted to raise property taxes, taxpayers revolted. In 20 percent of the State's school districts, voters turned down school budgets, although property taxes did rise 17 percent.

People are just fed up. The State pays 45 percent of the education bill; the Federal Government 5 percent and property taxes underwrite the other 50 percent. This problem is particularly vexing in my borough, Queens, where there are 280,000 homeowners and 20,000 apartment house owners.

These constituents are paying State and city income taxes in addition to their Federal income tax, sales taxes, excise taxes, and as the cost-of-living nibbles away at their dollar, transit fares have just been increased 50 percent.

Under these circumstances, what is the impact of sustaining the veto? Although the Federal Government contributes only 5 percent of our education budget, in certain areas it translates itself into considerable dollar support. For instance, New York State would lose $78.6 million in education and about $12 million in health funds. The State would lose $23 million in title I money; $4 million in school library aid; $14.5 million in vocational education; and $5 million in scholarships and loans for college students.

This last loss particularly concerns me because a sizable part of the student loan money is funneled into the State university system, of which 10,200 students out of a 172,000 enrollment are from Queens. To deny these students scholarship or loan money, or seriously reduce the availability of funds, will only drive them and their families into the money market, where banks are charging outrageously inflationary interest rates ranging from 8 to 10 percent for college loans.

The State's health needs are most critical. A score of the Nation's best medical schools, located in New York City, are operating at deficit levels this year that can only be bridged with Federal money. For some of them, the loss of the projected funding in this appropriation bill will be critical.

The most desperate situation exists at the New York Medical College which is in debt approximately $12 million and, indeed, is really seriously considering the possibility of closing its doors. Its operating deficit is $250,000 per month; year's Federal losses $1,200,000.

Other schools in the New York City area are: Mt. Sinai—operating deficit $2,000,000 per year; year's Federal losses $500,000. New York University—operating deficit $1,700,000 per year; year's Federal losses $2,000,000. Sloan-Kettering—year's Federal losses $1,400,000. Cornell Medical College—operating deficit $1,000,000 per year. Albert Einstein—operating deficit $4,000,000 per year; year's Federal losses $2 to $3 million.

These schools also rely upon Federal scholarship aid to help train young doctors, nurses, and para-professionals. The loss of funds would include: New York Medical College—$101,981; New York University—$61,500; Yeshiva University—$68,140; University of Rochester—$50,828.

The budget for the National Institutes of Health would be cut some $31 million if this veto override fails. Since New York's medical schools and hospitals

house some of the Nation's leading medical research teams. I am told no less than 40 percent of them would be broken up, and crucial research into curing crippling and killing diseases such as cancer, heart ailments, arthritis, and metabolic problems, and mental retardation would be severely curtailed.

Finally, New York's critical need for more hospital beds would also suffer. We can use $52 million in Hill-Burton hospital construction funds now, but if the veto is sustained, the State will lose $8 million.

The loss of education money to New York City's public schools from these Federal revenues would come to $35.8 million.

| | Million |
|---|---|
| Title I—Disadvantaged children and elementary education | $23.0 |
| Title II—Libraries | 1.3 |
| Title III—Innovation special education | 1.0 |
| NDEA—Teaching math-science | 1.5 |
| Federally impacted aid | 5.2 |
| Vocational education | 2.2 |

The controversial impact-aid program has special significance in New York City. Almost a third of the city's property is government owned, meaning the city is deprived of a lucrative tax base. The impact-aid money then is only a meager substitute for the loss of tax-exempt property. The board of education depends on this money to help fill many budget gaps, and the practice is to distribute these funds on a citywide basis.

Unfortunately, the gravity of these possible losses to New York City takes on more significance when the statistics must be matched with programs earmarked to be shortchanged, shattering the hopes for achievement of thousands of children.

As an example, in Queens, it is estimated that school district No. 28—which includes South Jamaica, Kew Gardens, Richmond Hill, and Forest Hills—will lose $717,000 in title I money used for Headstart, early childhood, cultural, and tutorial programs, and summer schools.

In addition, district No. 28 would also stand to lose $87,000 in funds for school libraries, much of it aiding our beleaguered parochial schools. And it would also lose $63,000 in vitally needed money to aid the teaching of math and science.

District No. 28 is only one of seven school districts comprising Queens—all similar in population size, ethnic, and economic outlook, and all having parents with the same aspirations for their children. Do some quick arithmetic and you can get an idea of the impact of this appropriations bill on the borough of Queens.

Mr. Speaker, with the school year into its seventh month and New York borrowing money with short-term anticipation bonds at high interest rates to pay for education; with the future of thousands of children whose parents can ill afford to pay increased property taxes to cover school bills; and with the hopes of many praying for breakthroughs in cancer and heart research bound to Federal support of medical research, it would be unconscionable for me to vote to sustain this veto of the HEW appropriation.

Education cannot make the sun rise, it has been said, but it can let the light in.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my support for this legislative effort to overturn President Nixon's veto—a veto that poses an alarming threat to virtually every educational insitution throughout the United States. The education of our young people, after all, is among the greatest challenges we face in this era of startling technological and sociocultural change. Our schools—schools ranging all the way from nursery centers to our most celebrated universities—constitute this Nation's most valuable asset. They turn out the physicians, the businessmen, the technicians, the lawyers, the statesmen, the craftsmen the United States needs to maintain a standard of life envied throughout the world. Already overburdened by waning sources of income and soaring enrollment rates, most educational institutions must—quite literally, must—receive financial assistance if they are to weather what can be described as a kind of economic siege. The future of the United States may hinge on whether the Congress and the administration honor their pledge to provide such assistance.

Yet, President Nixon, using an artful rationale that can be charitably described as specious, has sought to slice away $1 billion in Federal funds the Congress has voted for education during fiscal 1970. How does he justify this action? First, he argues that an appropriations bill exceeding his requests would fuel inflation. This, Mr. Speaker, is patent nonsense. A trivial percentage of our national budget for fiscal 1970, a $1 billion appropriation for education could not exacerbate inflationary trends in even the most insignificant way. Even if it could—a wholly hypothetical and suppositious notion that hardly merits consideration—most school systems would have to raise the funds Mr. Nixon wants to deny them through other means: major increases in local property taxes, for example, or wholesale borrowing.

Such 11th hour tactics would still give rise to spending at a rate approaching $1 billion, and, even more significantly, would threaten the average family's financial resources far more than say, a one-hundredth of 1 percent increment in living costs. Mr. Nixon contends, still further, that the Federal Government's aid-to-education programs fall short of what he considers to be ideal. Of course they do. No Government program—at least none of which I am aware—is so excellent and so exemplary that it defies reform. The point to emphasize is that aid-to-education programs are among the most fruitful ever carried out by the United States—despite the deficiencies Mr. Nixon cited in his television address.

In any case, Mr. Nixon has proposed virtually nothing as an alternative to our current programs. The President's third objection—that schools might whimsically squander money turned over to them late in the fiscal year—can be dismissed out of hand. Much of the money, of course, has already been spent or obligated. Even more to the point, educational institutions have made explicit and detailed plans for expending financial resources during fiscal 1970 and are now merely waiting for the Government to honor its word to supply assistance. The money most emphatically will not be scattered to the winds. Indeed, lack of this money might well give rise to financial and educational chaos in most schools.

Let me cite just a few examples of the difficulties President Nixon's veto might cause. A college student, pressed for funds, might not be able to return to school this fall. Minority groups—blacks, Puerto Ricans, Indians—might not receive the training and schooling they so desperately need to escape poverty. Small communities, almost wholly dependent on Federal funds to maintain sound educational programs, would be driven into an alarming form of retrenchment. Chicopee, Mass., a community in my congressional district, for example, stands to lose $400,000 in impact aid alone if Mr. Nixon's veto is sustained.

Quite plainly, Mr. Speaker, the President could have chosen another victim—the military, for example—in his battle to reduce Federal expenditures. Instead, he chose the most vulnerable victim conceivable: the Nation's schools and schoolchildren. How can we justify—rationalize, I should say—lavishing scores of billions of dollars on military projects of highly dubious merit and denying merely $1 billion to our educational system? The answer, of course, is that we cannot.

Let us suppose, for the sake of argument alone, that the Congress appropriations bill does, indeed, spur a tiny increase in the cost of living—raising the price of lamb chops by one-tenth of a cent a pound, for example, or the cost of bread by one-fifteenth of a cent a loaf. This would, of course, add to the average American family's living costs. But, as far as that same family is concerned, could such trivial price increases compare with a son's dropping out of college because of a lack of scholarship funds, or a daughter's unemployment because her high school had not prepared her adequately for a secretarial job? I think not.

We must not sacrifice our youth on a pretext so flimsy as that enunciated by President Nixon.

Again, I urge the overturning of his veto.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the President has asked us to combat inflation by spending less for schools and health. I strongly urge my colleagues to override the administration's veto and to appropriate the funds this Nation urgently needs for health and education.

In labeling this legislation "inflationary," the administration has grossly misrepresented the facts. I ask how the Congress can be accused of fiscal irresponsibility in light of the numerous reductions in appropriations that we have made in connection with other bills.

The issue before us, therefore, is not inflation. Rather, it is whether we will meet such needs as our school, library, handicapped children, and vocational programs. The administration has seriously misjudged our Nation's priorities if these programs must bear the brunt of its inability to decelerate inflation.

Last year, the city of Cleveland received approximately $7.5 million under the education programs we are considering. If the administration's veto is upheld, Cleveland's public schools will lose several million dollars. Programs for educationally deprived children, now offering health and tutorial services to students in the inner city, will gain less than half the funds Congress found to be essential in fiscal year 1970. Cleveland received approximately $1.3 million last year under the Vocational Education Act. Those funds enabled countless students to benefit from job training and thereby become employable. The Congress found this program required a doubling of appropriations, yet the administration views an increase of a mere 2 percent adequate. These are only two examples of numerous vital programs which are now in danger of being curtailed, including education of handicapped and bilingual student, school libraries, and instructional equipment.

Mr. Speaker, education and health programs made possible by Federal funding have had a significant impact on the city of Cleveland and on the Nation. I trust that my colleagues also view these programs essential and deserving of our full support.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the President in his decision to veto the Labor-HEW appropriation. This is a vote against inflation—not against education. This vote could set the tone of Government responsibility for the 1970's. Because if this veto is overridden, it will be "Katy bar the door" as far as future spending proposals go.

Over and over again in letters and in conversations with my constituents, I have heard "I agree we need to do something about inflation, but why did the President pick on education?" I do not think the President did.

President Nixon asked Congress for a $2.3 billion increase in HEW funds. This had my support. Yet, the Congress added $1.3 billion to his request in spite of previously assigned funding by the House Appropriations Committee and the President. When this increase passed, the President advised that he considered it inflationary—so the threat of a veto has been hanging over us since last July.

Yet, the history of this appropriation shows no attempt on the part of the party in control of this Congress to work with the President to come up with a mutually acceptable level of funding. Instead, all we have found is the attitude that it will be all or nothing—$1.3 billion without regard for the fact that the appropriation bill was late, that 7 months of the year have passed, and the effect this mandatory spending increase would have on other education and health programs because of President Nixon's statutory $192.9 billion spending limit. So the President did not pick this bill—the Congress did.

Mr. Speaker, I am vitally concerned about education and I want to improve the quality of education our schoolchildren receive. Quality education and good jobs are the real answers to poverty in this country. However, I am opposed to the misdirected funding this bill represents. How can we possibly be improving education when half of the increase is for grants to schools in federally impacted areas—a program which in 1968 paid $5.8 billion to the Nation's richest county and a total of $3.2 million to the 100 poorest counties. I support the concept of impacted aid, but I am opposed to an unfair formula that plows disproportionately large sums into rich counties. This must be changed.

The President has reassured the Nation that no schools will close as a result of this veto. So we're not talking about depriving any child in this country of a good education. The real issue is the nflation that is ravaging the school budget as much as it is those of private citizens. The January issue of School Management magazine reports:

> While many administrators complain bitterly, these days, about the adverse effect on education of the Nixon Administration's tough anti-inflation measures, the Cost of Education Index makes it abundantly clear that inflation itself is *far more damaging* than any of the attempts to bring it under control.

The hard fact is that if we are going to make substantial progress in getting sufficient and stable funds to badly needed education programs, we will have to get inflation under control. So the vote will be one of confidence in the President's inflation control policies; and not for or against education.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, today I vote to override the President's veto of the 1970 Labor-HEW appropriations bill, just as I voted last summer to provide those additional funds to which the President now objects. This vote was based on my own judgment of the best interests of the citizens of St. Louis County and the Nation. Yet, I realize that the President's action, too, was based on his own best judgment.

Great emphasis has been placed on the inflationary effects of this additional $1.3 billion in Government spending. Yet, these funds represent only one-half of 1 percent of this Nation's $200 billion Federal budget. In an economy such as ours, the anti-inflationary effect of such a minute reduction is more symbolic than real. Dr. Herbert Stein, a member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, makes this point:

> I have the impression that many people now see a magical significance in a shift of a few billion dollars in the budget position, especially if the shift crosses the line between surplus and deficit. In a trillion dollar economy this is hard to understand, especially after our recent experience with the limited significance of the budget shift between a $25B deficit in Fiscal 1968 and a $3B surplus in Fiscal 1969. Preoccupation with small changes in the budget position leads to bad forecasts by the private economy and bad policy by the government.

While any responsible reduction in Federal spending is welcome during an inflationary period, we must balance the possible anti-inflationary effects of such a reduction against the demonstrated need for these funds if we are to avoid such bad policy. This is particularly true since Congress has already cut the administration budget request by nearly $5.6 billion and has reduced overall spending by $3 billion this year.

We must realize further that the Nation's school systems have programed these expenditures at the congressionally approved levels and must now curtail programs, or seek locally funds denied by the veto. St. Louis County schools, for example, will lose on the order of $1 million. My discussions with homeowners over the past year lead me to believe that increases in State and local taxes—including property taxes—would be unsatisfactory for this purpose.

Clearly, action on this legislation is not a question of who is for or who is against inflation; for or against education of our young people; for or against health research. We all subscribe to these goals. In substance, the issue is one of spending priorities.

There has been great emphasis in Congress this year, as well as in St. Louis County and across the country, on reviewing and adjusting our national priorities. However, we now find that even the modest changes in priorities which have been accomplished during this session of Congress are being threatened.

We must question the priorities of a nation which would hesitate to spend such a small proportion of its income on the education and health of its citizens while approving a budget including large, more easily postponable expenditures with no hesitation. We must question whether the elimination of these funds for education and health can be justified in a year when we have committed $660 million for the supersonic transport; $780 million for the first phase of an ABM whose technical capability remains to be established; $50 million in additional military aid to South Korea; and $1 billion for naval ship construction.

Budget scrutiny is indeed necessary in the battle against inflation; but responsive national priorities are essential to this country's future. A sound budget effectively utilizes all of its resources—and have we a more promising resource than our Nation's young?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon characterized his decision to veto the appropriations bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as one of the most difficult of his Presidency thus far.

The decision of a Member of Congress on whether or not to support the President is no less difficult. My office has heard from a large number of First District residents. About half support the veto; the other half want the veto overridden.

I have been and am interested in the field of education—I was once a teacher myself. I understand from all angles the desperate situation which our public schools and colleges face today. Progress in educational techniques and materials has far outreached the capacity for many school districts to take advantage of them. The term "quality education" is used frequently today, and it has carried with it a challenge for all of us to provide the best possible education for all of our youngsters. I further realize that the Federal Government has a role to play in the resolution of financial problems which are a part of our educational system.

Throughout my career in Congress I

have consistently supported financial aid for education. When in the Iowa Legislature I led the fight for the first State aid for education bill. As chairman of the schools and textbook committee of the Iowa Legislature I was author and supporter of more legislation for schools at every level and libraries than ever was enacted in any period in Iowa history. Working closely with leaders from all sectors and sections of Iowa we paved the way for education in Iowa. A brief review of the more important bills that I authored and supported will establish my record of support for education:

First. Bills to give security and increased salaries to teachers.

Second. Reorganization of school districts to promote more and more effective education for boys and girls of Iowa.

Third. Legislation to take State superintendent of public schools out of partisan politics.

Fourth. State aid to public schools.

In addition my support increases in funding of Federal programs for education for public schools, colleges, universities, vocational training and manpower development adds to my record for education. During the House consideration of the educational provisions of the HEW appropriations bill, I supported the Joelson amendments which increased the appropriation for education by $894.5 million. I supported the increases at that time for many reasons: First, I felt that additional funding for the programs involved in the Joelson amendments was necessary for the development of effective and efficient programs; second, the administration had made no actual announcement that it would oppose and reject the increases; and third, while we were combating the dangers of inflation, it appeared at that time that the measures then taken would be sufficient to achieve the desired slowdown.

However, as I consider the matter of the funding level for educational programs from the perspective of today, I find that I must make my position clear. Inasmuch as our educational programs are of the highest priority, the threat that inflation poses to each individual American as well as the country as a whole must take precedence. Additional funding will be meaningless if the expenditure cannot purchase increased services and materials. Without a halt to the inflationary spiral, the Federal Government will assume a greater and greater burden at a loss to individuals and the country alike. In order to keep the effects of inflation as minimal as possible, I concur with the President.

The inflationary assaults on the 1970 budget make it mandatory that we reduce the expenditure level of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. When the Joelson amendments were passed, the threat of inflation was not as serious as it is today. Congress has responded to the necessity for reducing inflationary trends by passing significant cuts in the budget of the Department of Defense. We realized that a continued high level of Government spending would only plunge us further into the fiscal insecurity. Likewise, we in Congress should respond to the crisis by making reductions in the budget for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Since many of the programs, besides education, have uncontrollable costs we must necessarily move to reduce the educational appropriation—not by cutting out new programs, but by reconsidering some of the operating programs and reevaluating the essential expenses and the minimum necessary for an effective program.

It should be kept in mind that the Federal Government this year will spend over $10 million for education. This is the largest amount ever. The question is not this bill or nothing. The question is whether we can judiciously make reductions without impairing the quality of education and still control inflation. I think it can.

The primary domestic issue now is controlling inflation. The 25-percent increase in the cost of living during the 1960's cannot be repeated in the 1970's. We cannot afford it. Inflation has had a disastrous effect on the cost of education. A leading education journal maintains that the Cost of Education Index "makes it abundantly clear that inflation itself is far more damaging than any of the attempts to bring it under control."

Another question arises when we realize that the school year has approximately 4 months remaining. Programs are being administered at the lowest proposed level and a valid question can be raised if a sudden influx of funds can be spent efficiently. Teachers cannot be hired for the last 4 or 5 months of the year. I am afraid we would see evidence of spending money for the sake of spending money on many programs before the end of the year.

The issue is not one of supporting or opposing President Nixon. The issue is one of deciding whether the battle against inflation demands that HEW funds be reduced from the level in the bill passed earlier by Congress. I feel it does.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, it should be unnecessary, for purposes of this debate, to restate the dimensions of our national problem with inflation.

The facts thereof are all too familiar, unhappily, to all of us—but perhaps the best summary thereof is the fact, as mentioned by the President on Monday night, that between 1960 and 1970 the cost of living went up 25 percent, meaning an increase for the average family of four in America of $2,400 a year in the cost of such necessities as groceries, housing, medical expenses, and education.

The major cause of this dramatic deterioration in the purchasing value of our dollars is the further fact that, during that same 10-year period, the Federal Government spent $57 billion more than it took in in taxes.

Though there are some differences of opinion among the Nation's economists as to specifics, they are all in virtual agreement that only a combination of carefully applied fiscal and monetary restraints can take the steam out of the inflationary binge we have been on for far too long.

President Nixon has sought to apply that necessary degree of fiscal restraint, though—so far—without much cooperation from Congress. Those who have taken the opposite side from the President on this specific issue will point out that Congress has, nevertheless, made substantial cuts in some of the other appropriations bills it had before it last year. This is true, and this fact reflects the beginnings of an urgently needed reordering of national priorities, in the direction of which—I am proud to note—the Nixon administration has shown the way.

But it is also—and this time unfortunately—true that cuts in appropriations do not, by virtue of the workings of the Federal fiscal process, always automatically translate themselves into expenditure reductions in the particular fiscal year in which made.

Thus, despite the efforts of both President and Congress, it is a fact—particularly when certain uncontrollable increases such as interest on the national debt, up $800 million, medicare payments, up $350 million, unemployment benefits, up $500 million, and the like, are cranked in—that the expenditure picture in this crucial Federal fiscal year has deteriorated, rather than improved, in recent months; so much so, indeed, that the substantial budget balance once hoped for as an additional device for reducing the momentum behind the inflationary surge may now be in jeopardy.

In any event, Mr. Nixon's inability to bring to bear the kind of fiscal discipline he has thought was indicated has forced us to continue to rely more than we ought on monetary restraints. The independence of the Federal Reserve Board has, in this respect, been largely overlooked by the public that tends to blame the President for the tight money situation we are enduring, along with interest rates at levels that threaten to destroy the housing industry.

One cannot expect the Federal Reserve Board to much relax its currently tight money policy unless and until it sees some more positive evidence of congressional willingness to add some greater degree of fiscal discipline into the overall equation; and I would assume that the President had this fact also in mind when he decided to take the politically difficult—and therefore more dramatic—step that he now has.

Besides all of which, it needs to be understood that there is a greater degree of individual momentum behind this disastrous inflationary surge than most of those in positions of responsibility had imagined. By that I mean to suggest that there are countless numbers of businessmen, labor leaders, and just plain citizens who have come around to the point of view that inflation, for us, has now become a way of life and, that being so, one had better buy, build, and spend now rather than next year when costs would be even higher.

We have already seen the results of this kind of inflationary psychology—for that is what it is—reflected in wage settlements in the construction industry; the continuation of this kind of psychology has to be a factor bearing also upon the ultimate result in the currently protracted General Electric strike and, still in this same connection, it would be well for us to remember that, in March,

some 450,000 teamsters will be following the General Electric workers down the same crucial wage-negotiations road, to be followed in turn by over 600,000 auto workers by late summer.

It would be indeed rash to suggest that, if Congress now sustains this particular veto, such an event, alone, would be sufficient to burst the inflationary bubble. But such an event—politically dramatized as this one has become—could send salutory shock waves throughout the economy, to be read by businessmen, labor leaders, and consumers alike, as evidence at least for the moment of the fact that Congress was at last ready to join the President in applying a greater degree of fiscal discipline than it had heretofore felt compelled to do.

Such an event might also be the signal the Federal Reserve Board has been waiting for, as an indication that the time had come to relax the monetary restraints the Nation has been laboring under—restraints that have become every bit as much a problem for the educational community, with its constant need to expand, as they have for America's housing industry.

However, I think it would be exceedingly unfortunate if the result on this issue were to turn, solely, on that question of whether this bill is, or is not, inflationary.

By itself, it is not inflationary. None of the 14 or more annual appropriations bills Congress considers can ever be separately so categorized. For it is only in the aggregate that congressional appropriations decisions can be so judged—only in their aggregate that the wisdom and correctness of congressional reshufflings of Presidential budgetary recommendations can be so weighed and assessed.

As Mr. Nixon noted, there is far more involved in this issue, then, than "whether some of us are for education and health and others are against it."

I fully anticipate that this fall, in the forthcoming congressional campaign, my vote to sustain this veto will be attacked in that simplistic light.

However, the way I read the overriding national interest in this issue, it is far more important for us now carrying the burden of deciding to consider the implications of President Nixon's warning—in the state of the Union message last week—against "putting good money into bad programs," on a continuing basis until we "end up with bad money and bad programs."

For, though every American would give quality education an extremely high ranking in any table of national priorities, it is important to remember that there are priorities within priorities—and that there can be bad programs in aid of education as well as good ones.

One of the worst of such bad programs was stubbornly overfunded by this Congress in the bill now back before us—and I refer, of course, to the so-called impacted areas program that, in 1968, poured $5.8 million in Federal tax dollars into Montgomery County, Md., one of the richest counties in the Nation, while the 100 poorest counties in the Nation had to divide up, under this same program, a meager $3.2 million.

As a part-time resident of Montgomery County—and a landowner and local taxpayer therein—I have personal experience with this particular program and personal knowledge of the fact that probably one-half of the educational costs of my own two sons who have attended public schools in Montgomery County have been paid for, because I am a Federal employee, by all the Federal taxpayers, wherever they may reside.

This program has largely outlived its usefulness. Its continuance can only be justified on the basis of the fact that, last year, it benefited 375 of the congressional districts of which there are 435 in total number, and that every thus assisted school district in each such congressional district—including mine—would have to adjust its local school tax rate upward if the program were to be discontinued or gradually phased out.

Surely, there are better Federal programs in aid of education than this one—the benefits of which, in the economic rather than the Biblical sense, fall as much, if not more, on the unjust as on the just if it is true educational need we are concerned with. The fact that this bill contains nearly $400 million more for this program than was requested in the budget is reason enough—absent all others—for the Presidential veto and a vote to sustain it.

Of course, it can properly be argued that, if this program is bad, any change therein should come through the regular legislative process and not by way of funding restrictions. However, even though Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, and now Nixon, have asked Congress to review and revise this program, Congress has continued to perpetuate its blatant unfairness and ineffectiveness, and there comes a time, surely, when some sure shock treatment as this now being administered is necessary.

Similarly, there are clear deficiencies—of which Congress is aware—in the workings of the title I program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, in that too little of the moneys thereunder really go for the benefit of the disadvantaged child for whose special assistance the program was supposedly devised. The bill back before us contains $171 million over the budget for this program—additional reason, absent all others, for the Presidential veto and a vote to sustain it.

Besides which, the very lateness of the Congress in bringing this bill through to a conclusion—more than halfway now through the current Federal fiscal year and the current school year—requires us to reexamine how much of the additional moneys, over and above the budget requests, can wisely and efficiently be spent in the time remaining between now and next July 1. For this unhappy fact—which could and should have been avoided—the Congress has only itself to blame; a fact, however, that is now almost totally ignored by those who are most loudly proclaiming here that the Presidential priorities are all out of whack.

I have disagreed with some of Mr. Nixon's priorities. My votes, last year, against such budgeted items as the ABM and the SST stand as evidence of that.

I disagreed, too, with certain of his educational budgetary priorities—such as the cutbacks he had recommended in such as the school library resources program, the supplementary centers and services program, the guidance, counseling and testing program, and the equipment and minor remodeling program; and it may be remembered that, when this bill was first before us back in July of last year, I offered an amendment thereto which would have added $110 million to the original committee bill in order to bring all four of these useful and necessary programs back up to the prior fiscal year's levels.

Similarly, had the so-called Joelson amendment—that package approach sweetened irresistibly by the carrot of impacted aid—not then carried instead, I was prepared to go on to support other categorical increases over budgeted items as contained in the committee bill in such areas as vocational education, the NDEA student-loan program, education for the handicapped, and the regular library—as distinguished from the school library resources—program.

If this veto is sustained, I am prepared to work with others of like mind on framing the compromise bill that will then be necessary, so that it will contain more adequate funding than had the budget for these and other useful and necessary programs in aid of the kind of quality education that is our common goal.

I would most urgently hope that the President would be willing to compromise somewhat on these items, too, and not merely—out of political necessity today, as has been rumored—on the impacted areas program's funding, and I have already been in touch with the White House to express this point of view for myself and others of like mind as clearly and as strenuously as I could.

However, Mr. Speaker, in considering the true dimension of the challenge in education facing every American today, it is necessary for us—all—to lift our eyes above the level of political debate surrounding this one, single issue.

Let us not allow ourselves to be so blinded by this debate over such ridiculous questions as whether Democrats really care more about people and social issues than do Republicans—or over Democratic charges that Republicans adopt a coldhearted accountant's approach to basic human needs, and Republican countercharges that Democrats have here cynically shirked off their fiscal responsibilities in a quest for short-term political gain—as to become unaware of our true responsibility for meeting that challenge.

For the deficiencies in the American system of education—at almost every level—are steadily becoming more and more apparent. It is, I would suggest, at least something of an indictment against those in charge of that system—either as members of the academic community or as legislators bound to support that system—that we were so largely unaware of those deficiencies until they were brought to our attention, and sometimes with unfortunate forcefulness, by its intended beneficiaries, the students, themselves.

In an editorial anticipating this veto, and this vote today, the New York Times recently declared:

The evidence is overwhelming that the deficiencies in the Nation's education and health cannot be corrected by expenditure of less money.

To which I would respond, Mr. Speaker, that neither is there any assurance that the mere expenditure of still more money will correct those deficiencies.

In any event, the Times then went on in that same editorial to charge that:

No amount of political rationalizing can alter the fact that the veto would be a blow against the very foundation of (our) domestic strength.

Well—strong words, but do we add or detract from the stregth of that foundation by continuing to solve the multitude of educational problems one can see down the road ahead through a variety of hit-or-miss programs, many of which were devised in and for other times, and of which more than a few are obviously inefficient and obsolete?

I was particularly impressed—and on subsequent thought about it still more impressed—by President Nixon's proposal, in his state of the Union message, for the development of a "national growth policy."

The purpose behind that thought—and an utterly crucial one for the quality of our life in the coming years—would be the setting of goals and patterns which would enable America to meet its challenges constructively rather than to be overwhelmed by them, as we seem to be in danger of becoming.

The decade of the 1960's, just ended, was—as someone has noted—outstandingly a period in which piecemeal solutions to grave challenges were sought and tried, as a result of which, at most points, America entered the 1970's with increased rather than lessened problems.

Certainly, this was so in the field of education—and all of us know it.

So, Mr. Speaker, let me express the hope that we will move forward from this overly partisan and sometimes ridiculous debate, toward a constructive, bipartisan review and examination of America's educational system, with all its strengths and weaknesses, and through the hopes and fears of those who seek to administer it, and on to the development of an overall, carefully thought out, patiently planned national educational policy—the one essential thing that, despite all the educational items contained in the bill before us, we do not presently have.

A commitment to that sort of an effort, it seems to me, would be a far better measure of one's commitment to education, than the question of how anyone of us votes on this issue today.

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, I am a strong supporter of public education on a broad scale and I voted for the increased funding when it first came up last July. I do not consider that educational appropriations can be considered as spending in the normal use of the word; but rather are an investment in our Nation's future to be returned many times over. I am furthermore vitally interested in the fields of library work, vocational training, counseling, special educational needs of the handicapped, and the health research aspects of this appropriations bill. In my part of the country, vocational education has made, and continues to make, tremendous contributions as we move toward a more industrial economy. Community libraries and their bookmobiles have provided culture and inspiration to many citizens at the most local of levels. It is of increasing importance for young people to obtain education and training beyond the high school level, yet the cost of higher education has doubled in recent years. Thus, federally guaranteed loans, grants, and scholarships have become very necessary for many youngsters in seeking to get an adequate education.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, and others, the needs of education are a matter of great concern to me.

But, Mr. Speaker, we do not have any more important domestic problems in our country today than the crisis facing our schools as a result of Supreme Court decisions and actions by the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare and Justice, and then the great problem of ruinous inflation. In my opinion, overriding the veto at this time would contribute to inflation and the crisis in public education in Alabama, and I was unwilling to be a party to this. Quality public education shall always stand high on my list of priorities, but for too long now, the funds have been tools for the wrong purposes.

This is the hardest vote that I have had since I have been in Congress, but, reluctantly, I find no other reasonable course of action than to vote to sustain the veto of this bill.

It is my firm belief that time will show my vote to have been in the long-range interest of better programs for health, education, and welfare, and above all, in the best interests of all Americans in helping to stop inflation.

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. Speaker, since the President's veto of the 1970 Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, I have wrestled with the course of action I would take when this bill returned to the House of Representatives.

Stripping away the pressures of the education lobby and the political cynicism of the Democratic Party, I have settled with one hard, but clear-cut decision.

I have decided to use my vote in Congress to give people hope, the hope of better young lives through education, the hope of conquering disease, the hope of dignified old age—in short, the hope that only comes from excellence in science and education.

In making this decision, I owe no explanation to any lobby group, nor need I explain my vote to the Nation. My debt of explanation is only to the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Connecticut and the people of my State. This decision has been based on conscience and the principles that I have consistently supported.

The issue has been presented as a battle between people's needs and combating inflation. In my mind, this should have never been, because, in fact, there are two battles—the battle to combat inflation and the battle for human fulfillment. I believe we can reduce inflation in many areas of bloated Government spending without ignoring a child who seeks an education, or rejecting the possibility of a cure for those afflicted with disease.

The proportions of the educational side of the problem are particularly acute in the State of Connecticut. The Federal share of Connecticut's education costs has in the last 3 years gone from 4.2 percent to 3.3 percent to 2.9 percent. A further reduction would be unconscionable. It is also true that the State and local contribution has had to be proportionately higher. Is there a community in the State of Connecticut which does not have its head against the ceiling when it comes to local real property taxes? Certainly in my Fourth Congressional District where the per pupil costs are the highest in the State, the local taxpayer has had it, and the local taxing authority has no place to go. I have been informed by the commissioner of education for the State of Connecticut that if this bill is not passed, Connecticut could lose upward of $8 million in education funds.

In the area of health, rejection of this appropriation means that we continue the pattern of the last several years in doing less rather than more toward conquering disease.

The hardest part of the decision I made was the political considerations. This do-nothing Democratic Congress which has not had one creative or constructive thought would receive a psychological boost by embarrassing my President if the veto was overruled. I weighed this fact, but it just could not balance the other side of the scale which has on it those that need our special care and who every year for the last 25 years have been asked to wait until next year.

Now I want it clearly understood that my action today is not a one-shot proposition. As long as I hold public office, I will continue to push for a national offense of positivism in the areas of health, education, environment, housing, and transportation.

The time has come for people, not only politicians, to make a choice. In November my constituents will not be voting for President, nor will they have to look far to accept or reject my concept of what our national objectives should be. My choice of today will be theirs in November.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, when President Nixon took the reins of power in Washington 1 year ago last week, he was faced with a legacy of several years of heavy wartime spending and of a "guns and butter" Federal budget which far exceeded Federal revenues. The President made it crystal clear from the outset that he viewed the problem of inflation, along with Vietnam, as the most serious issues facing his administration. He recognizes that without an effective attack on inflation, further erosion of the dollar can cancel out any progress that is made by deficit expenditures by the Federal Government.

The President has gone far beyond political rhetoric in carrying out his attack on inflation. He is the first President in more than a decade to make any serious effort toward cutting back mili-

tary budget items. Together with Congress, President Nixon and Secretary Laird have cut upward of $8 billion from the defense budget in fiscal year 1970.

Some who will vote with me to override his veto of the Labor-HEW appropriation bill will make general statements intimating that the President is ignoring the budget priorities of urgent domestic problems. This is not a fair accusation. The President, hand in hand with cuts in defense and other areas and his attack on inflation, has proposed a bold new and costly welfare reform plan to the Nation last summer.

FALSE ISSUES

Thus, I believe several false issues are being raised on both sides of this important question. I do not believe the President can be accused of insensitivity to domestic needs, and I do not believe that Congress can be accused of insensitivity to the need to balance the budget. as part of the attack on inflation.

The President and Congress are charged with the very serious duty to control inflation, and prevent further erosion of the value of the dollar. A dollar will buy today what cost only 75 cents a decade ago. The President is undoubtedly correct when he attributes much of the problem of inflation to the deficit Federal spending spree in the years since the Vietnam war began. During this relatively short period, our Government spent more than $57 billion more than it received in taxes. The borrowing pressure generated by this deficit spending has had the effect of tightening the money market, forcing up interest rates, and adding, in turn, a huge and uncontrollable "debt service" cost of just under $20 billion a year to the Federal budget.

BALANCED BUDGET ESSENTIAL

The inescapable conclusion is that Congress must cooperate with the President in balancing the Federal budget. If the budget requests submitted to Congress by the administration result in a balanced budget, Congress is obliged to appropriate funds in such amounts as will not upset the balance. In addition to finely tuned adjustments in monetary policy, a balanced budget is an essential element of any successful fight against inflation.

While Congress must maintain balance in the budget, it is not necessary that Congress accept without deliberation and improvement the priorities contained in administration budget requests. In other words, within the limitations of a balanced budget, Congress is not only free but is bound to exercise its judgments on how much of the budget should be spent on space, how much on new weapons, how much for health care, for education, and so forth. This is exactly what the 91st Congress has done with budget requests for fiscal 1970.

Acting on the President's budget requests as a whole, Congress has, according to Congressional Quarterly, trimmed over $7.5 billion from the total recommended expenditures, including the increases it has appropriated for Labor-HEW programs, for antipolultion programs and other items. Having made substantial cuts in defense outlays, beyond those recommended by the President and in foreign aid and other items, Congress exercised its power of the purse to beef up budget items which it feels fall short of current national needs.

So, at the outset, we do not have a situation prompting this first veto by our President where Congress has gone spendthrift and has paid no heed to the constraints of inflation. We have heeded the need for a balanced budget and within this scope, have exercised some responsibility for rearranging Federal budget priorities.

BUDGET PRIORITIES

Before discussing in some detail the issues within H.R. 13111, the Labor-HEW appropriation bill, let me say an additional word about overall budget priorities. I have been saying on this floor and in public statements all year long that defense versus civilian priorities would be the major issue before the 91st Congress. The title article in my first newsletter to my constituents in this Congress dealt with the threat to sufficient domestic program funds by continuing war and defense costs. The current Federal budget which provides from each tax dollar about 58 cents for defense and veterans programs, provides less than a nickel for all Federal education programs. I have disagreed with this budgeting emphasis for many years. Now that we can, thanks to President Nixon's efforts, begin to phase down the costs of the Vietnam war, I have voted in the Congress to rebalance these distorted priorities. I voted against the direct Federal subsidy for the SST; I voted against deployment funds for the ABM and against other new weapons systems recommended in this fiscal year; I voted for a ceiling on costly and counterproductive farm subsidies; I voted for the substantial reductions in foreign aid, and against military aid funds for Taiwan which were not requested by the administration. On the other side, I have supported the full amount of increases in budget items for education, health, housing, urban renewal and antipollution programs, and have announced support for the President's welfare reform proposals.

I sincerely believe that inflation can and must be fought within a context of budget priorities which do not stall needed progress in specific urban and domestic programs. The budget can be balanced with cuts in defense and certain old-line programs which have lost their relevancy to immediate problems as easily as it can be balanced by holding the line in the quest for solutions to domestic social and economic problems.

SYMBOLIC VOTE

The administration views the vote we are about to take as symbolic of congressional desire or lack of desire to hold the line on inflation. My decision to vote to override the Presidential veto is symbolic—not of indifference to inflation—but of the way I think inflation must be fought. At issue here is not the sincerity of congressional opposition to inflation, nor the overall sincerity of Presidential commitments to education.

The question we must resolve today boils down to whether Congress should be allowed to exercise its judgment by adding funds, specifically $1.3 billion, to a Department's budget requests if it can do so within the context of an anti-inflationary balanced Federal budget. The issue is very much tied up in the specifics of the Labor-HEW appropriation bill and the programs it supports.

The President, in his message to the Nation and the Congress explaining his veto, said that this appropriation is in the wrong amount, at the wrong time, and for the wrong purposes.

AT ISSUE: LESS THAN 1 CENT PER DOLLAR

First let me discuss the amount of this appropriation. Some have implied that the $1.3 billion increase contained in this bill represents a spendthrift attitude in Congress and an overapplication of funds to health and education programs. It should be understood, first of all, that $1.3 billion is just over one-half of 1 percent of total Federal outlays for fiscal 1970. At issue is less than a penny out of every Federal budget dollar.

AUTHORIZATION VERSUS APPROPRIATIONS

There is another significant factor about the amount of the funds appropriated by Congress for education programs. Congress appropriated increases over the budget request for 10 separate education programs. The total authorized funding level for all 10 of these programs in fiscal 1970 is $6,021,297,000. The authorized level for all programs less Public Law 874 and Public Law 815—the impact aid programs—is over $5.3 billion for this year. These authorized funding levels, contained in the law, were implied promises to localities, States, school systems and universities of the level of Federal education aid in this fiscal year.

The total budget request for all 10 programs this year was $2 billion. The conference report on H.R. 13111, which the President vetoed, appropriated a total of $3.09 billion—only half of the original authorized level of $6.02 billion. Without counting funds for impact aid, we appropriated $2.494 billion compared with an authorization for this year of $5.3 billion—far less than half the authorized amount.

The original authorizations were only an estimate of the Federal aid funds that would be prudent and necessary in this fiscal year. The estimates were made before some factors, including inflation, higher salaries, higher enrollments and greater need for special programs, put even greater pressure on education systems and institutions.

I take the time to review these figures merely to point out that this is far from a spendthrift appropriation. Health and education expenditures in fiscal year 1969—the year of heaviest war spending—are not an accurate or adequate yardstick of what spending level for these programs is appropriate for this year. They, like the budget requests for this year were far below the minimum.

Thus, I cannot agree that the appropriations we approved for these programs are in the wrong amount. In fact, Congress took only a small step toward affording health and education their proper priority within the context of a balanced Federal budget.

LATE FUNDING

Second, I do not think the timing of the appropriation bill warrants its veto. There is no question that the 91st Congress has been more delinquent than any Congress in history in passing appropriation bills in time for the beginning of the fiscal year. Although the House passed H.R. 13111 last summer, several delays postponed final action on this bill until this week—7 months after the start of the fiscal year. But I do not believe that the expiration of half of the school year is any excuse for cutting back on the appropriation levels for these programs. In some instances, in fact, programs that have been operating under the continuing resolution at 1969 levels would be cut back if we reverted to funding levels contained in the budget requests, which in fact eliminate funding for some activities we funded last year.

There is no question that some inefficiency is involved in implementing any appropriation bill 7 months after the start of the fiscal year, but, the money is no less necessary. Because of the veto and this controversy over the total funding level, this appropriation has much greater symbolic importance at this time than if it had passed last fall. Just as the fiscal year 1969 appropriation levels have been used as a yardstick for measuring appropriate education and health funding levels for this year, the fiscal 1970 appropriation will be a very important factor in determining what is allocated to education and health programs in fiscal 1971 and future years.

The inefficiency of Congress in expediting the appropriation bill, and the failure of Congress and the President to agree on appropriate funding levels is no excuse to short-change education and health programs which are funded at minimum levels to begin with. If anything, I think the timing of our action dictates that we not renege on funding expectations that schools have been operating under for most of the current school year.

Third, the President said that he vetoed this bill because it appropriates funds for the wrong purposes.

IMPACTED AID OUTDATED

As far as the impact aid segment of this bill is concerned, I stated on the floor last summer that I favor the President's proposal to phase down this program and redirect its aid formulas which have grown seriously out of date. I am deeply concerned, as is the President, that disproportionate amounts are allocated under this bill to richer counties, with less than necessary funds going to the 100 poorest counties.

I supported last year and would support now a bill which deletes the $400 million Congress added for the obsolete impact aid program. This would cut almost a third of the funds that Congress added to the budget request without impairing the more crucial programs: Titles I, II, and III of ESEA, title III and title V-A of the NDEA, vocational education and student loan and higher education facilities construction programs.

Money appropriated for the impact aid program is money appropriated for the wrong purpose. Yet, I understand that the compromise bill being considered would leave in $400 million for impact aid under Public Law 874 and Public Law 815, but would revert funding for the more crucial programs back to levels requested in the budget. Such a bill would indeed be out of kilter with any sense of priorities for Federal education aid.

NEED FOR REFORM

The President also indicated the very real need to reform present education programs, including many of those I have mentioned as being crucial in this fiscal 1970 appropriation.

I endorse his desire to reform and expand Federal education assistance to the States and to institutions, and I look forward to reviewing the administration's proposals in this area. Knowing the high caliber of Commissioner Allen and Secretary Finch and their staffs, I believe this administration can make a real contribution both to upgrading the priority that is given to education and to redirecting Federal efforts within a higher echelon of funding priority. I do not believe, however, that we can afford to erode present programs, which have achieved some measure of success, until after Congress deliberates proposals for reform that are not yet submitted. We must continue to support what we have until better programs are devised and agreed upon. Just as we did not stop building diesel submarines before we were able to design and fund nuclear submarines, and just as we have continued antiquated farm subsidy programs until new ideas can be perfected, I think we must continue present health and education program commitments until we have the necessary reforms and improvements in hand.

Thus, I do not think this one-half of 1 percent of the total budget is being spent for the wrong purposes. With the major exception of the impact aid program, I feel the funding priority Congress has bestowed on ongoing health and education programs must be continued and jealously guarded until we have better programs in hand.

Mr. Speaker, I have stated my reasons for voting to override President Nixon's veto of H.R. 13111. Without taking any additional time, I insert at this point in the RECORD, the text of my statement of July 29, 1969, which stated in detail, my reasons for supporting the amendment which added these additional education and health funds to this bill when it first came to a vote in the House:

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, the bill that is before us now, the labor, health, education, and welfare appropriation bill, may be the most important bill the 91st Congress will consider. This legislation is so crucial because it is symbolic of our intentions over the next 12 months to make good the Federal promise of meaningful and adequate resources needed to solve domestic problems.

There has been much criticism leveled at programs which have been labeled "patchwork" approaches to the problems of poverty, unemployment, and underemployment—programs which treat the effects and not the causes of these problems. But no one can question that the very best possible assurance that these problems and their detrimental effects on people and on society as a whole will be reduced or eliminated is to insure that young Americans, particularly the disadvantaged, are given the educational opportunities they need to achieve their full potential as productive, tax-paying citizens.

We realized several years ago that this kind of educational opportunity could only be made available on a nationwide basis with substantial Federal help. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Higher Education Acts, the Vocational Education Act, the National Defense Education Act, the Bilingual Education Act, the International Education Act, the Education Professions Development Act, the Health Manpower Act and many others are legislative landmarks to our commitment to Federal education assistance at many levels and in many spheres.

Our enactment and extension of these laws and the funding authorizations they contain constitute a continually reinforced Federal promise to provide certain kinds and amounts of education assistance to State and local government and to educational institutions. Because many of the education facilities and opportunities in both urban and rural areas of America are seriously deficient, and because to a man, the States and localities and priavtely funded educational systems and institutions are facing severe limitations in available revenue and financial resources, the fulfillment of this collective promise to help educate our people is the most important item in our Federal budget.

When the new administration took office, the new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare wisely sought meaningful increases in many categories of education aid in the 1970 budget. Soon after the press reports of these sought-after increases, it was reported that Secretary Finch was being instructed by the Budget Bureau to cut the level of education aid requests by as much as 5 or 10 percent. Even the increases which Secretary Finch sought would not have brought 1970 funding levels up to the implied promise of the authorization bills. But they would have been sufficient to serve notice on the educators and on the families of America that this Government intended to pursue educational excellence in this country, even at a time of budgetary difficulty. Instead, the cutbacks were sought, compromised and recommended to Congress. In effect, the needed national commitment to fulfilling these promises was postponed at least another year by budget planners, in the face of rising inflation and a tight budget. I have no quarrel with the goal of a balanced Federal budget during a serious inflationary period. My only quarrel is with the priorities which had to be employed in order to produce recommended cutbacks in crucial education programs. I cannot, in conscience, place education after farm subsidies, or after the ABM, or after public works, or after costly new weapons systems and countless other budget items which, despite their worthy nature, cannot supersede the need for providing the world's best educational opportunities for American youngsters.

I commend the Labor-HEW Appropriations Subcommittee for restoring some $123 million of requested cutbacks. And I further concur with the administration's and the committee's judgment and the impacted school aid program should be trimmed, as the lowest priority program and as one of the most costly Federal education programs. But I cannot agree that our outlays for education aid in general should fall short of 1969 expenditures by more than half a billion dollars. If this bill is passed in the same form it was reported by the Appropriations Committee, it would mean a deep cut in the most crucial education programs.

Programs for library assistance and con-

struction, for education of disadvantaged youngsters in inner-city schools, for desperately needed work-study grants and student loans to open college doors to deserving students who otherwise would never achieve their potential, for higher education facilities, for innovative title III programs which can find new ways of retrieving children now lost to productive society because of a hostile environment—all of these must be given the resources they need to have impact.

School systems today are faced with a funding squeeze at every turn. Where annual budgets are increased, larger and larger portions of the increases are eaten up by either higher teacher and staff salaries or by higher enrollment, leaving little or nothing to improve the quality and impact of the education program. In fact, many schools are having to phase out so-called low priority aspects of their education program, such as athletics, physical education, driver education, after-school clubs and activities and others. At the same time that local and State resources are becoming scarcer, it is proposed that the Federal aid portion of local budgets now also be trimmed back. These Federal funds are the only education funds which schools must spend on program improvement and enrichment. Without them, and without these funds in sufficient quantity, some schools can do little more than keep their doors open from September through June, and some cannot even accomplish that.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that I am taking a considerable amount of time to express my concerns about this bill, but I do not feel there has been a more crucial debate since Congress convened in January.

While there is not time to read all of the many constituent letters I have received urging full funding of these programs, educators, parents, and concerned citizens both within and outside my own district have written or wired urging my support of adequate funding of Federal education programs. These people, for the most part, see the deficiencies and the benefits of education every day of their lives, either through the eyes of their youngsters who attend school, or as professionals responsible for our educational system.

Their appeal is not a selfish one. These people are not indifferent to the problems of inflation and Federal budgeting. They are in a position to identify a high priority national problem and to seek what they believe is a proper and adequate response to this problem from the Federal Government. We must respond to this need—at all levels from Headstart and kindergarten through graduate and post-graduate studies—by supporting significant increases in the most crucial of these programs. There is no better, surer way to treat the cause of our domestic and urban ills than to invest today's tax dollars in the futures of millions of soon-to-be-taxpaying Americans, some of whom, without this investment, would have merger futures at best, to look forward to.

I urge my colleagues to place on education assistance the importance and priority it deserves and to support efforts to adequately fulfill the promises we have made to strike, through education, at the root of human problems in America.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon, in vetoing the HEW appropriations bill, broke his promise to the American people that education was the most important investment this Nation could make in its future. He attacked the impact aid program specifically by using an illustration which could well have been the city and county of Honolulu. Yet everyone in Washington, except I guess the President, agrees that Hawaii deserves these funds and that in fact we are underfunded. It is obvious that the President's illustration was a gross exaggeration of the truth. His example also was in relation to the wealth or poverty of the area. Public Law 874, the impact aid program has no relationship to income. It is solely based on the number of federally connected children. I know of no Federal law which says military installations must be built in the poorest regions of America. It is therefore patently absurd to make this kind of irrelevant analogy. He ignored, in this attack, the fact that impact aid legislation is the law. The formula for distribution of these funds is fixed by law. The Congress did not increase this formula; it only provided enough funds to pay 90 percent of the costs. If the President was so firmly committed that this particular law was bad law, why did not he submit a bill to repeal it?

I believe this veto reveals the true sense of priorities of this administration and it is now clearly understood that these priorities do not include our children's health, education, and welfare.

The inflation argument is equally fallacious. The Congress reduced the overall Nixon budget by $5.7 billion including the add-on for education. We acted responsibly. We cut defense funds by $5 billion and reordered priorities to meet our pressing domestic needs, like pollution control, health, and education.

How can it be said that teachers' salaries, student loans to go to college, and library books are inflationary? Moneys that school districts expected under these Federal programs have already been spent.

Impact aid funds are provided by law enacted in 1950. Until it is repealed or amended it is the law and no man, not even the President, should be above the law. We are not providing for more than the law allows.

Despite what the President stated there will be a crisis. Despite his argument that the veto was necessary to prevent additional taxes and to keep down the cost of living, I predict that if his veto stands, many school districts will have to seek an increase in local taxes or face a closedown of programs, and that in fact the cost of living will continue to rise regardless of the veto.

Thus, we are given a choice of supporting our local schools and their children, or a President in Washington who is seemingly unconscious of the immense and pressing need to improve our Nation's educational system. I urge my colleagues to vote again for the future of the children of America by supporting an override of the President's veto of this bill.

I believe the President vetoed the wrong bill, at the wrong time, and for the wrong reasons. Now he is faced with the consequences, and I hope the Nation will exercise its opinion of this dark and erroneous act. Let us not make the same mistake.

THE EDUCATION VETO

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's theatrical veto of the Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bill was a first on national television—live and in color. The President chose to use health and education programs as whipping boys for a grandstand play to the American television audience. Casting himself in the role of a "Saint Richard" in search of inflationary dragons.

President Nixon's "T.V. Special" veto of the Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill has brought this Congress into a showdown confrontation with the White House on the question of national priorities.

The President says that our appropriation, passed by an overwhelming and bipartisan majority of this House, is spending money in the wrong place, in the wrong way, and at the wrong time.

Mr. Speaker, I vehemently and emphatically refute his statement. I say there is no better place and no better way to utilize our resources than in educating the young people of our Nation and in improving the health of all our people.

I agree with Mr. Nixon that it is the wrong time. We should have been allocating more of our Federal resources to these problems for many years. But we cannot educate our children retroactively; we cannot find cures for cancer and heart disease yesterday. Our only choice is to do it now.

No one argues that this Nation should not fight inflation. No one contends that Federal spending should not be reduced. The only argument is where.

I contend, Mr. Speaker, that the President has a sadly mixed sense of priorities.

This Congress reduced his foreign aid budget by a billion dollars. We cut military spending by $5.6 billion. We slashed his overall budget recommendations by more than $5 billion.

I ask the President: why would this money not have been inflationary? Why the great and sudden concern when Congress asked more money for education and health?

The President said in his televised statement Monday night that local school districts have already gone through more than half of the current fiscal year, and do not really need the additional money. This is pure, unadulterated nonsense. Local school districts adopted their 1969–70 budgets in mid-1969 in the belief that Federal aid would be forthcoming. They are counting on this money to help them operate for the balance of the year.

Even counting this Federal aid, I know of no school district that is free of financial worry. Many of them are already operating on money borrowed in anticipation of future tax income, Federal funds, or State aid.

In my congressional district, most classrooms are overcrowded, the pupil-teacher ratio is far too high, and many students have been forced into half-day sessions.

In the Taylor, Mich., school district, some 5,000 students have been attending classes for 3 hours daily for the past 2 years. To solve this, the district is now planning a split-shift schedule for the sixth, seventh, eighth and ninth grades. Half of them will go to school from 7 a.m. until 12:30 p.m., and the other half will go in the afternoons, from 1 to 6:30.

This will require 120 new teachers and another $1,300,000 in new revenues.

Officials of the district will have to ask the voters to increase local property taxes to raise this money.

In another district, Lincoln Park, voters are being asked for the third time in less than a year for additional tax moneys. Should the request be turned down by the already hard-pressed taxpayers, school officials predict "complete collapse" of the educational system.

Already, all first-graders are on half-days; all music, art, physical education and library programs have been dropped from elementary schools; high school sports have been curtailed; summer school and adult education have been eliminated, and 78 teachers have been dismissed.

The next step will be half-day sessions for all students, and complete elimination of such activities as athletics, driver-training and band programs.

In the Crestwood school district, voters will be asked to raise taxes by 4.5 mills at a special election next month. The district already has one of the highest tax rates in the area, but should voters reject the increase, officials will be forced to begin a cutback program.

These three districts are typical of others in my district and throughout the Nation in their frustrating efforts to maintain adequate educational facilities and programs.

Mr. Speaker, time does not permit me to go into the other facet of this vital issue—the great need for research into cancer, heart disease, arthritis and the many other diseases which bring death and suffering to countless Americans each year.

I can only say again that this is not the area in which to cut Federal expenditures. Human suffering surely deserves a higher priority.

Mr. Speaker, I will go along with reduced Federal expenditures in many areas—in military hardware, in the space program, in farm subsidies, in foreign aid, in public works and in research on supersonic airplanes—but I cannot and will not go along with reducing our commitment to education and health.

I will vote today to override the President's veto, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to rise above partisan politics and tell the President that we will not sacrifice our children and our health on the altar of false economy.

It is apparent from newspaper commentary and observation around the country that this transparent farce concocted by an administration which is ready to play party politics at the expense of the American people's need for health care and education, has been seen for what it is. I include at this point in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the New York Times today, January 28, 1970, which, I think, sums up fairly well the facts in this case:

VETO ON EDUCATION

President Nixon's dramatic attempt on television to justify his veto of the health, education, welfare and labor appropriations bill failed to make a persuasive case. His over-simplified political appeal served only to obscure the situation with broad generalities.

The President laid great emphasis on the inflationary effect of an additional $1.2 billion in Federal spending, overlooking the fact that Congress is still approving a smaller over-all sum than his own budget recommended. In any case, the attack on inflation does not diminish the Government's duty to reorder priorities. Mr. Nixon was on shaky ground when he equated an inadequate reduction of huge military expenditures with his veto of education aid. A defense establishment with overkill capacity is hardly comparable to an education posture with long-standing and grave deficiencies. There are no stockpiles in education's arsenal.

The President claimed that his Administration has appropriated record amounts for health, education and welfare. By lumping together support of education with the largely mandated escalation of welfare costs, it was possible to conceal an actual decline in Federal aid to education alone. While the President was certainly justified in chiding Congress for its refusal to phase out the inflated subsidy of Federal-impact districts, the cure is not to wipe out the appropriation but to transfer it to more useful purposes.

Mr. Nixon contends that the veto will bring about reform of "the same old programs." In reality, the veto jeopardizes many programs which came much too late when they were enacted in 1965 and, though plagued by some growing pains, can hardly be characterized as outdated. Their reform depends on effective supervision and imaginative planning, not on budget cuts.

The President's clincher was that the school year is already more than half over and that the extra money would therefore be squandered in a five-month spending spree. The fact is that much of the money has already been spent—and, according to the United States Office of Education, at a slightly higher rate than last year. Moreover, many of the big payments must be made at the end of the year.

This means that if the veto is sustained, many schools will be forced to retrench. Many districts already operate on austerity budgets and, as Mayor Lindsay stressed yesterday, they will have to eliminate projects that are already budgeted. Under such conditions, the newly created programs to aid the most deprived are always the first to be curtailed.

Some Republican leaders are currently passing the word around Congress that, in return for a sustained veto, they will try to gain White House support for a new bill which, though less costly in toto, would sweeten the politically popular impact-area pork-barrel. Such an unconscionable bribe would buy more of the worst by selling out the best.

The veto has driven home the dangerous folly of forcing the schools, year after year, to live on borrowed money. It has exposed the irrationality of depriving education of the chance to plan ahead. It has put the spotlight on Congressional irresponsibility in making a bad situation worse by unwarranted delays. The crowning blow would be for Congress, having at last taken a stand on the issue of education's place among the national priorities, to now surrender to the President's unconvincing plea.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, as the House considers overriding the Presidential veto of the Labor-HEW appropriations bill, I think it is necessary to gain some perspective about appropriations and inflation that the administration seems to have conveniently overlooked.

I have listened to the arguments advanced by the administration concerning the issue of inflation. However, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I cosponsored a measure enacted by this Congress during the past session that would give the President extraordinary powers of discretion in fighting inflation. He can control interest rates and credit rates at will, both powers which the President has specifically said he would not use. By rolling back the prime interest rate, to mention only one example, the Federal budget would be reduced by vast sums of money, some say by several hundred millions of dollars. And I have not even mentioned defense appropriations, the largest item in the budget.

I cannot see the sense of taking money from children, the sick, and the needy, and asking them to shoulder the burden of inflation singlehandedly. Funds for education and medical programs should not be diverted in such fashion.

In fact, the present Congress passed a number of appropriations bills producing a cut of $5.6 billion in the total budget. While $7.6 billion was cut from the budget in some areas, some $2 billion was added in others including Labor-HEW, to produce a total slash in the Federal budget of $5.6 billion. The Congress was thereby demonstrating its sense of priorities by its willingness to cut back in many areas but not education and medical programs.

We all know that inflation shrinks the value of the dollar. Just to sustain the programs contained within the Labor-HEW budget at the present level, it would be necessary to surpass last year's appropriations. Yet the administration in its budget request for 1970 asked for $50.5 million less for elementary and secondary education, $20.1 million less for higher education, $319.1 million less for impacted areas assistance, $39.4 million less for libraries and community services, $28.6 million less for medical research and $104.4 million less for hospital construction than was actually enacted the previous year. Programs would thus not only be precluded from operating at current levels, but would fall far behind if such budget cuts were operative.

The President's own task force on urban education suggested increasing appropriations for education by $14.5 billion more a year by 1975 as a necessary goal, admitting that there is no hope for effective education in the cities without adequate funding.

What type of losses would ensue if the veto were sustained? Probably many schools would be forced to curtail operations. Many potential teachers would be turned away from training offered under the Education Professions Development Act. The most dropout-prone children would be cut off from vocational education programs. Bilingual assistance would be withheld from many schoolchildren in need of this aid to learning within the school system. College students would be denied loans to permit them to pursue a higher education. Coronary care units in hospitals would lack trained personnel while an overall inadequacy of facilities and personnel would result in substandard care for some hospital patients. The great need for doctors would certainly be aggravated when potential medical students

lost opportunities for loans. Cures for major crippling and killing diseases such as cancer and circulatory ailments would be drastically set back. The reduction in the appropriation for the National Cancer Institute, taking only one example, would mean that the National Institutes of Health would have to cut by 40 percent the number of research projects in cancer begun in 1966.

The foregoing programs certainly demand top priority.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said about the Labor-HEW appropriations bill being inflationary. I will concede to no Member more concerned about the menace which this has brought to the soundness of the American economy.

I agree that there are areas of Federal spending that need to be cut. But, first I think we need to take a look at our priorities.

The President recommended the largest amounts in recent years in the fields of foreign aid and the poverty program. Here are two areas that I feel can be cut, and cut substantially. Instead, we see a veto of a measure that directly affects the educational needs of American children. A serious reduction in these funds could necessitate the closing of some schools or drastic increases in local property taxes.

I have supported cuts in the budget and I am proud that the Congress saw fit to cut nearly $6 billion from the administration's recommendations. If we are to get at the heart of inflation, I would recommend also that the President make use of the anti-inflationary authority which was provided him by Congress in the last session.

Within the appropriation for Labor-HEW, there are many items relating to the Nation's educational system, particularly higher education, cancer research, heart disease research, and so forth. These programs are important and it is not a waste of money to support them at the level which we have voted.

I am not in favor of all of the provisions of the present bill, but it seemed to be the best that we could get through the Congress and there is a great deal more good than bad in its provisions.

Again, I say that there are areas where Federal spending can and should be cut. I think our priorities have been misplaced.

These are the reasons why I will vote to override the President's veto.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the President's chief argument on behalf of his veto of the Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bill—H.R. 13111—passed by the Congress with $1.3 billion more for education and health programs than he requested, is that it is inflationary. I certainly share the President's concern about the current inflation and his desire to do something to stop it. I feel strongly, however, that the President's action on this bill is indefensible on those or any other grounds.

There is no question that excessive Government spending is a contributing factor to inflation, and that we must hold down such spending. With that in mind, I made every effort during the past session, in conjunction with many other Members of the House, to point out the immense amounts of waste in our huge military budget. Some of that waste was wisely cut by the Congress, but many other potential savings were ignored. Similarly, I have supported efforts to reduce spending for our space program, the development of the SST—supersonic transport—and other nonvital programs.

Unlike cuts in spending on nonvital programs, cuts in education and health programs lead to greater State and local spending to meet established health and education needs and commitments. Such increased local spending to compensate for unavailable Federal funds creates pressures for higher local taxes on property and sales, and nullifies any supposed anti-inflationary effects of reduced Federal spending.

Finally, the President has failed to use other methods at his disposal to combat the inflation that concerns us all. I believe, for example, that much more could and should be done to control the availability of short-term commercial and consumer credit which contributes significantly to the inflationary spiral. The President has the authority to impose such regulations, but he has failed to exercise that authority.

In short, the President's veto would impose needless sacrifice on those of our citizens who most need our help and merit our investment—the sick and the young. The anti-inflationary benefits are doubtful, and could be better accomplished by other means. With these factors in mind, I intend to vote to override this unfortunate veto.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, in recent months President Nixon has transmitted to the Congress, or his administration has otherwise released, the reports and recommendations of three distinguished assemblies of educators, addressing problems and prospects of the most urgent importance to this Nation and its future, and indeed to its survival.

I refer to the recommendations of the Urban Education Task Force, and of the National Advisory Committee on Dyslexia and Related Reading Disorders, and of the Commission on Instructional Technology.

It gives me great pride, Mr. Speaker, to remind my colleagues that the chairman of the last-named body, the Commission on Instructional Technology, is the distinguished dean of the graduate school of the great University of Utah, Dr. Sterling M. McMurrin.

I spoke of problems and prospects facing our Nation. Though my State has relatively few urban places, I recognize the gravity, indeed the prime urgency, of the challenge we confront in urban problems. It has been truly said that financial support for education is America's investment in the future. Where better might we invest than in urban education? In education in the urban places of this land, education not only to produce a generation of city dwellers with understanding and respect for law, and the fear of God, but to transform that generation into useful and self-sustaining citizens—and taxpayers.

The Urban Education Task Force, Mr. Speaker, stressed the need for short term expansion of title I of ESEA. The Congress responded to the need identified by the task force, and added $200 million to the President's recommendations for that title.

As a Republican and an admirer and supporter of President Nixon, it also afforded me pride when the President's Commissioner of Education presented his landmark "Right To Read" proposal last fall.

In that connection, it is well, I suggest, not only to recall the near-universal acclaim which greeted Commissioner Allen's idea, but to do so in the context of the realities behind the dollar sign. The National Advisory Commission on Dyslexia and Related Reading Difficulties—whose report was released by HEW a scant 10 days ago—went to the core of the reading problem, which it accurately placed among "the most serious educational problems confronting the Nation." The panel urged federally supported research directed to improving methods of preventing and remedying reading disorders, and identifying failing readers early. The report criticized existing efforts as "a patchwork."

But Mr. Speaker, the administration budget last spring proposed the elimination of ESEA title II—funds for library resources. I do not believe, and the educators and parents among my constituents cannot believe, that this Budget Bureau proposal reflects President Nixon's real priorities for education.

I referred to the Commission on Instructional Technology, headed by that distinguished Utahan, Dean Sterling McMurrin. The commission's report, transmitted to the Congress since this session convened, notes the limited use made by schools of the teaching tools of the new technology—television, computers, programed instructor, and even teaching films. This report, too, is dissatisfied with the present structure of education, and urges the development of new approaches. But, Mr. Speaker, the administration budget for 1970 eliminated funding for educational television and films. Are we to grind to a halt in the use of the new educational technology while we seek ways to spend more money more effectively?

These are among the considerations that have led me to recognize that my duty to my constituents, and to schools and schoolchildren in my district and in every district and every State, is to vote to override. I acknowledge to my colleagues that I am responding to pressure, but it is a pressure more difficult to resist than just the suasion of my constituents—which I assure you is no trifle. It is the pressure that Dr. McMurrin's commission alluded to when it spoke of "a society hurtling into the age of the computer and the satellite," which can no longer "limp along at the blackboard and textbook stage of communication."

My decision to vote to override the President's veto of the HEW appropriations bill was not reached easily. In this case, I am torn between my desire to uphold the President for whom I have great personal respect, and the best interests

of my constituents. On balance, I must vote for what I consider to be best for my State and the schools and children in my congressional district.

In his veto message, the President pointed out that the money for impacted areas does not always go to school systems or States which have the greatest need. My State is an exception.

Utah has long been noted for its high educational responsibility and limited resources. Only two States, Alaska and New Mexico, have more school-age children per thousand of population than Utah. Utah has 67 school-age children for each 100 adults. This is 14 more than the average for the Nation. In the United States at large, there are 53 children per 100 adults.

This high educational responsibility must be met with average personal income which is below the average for the Nation. When school responsibility is related to ability, Utah ranks 44th among the States, with $8,521 per pupil of school age compared to $12,117 for the Nation.

The loss of $6½ million in aid for impacted areas, $4½ million in assistance under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and $1½ million in aid for vocational education, if the veto is upheld, will result in serious hardships in my State. The loss of aid to impacted school systems in my congressional district will be especially serious.

School systems with limited revenues in my district have prepared budgets in anticipation that the programs authorized by the Congress would be funded. Accordingly, it is not a matter of spending all of the Federal money in a limited period. Most of the money anticipated from Federal sources has already been spent. To deny it now will mean that school systems will either end the year with a deficit, school terms will be shortened, or the reduction will be paid by teachers and other school employees.

It is too late, Mr. Speaker, to sustain this veto. Let us override it, and keep our faith which this Congress pledged in enacting H.R. 13111, and reiterated in adopting the conference report. And then, with a clean slate, let us get about the business of legislating and appropriating for education tomorrow. For tomorrow is upon us now.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government is taking over our schools and should help pay the bill for operating them. Local school districts cannot stand further increases in taxes. They have exhausted all sources of revenue. Keeping our schools open is the major problem of our people. I would support further appropriations for education rather than less.

It is imperative that aid to the student loan program, vocational education, public and school libraries, and secondary and higher education be continued. I have five children in the public schools and am acutely aware of this urgent need. I have a high regard for the President and respect his position. I support him when I think he is right, but this cut in education is in the wrong place and at the wrong time.

I agree with the President that water pollution, air pollution, and crime are major problems of the 1970's. These problems must be solved and it will require money—Federal money in vast quantities.

Mr. Speaker, I believe education is in a crisis. Education is also a major problem of the 1970's. I believe in local control of schools but the Federal Government has taken control of our schools by court orders, decrees, and even Federal troops. Our schools are being forced to bear the financial burden of busing and carrying out decrees of the Federal Government.

Therefore, I think it is right and necessary that the Federal Government pay some of the bill. I will, therefore, vote to override the President's veto of this education and health bill.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, statements have been made on this floor that the Nation's school doors will close and our educational system grind to a halt if the President's veto of the Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation is sustained.

Nothing could be more untrue.

If the veto is sustained, funding of our school systems will continue without interruption. Until another appropriation bill is approved, the continuing resolution under which our schools have been operating throughout this fiscal year will remain in effect.

No schools will be closed, no children will be deprived of a day's education because of the action of this House in supporting the President. In his veto message Monday night, he himself declared:

> You can be sure that no school will need to be closed. No school child need be denied an education as a result of the action I take tonight. I will work with the Congress in developing a law that will ease the transition to education reform and do so without inflation.

In view of this statement, and of personal assurances I have had from the White House, I do not see how it is defensible to approve $1.26 billion in additional educational funds this late in the fiscal and academic years. The administration would be required to allocate these sums regardless of whether real need existed and despite the obvious inflationary effect this billion-dollar explosion would have on our already volatile economy.

I must also point out that the majority party which controls this House and all the legislative activity in it has created whatever monetary crisis exists in education today because of their deliberate, dilatory handling of this money bill.

This appropriation should have been enacted into law by June 30, 1969. It now is January 28, 1970. Late last summer educators were appealing to me because the appropriation had not been approved. They were having a very difficult time trying to plan their school years. This was common knowledge on Capitol Hill, but the majority party in both House and Senate continued footdragging in an effort to embarrass the White House, to create the sort of situation we have today. The fiscal 1970 education appropriation was in limbo for almost 7 months.

My sympathies are most strongly with the educators in this matter. I originally voted for the additional funds, because I am deeply concerned about quality schools and education in this Nation. But I did so when there was still time for school administrators to program their allocations. At this late date, I cannot sanction letting loose a flood of tax dollars which would arrive too late in the school year to be used wisely or well.

The irony of it is that those who today are posing on this floor as the great defenders of education are the very ones who delayed this bill for 7 months while they played politics.

I know I can expect charges without respect for the facts, during this coming election year that I am against the schools. Time will tell the truth and I have great confidence in the wisdom and judgment of the 23d Congressional District which I serve.

When the revised appropriation bill comes to the floor, I will be in the front ranks of those who vote for its passage. And, I look forward to the President's education reform proposals in my continuing drive for the highest quality education obtainable for our children.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I will vote to override the President's veto of the Labor-HEW appropriations bill for the current fiscal year.

There are, Mr. Speaker, Republicans who believe that the veto should be overridden because this is a question of national priorities fundamentally affecting the future of education. We believe that Congress should not retreat from the firm stand it has taken placing education in the front rank of national priorities. We believe that to do so would adversely affect local school districts which have already counted on and even spent these funds. In short, I believe that we in the Congress have made a commitment and we must keep it by overriding this veto today.

This is not to minimize the inflationary problems of this country or the enormous rise in the cost of living; my concern about these trends and their impact on the family budgets of millions of Americans is as deep as the President's. But I do not think that the figures support the President's claim that the additional expenditure of $1.3 billion will have a devastating effect on the fight against inflation.

The facts are that an additional $1.3 billion is one-tenth of 1 percent of a trillion dollar gross national product, and one-half of 1 percent of a $200 billion Federal budget. These are very small percentages indeed.

Further, the Congress has already cut $5.6 billion in budgetary authority for this fiscal year and $2.9 billion in budget outlays. Thus, an increased expenditure of $1.3 billion would still not mean that we are spending more than the President budgeted in total.

I would point out that on November 21, 1969, Dr. Herbert Stein, a member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, stated:

> I have the impression that many people now see a magical significance in a shift of a few billion dollars in the budget position, especially if the shift crosses the line

between surplus and deficit. . . . Preoccupation with small changes in the budget position leads to bad forecasts by the private economy and bad policy by the government.

Surely we must keep a careful watch on Federal spending and reduce it wherever the national interest makes it possible. There are areas to cut—the SST; wasteful defense spending, including cost overruns for 38 major weapons systems undertaken since the late 1950's which surpass the entire $19.7 billion this bill would appropriate; the ABM and MIRV, to name just a few. As the New York Times pointed out in its lead editorial this morning:

A defense establishment with overkill capacity is hardly comparable to an education posture with long-standing and grave deficiencies. There are no stockpiles in education's arsenal.

Health and education are not and cannot be in the category of unnecessary spending, or else the quality of life which the President pledged to improve in his state of the Union address is already doomed to become worse instead of better.

Equally, the fight against inflation must be fought with other weapons. The President has quite a number, but he has, for reasons I will not question, chosen not to use most of them which were made available in legislation recently passed by the Congress. Even without legislative authority, the administration could use the persuasive power of its office to urge voluntary restraints on wages and prices by business and labor. These, it seems to me, are the kind of actions which would help in reducing the family grocery bill and insurance premiums.

I think it is an oversimplification for the President on nationwide television to tell the American people that the veto of $1.3 billion in expenditures will lower the price of eggs.

Further, the total appropriation in the conference report, even including the additional funds, is only 46 percent of what is authorized for health and education programs. More precisely, about 38 percent of what is authorized for elementary and secondary education is appropriated and about 29 percent of the higher education authorization.

The real question, therefore, is one of national priorities, of those activities which this Nation considers most important to its future, of the quality of life now and in the years ahead. And the priorities to be reordered are not the fight against inflation versus the needs of education and health. Rather, our priorities must be a determination of the order in which we will spend available resources to solve pressing problems. I happen to think that education is more important than a missile defense system, that health care is more important than a superfast airplane. I also believe that the issue is not really how much we now spend on education and health but rather the magnitude of education and health needs that are unmet.

President Nixon told the Nation on Monday night:

We spend more for health and education than any nation in the world.

But I think it is clear that that is not enough for the richest country in the world in light of these statistics from one source:

Infant mortality is less in 14 other nations;

Twenty countries have less heart disease;

Infant mortality rates for Negroes in Mississippi or a northern city are comparable to Ecuador's;

Fifteen other countries have a longer life expectancy;

In city slums there is three times as much heart disease, five times as much mental disease, four times as much high blood pressure, and four times as many deaths before age 35 than there is nationwide.

One estimate holds that the cutback in funds for NIH and the Health Services and Mental Health Administration will result in 50,000 unnecessary deaths in the next year as a result of lack of funds to train personnel for coronary care units in hospitals. Six and a half million for construction of community mental health centers would be cut back and $104½ million for hospital construction. The conference report provides an additional $10 million for the rubella vaccination program, raising the sum for this vital fight against German measles from $16 million to $26 million. Experts have already predicted that without an all-out innoculation program this year, there will be a tragically large number of retarded children born to pregnant women who contract German measles during the epidemic expected in 1971. Equally, this bill contains funds for the fight against air pollution; the President, in his state of the Union message, persuasively pointed out that befoulment of our air is a luxury we can no longer afford. Surely then we cannot afford to be cheap about the funds allocated to this endeavor.

In general, our health care delivery system in America is approaching a state of crisis, both in terms of the cost to the patient of even the most simple services and in terms of the frequent inadequacy or unavailability of competent care for routine ailments.

Money is not the only answer to this crisis, but if we reduce funds for NIH, the Health Services and Mental Health Administration, and the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Services Administration we are also drastically reducing the manpower and the equipment needed to cope with this crisis. I think this would be nothing short of negligent.

My own State of New York would suffer a loss of $39 million in Federal funds from these three health administrations if this veto is not overridden. That is the difference between the budget request of $282 million for New York and its $321 million share of the funds in the conference report. Even though there would be an additional $1.357 billion for medicaid and medicare in either case, the drastically deteriorating public health facilities in New York cannot bear the burden of such a loss.

Much has been written and said in recent weeks about the financial plight of educational systems in this country. I think that one of the most relevant observations is that children now in school are not going to wait 6 weeks until the President sends up his proposals and then an additional indeterminate period until the creaky machinery of the Congress finally passes a bill. If we wait for this process to be completed before providing additional funds for education, children now in the first grade may well be in the third and still not know how to read, and by the time we really reach them in the sixth grade they may be well on the road to becoming dropouts.

While I am delighted that the President plans to send up an education message shortly, the fact is that it is not yet before the Congress, and the President has had more than a year in which to study the educational needs of America. Yet the report of his Task Force on Education, headed by Alan Pifer of the Carnegie Corp. and submitted before his inauguration, has never been officially released. It calls for many new programs and the expenditure of an additional $1 billion for urban education and another $1 billion for other education programs. More recently, his Task Force on Urban Education completed a report which has also not been officially released. That report calls for spending $14.5 billion more a year by 1975 and it warns:

Without adequate funding, there is no hope for effective education in the cities.

No American and surely no responsible legislator wants to throw money away on programs which do not work. But the reports that some States and jurisdictions have misspent title I funds is not sufficient reason to cut them off from those many school districts which have plans formulated and programs underway for their constructive use.

Most States have been counting on the higher funds in the conference report since they were initially approved by the House last July; their availability now will more likely permit ongoing programs to continue than enable administrators to buy frivolous educational hardware.

According to the Office of Education, much of the money in this bill has already been spent or committed, with many of the large payments falling due at the end of the fiscal and school year. The Congress and the administration must share the blame for the cumbersome appropriations process, lack of advance funding and leadtime for educational planning that has caused these funds to be obligated. But that is an even more compelling reason why these funds must be approved. In White Plains, N.Y., in my district, for example, the school system's total budget for title III of NDEA is $35,000 of which the community pays half and the Federal Government pays half. Without the funds in the conference report, White Plains, and every other school district in the country, will get no title III funds because President Nixon did not request any in his budget. As a result, the ongoing program in White Plains would be cut in half, seriously hampering their program of acquiring classroom equipment and ma-

terials that will raise them from the "basic" or "advanced" categories to the "goal" category in their effort to meet American Library Association and State education department standards for instructional equipment.

In particular, in September New York State is implementing a mandatory health curriculum of which drug abuse education is an important part. The White Plains school system lacks adequate instructional films and materials on this vital subject, and had hoped to use title III funds to buy films to make up the deficiency. Equally, it had hoped to use part of the $13,000 White Plains should receive under the conference figures from ESEA title II to build up its library on this subject.

White Plains' title I ESEA program is only budgeted at 90 percent of the Nixon budget, so that retrenchment would not be necessary if the higher funds are not approved. But as a result, a crucial part of the school population is being missed in the reading center which is the beneficiary of White Plains' entire title I allotment. There are now 384 children in the reading center and as a result of the lack of funds, remedial instruction is concentrated on the 351 children who are in grades two through six. In addition to reaching the remaining children in the center from higher grades and already in need of remedial instruction, White Plains needs the additional funds to expand its reading center program into kindergarten and grade 1 to concentrate on prevention and diagnostic techniques in order to minimize the need for remedial instruction later.

New York City is not so fortunate. If this veto is sustained, some 450,000 youngsters may have to be dropped from title I programs next fall. Another 250,000 children will be deprived of summer programs; that is the beginning of a cycle of despair and idleness and trouble that will only cost society a great deal more later. Libraries in New York City will lose $1.3 million; handicapped pupils will have $500,000 less; $1 million will be cut back from bilingual education programs in a city with an enormous Spainish-speaking population; and $1.5 million will be lost from programs seeking to replace antiquated instructional materials.

Specifically, New York State and New York City would be affected by this cutback as follows:

*New York State share of Federal education funds*

| | |
|---|---|
| Total education: | |
| Conference report | $305,069,768 |
| Budget request | 228,516,907 |
| Loss | 76,552,861 |
| Title I, ESEA: | |
| Conference report | 177,000,000 |
| Budget request | 143,000,000 |
| Loss | 34,000,000 |
| Impacted aid: | |
| Conference report | 22,192,000 |
| Budget request | 7,715,100 |
| Loss | 14,476,900 |

*Losses to be sustained by New York City if conference report not approved*

| | |
|---|---|
| ESEA: | |
| Title I | $23,000,000 |
| Title II | 1,250,000 |
| Title III | 1,000,000 |
| Title VIII | 500,000 |
| Bilingual education | 1,000,000 |
| NDEA: | |
| Title II | 1,500,000 |
| Title III | 500,000 |
| Title VA | 500,000 |
| Impacted aid | 5,250,000 |
| Vocational education | 2,250,000 |
| Total | 36,250,000 |

Throughout New York State last year, 127 school bond issues were rejected by the voters; in Westchester County alone, 14 out of 33—almost half—were turned down at the polls. At the same time, the State legislature last year reduced by some $300 million the total of State aid to localities for education, and the Governor's proposed new formula this year does not really make up that deficiency.

In short, the property tax cannot be raised further to finance education on a local level, the State refuses to recognize or act upon the local financial squeeze, and now the Federal Government threatens to weaken the fiscal position of school systems still further. This is really the crowning blow; we are not talking about frivolities; we are talking about the necessity of keeping the schools open to provide our children with the highest quality of education that America has the capacity to deliver.

This veto must not be allowed to stand as the only tangible evidence this administration can offer of its claim to "care deeply about the need to improve our Nation's schools." This entirely mistaken notion of what is important in America must not be our response to the need to make health care available, affordable and more than adequate for all our citizens. People are involved here; not statistics on a budget chart. For once let this Congress take a courageous step, an action which recognizes the human dimensions of America. That is the issue today, and that is why I believe the President's veto should be overridden.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the recent Presidential veto of the Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bill is a cruel hoax played on the American people in the name of fighting inflation and of economy. The President has advocated economy, but at the expense of our children, of the sick, and of the helpless.

There are areas where the President could have made real economies, not at the expense of our children, but in areas where we are now wasting money. The President is preaching economy, but his administration is firing those who accomplish economies. Witness the Fitzgerald case. Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG recently pointed out some of the areas where we could far better save money—$36.5 million to a Greek dictatorship which governs by torture, for example. Or instead of building a supersonic transport, which will cost billions of dollars in development costs, not to mention the need for new airport facilities, the President might have committed those funds towards education. Instead the Presidential economies are directed at our schools, our true hope for the future.

The President made much of impacted aid to schools in his veto message. Impacted aid, of course, is just Federal payments to support the Federal load to schools where Federal installations cut the tax base.

This morning I called the Santa Clara County superintendent of schools to find out how much this veto will cost the taxpayers of Santa Clara County. In California, the bill provides $88,891,000 in impacted aid. In my congressional district, the ninth, it provides $1,245,000, and in the neighboring 10th Congressional District, $1,636,000.

So, let us see what it will cost on the tax rate for local school districts. In the Berryessa Elementary School District the President's action will mean an estimated 10-cent increase in the tax rate, in Campbell Union 9 cents, in Cupertino 9 cents, in Evergreen 6 cents, in Fremont High School District 5 cents, in Santa Clara Unified 9 cents, and in Sunnyvale 7 cents.

There is one school district within Santa Clara County, not, however, within the Ninth Congressional District, which is an almost perfect example of the damage the President's veto will do. The district is the Whisman Elementary School District in Mountain View, not, by far, the richest district in the county. The school district takes in much of Moffett Field, a huge naval installation. Its present tax rate for all purposes is $3.815 per $100 assessed valuation. If the President's veto stands, it will cost taxpayers in the Whisman School District an estimated 30 cents more on their tax rate, according to the county superintendent of schools.

The failure of the Federal Government to bear its fair share of costs, where it creates costs will come home to haunt the local taxpayer.

There is much more that could be said about the President's veto, including the fact that it endangers much more than just impacted aid. The total Federal school allotment to California is $310 million. Unless the veto is overridden, California school administrators will be left hanging as to what, if any, Federal aid they are to receive. The same is true of health officials, the National Institutes of Health, and hundreds of other necessary programs.

Finally, I would note that the President's veto includes funds for what he said in his state of the Union message is a necessity—pollution control. I wonder, in fighting inflation, how much he will reduce the appropriation of $108 million for air pollution. I suggest that what is needed in this area is an increase, not a decrease.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, it seems that everything must have a label.

Now, according to some of the proponents of Government spending and inflation, anyone that is not for overriding President Nixon's veto of the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bill is automatically against children, against education, against the

public school system, and against health care for the American people. They—the proponents—would have us believe and unfortunately have much of the public believe that our schools will close, our system of education will be irrevocably impaired, health care will become inferior, and our children will suffer from this deterioration for the rest of their lives.

Mr. Speaker, this is simply not the truth.

First, let me state that as a matter of principle I would like to have less—not more—Federal intervention in our elementary and secondary schools, both in their operation and in their financial affairs.

Aside from that, the Federal Government will spend 13 percent more on programs for health, education, and welfare than it spent last year. The President's proposal which I supported asked the Congress to appropriate more for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare than it has ever appropriated before.

I do not like the way Secretary Finch has been spending the money already given him and I see little reason why the Congress should give him more than a billion dollars over the amount he says his Department can wisely spend. He says he does not want the increase.

If the increase were forced on him by the Congress, he would be forced to spend many millions of dollars on some bad and wasteful programs because he has no discretionary power in spending—his hands are tied by this legislation.

Fiscal year 1970 is over half gone. No money can be carried over to be spent in another fiscal year. In other words, the $1.3 billion over the President's budget request would necessarily have to be spent in 5 short months. This would without doubt raise the price of many school-related supplies, educational aids, and construction materials adding fuel to an inflationary fire that the President is trying desperately to control. In the end, all would suffer—nothing at all would be gained.

Mr. Speaker, the overriding issue is not whether or not we are going to back the President and his administration. Are we to tell the President to fight inflation and deficit spending and to balance the budget and then when he tries to cut spending, are we going to force him to spend over a billion dollars more than he or the administration needs or wants? How can the President reduce inflation if we force him to spend over a thousand million dollars he does not need to spend?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at this point two very timely articles on this subject. The first is an editorial from the Wednesday, January 21, 1970, San Diego Union. The other article is from the January 31, 1970, Human Events:

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, Jan. 21, 1970]

DEMOCRATS DEFY PRESIDENT: INFLATED HEW BILL IS CRUCIBLE

To Democrats, who are the majority in Congress, final approval of the $19.7 billion omnibus Health, Education and Welfare bill by the Senate yesterday probably would represent good politics.

But it would be bad news for the United States of America.

It is secondary that the Democrats' political ploy will force an agonizing decision upon President Nixon because the bill appropriates $1.26 billion more than he requested.

More important is the effect the appropriation would have in stimulating continuing inflation, which is the problem of all Americans not just of the President, and the psychology among some members of Congress that politics should come before the interests of the people.

The politics behind the majority party maneuvering are plain.

In the first half of the 91st Congress last year, Democrats sought to give the impression that President Nixon seeks only to raise taxes. They made him speak out for extension of excise taxes and the surtax, and elimination of the investment credit tax.

They also sought to give the President the onus of opposing appropriations for social programs that affect millions of Americans. Last year the majority party raised Social Security benefits far above the amount requested by the President and far above the rise in the cost of living.

This year they opened Congress by serving notice on President Nixon that they intended to place him in a position where he would have to veto the $19.7 billion HEW bill that supports health programs, welfare agencies, education, labor and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

It is dangerous and irresponsible action.

Taxes had to be continued because of an inflation that the nation inherited from five years of the same kind of political legislating that has dominated the 91st Congress. Democrats controlled the Congress in all of those years.

Congress, dominated by Democrats, voted for the tax increases and extensions last year. The majority party also voted large new appropriations that are not matched by anticipated federal revenues.

And the $1.26 billion the majority party added to the HEW bill is more than the entire budget for the Department of Commerce. It exceeds the combined budgets of the Departments of State and Justice.

Nor can HEW claim to be a poor federal cousin. Its total spending when all activities are included is estimated at $50 billion a year—up from about $17 billion in 1961. Projections show its appropriations may exceed those of the Department of Defense by 1975. Further, President Nixon asked $2.1 billion more in HEW appropriations over the previous year.

We would question whether the American people will be misled by such obvious gamesmanship, particularly if they are reminded of it every time there is a rise in the price of food or shelter because of the inflation it encourages.

---

[From Human Events, Jan. 31, 1970]

NIXON'S VETO NECESSARY

The education lobby and its Democratic allies in Congress are accusing President Nixon of being "antieducation" for threatening to veto the $19.7-billion appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare. The President, of course, has claimed the $1.3 billion extra added to his own requests is "inflationary," but the liberals are hoping to turn the controversy into a major campaign issue for 1970.

Administration spokesmen on Capitol Hill, however, have been presenting powerful evidence to support the President's "inflationary" charge against the added appropriations, the lion's share of which is targeted for education purposes.

Sen. Robert Griffin (R.-Mich.), the assistant GOP Senate leader, noted that fiscal year 1970 ends next June 30, only five months away, and that if the full appropriations bill were passed, the Administration would be under pressure to spend all the money before the next fiscal year. Such a massive outlay in such a short period of time, Griffin stressed, would doubtless raise the costs of school-related supplies, education aids and construction materials.

Another point made by Administration supporters—and coldly ignored by the self-styled "friends of education"—is that the nation's public schools are among the most severely crippled victims of runaway inflation. Recently the prestigious professional publication *School Management* had this to say on the subject:

"Inflation is burning up most of this year's record spending increases—the median district is spending 13 per cent more per pupil—and the bulk of what's left goes into higher salaries. The grim conclusion: Drastically increased spending in recent years has probably had little effect on the quality and quantity of education many children receive."

And yet the education lobby marches on, claiming the added $1.3 billion is essential to improving the "quality" of education. The lobby and its Democratic cohorts should heed *School Management* when it says with brutal frankness:

"Inflation is roaring through education's fiscal forest like a fire blazing out of control. . . . Local [school] districts are attempting to douse the blaze by pouring more and more money into education. But very substantial portions of the increased spending are being consumed in the flames. . . . Results of the annual survey of current public school spending show that the unprecedented inflationary spiral of the past two years has created a tremendous need for school funds to merely maintain the status quo with respect to purchasing power. . . .

"In sum, the prospect for the current school year [1969–70] is gloomy. Until inflation cools down, school districts that increase spending will, in effect, simply be spinning their wheels; school districts that fail to increase spending will face program cutbacks. While many administrators complain bitterly these days about the adverse effect on education of the Nixon Administration's tough anti-inflation measure . . . it [is] abundantly clear that inflation itself is far more damaging than any of the attempts to bring it under control."

On another level, the Administration opposes the education spending increase because much of the added $1.3-billion outlay would go to programs which the White House is currently reevaluating. HEW Secretary Robert Finch, assuredly no "anti-education" reactionary, describes such programs as being "under a cloud" and argues that no new funds should be spent on them until their effectiveness can be thoroughly adjudged.

Among the specific education programs the Administration is reviewing are compensatory education for deprived children, aid to federally impacted areas and Title I of the 1965 Education Act, which grants added funds to schools in poor, lower-class neighborhoods. Title I has been one of the act's most controversial sections, and a recent New York *Times* survey (see *Human Events*, Jan. 10, 1970, page 4) reported that, in four years of operation, Title I funds have been of little benefit in improving the quality of education in its target areas.

Aid to federally impacted school districts may be one place where the Administration may be ready to compromise, in order to get the votes it needs to sustain a presidential veto. The program has been under constant fire from fiscal conservatives because a district such as Montgomery County, Md., which has the highest per capita income of any county in the nation, received $5.8 million in impacted aid in 1968, while the country's 100 poorest counties *together* received only $3.2 million. However, many of

the districts receiving impact aid (including Montgomery County) are represented by Republicans, and these congressmen are not eager to uphold the President's veto of a bill which contains an increase in money for their districts.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to override the President's veto of the Health, Education, and Welfare-Labor appropriations bill.

I do not believe there is a Member of this body who does not favor efforts to combat inflation. Inflation puts the worker on an economic treadmill, robs the poor, increases the cost of housing construction and mortgage interest rates, and decreases the buying potential of senior citizens and others on fixed income.

But what I want to know is why the President has chosen to fight inflation by employing a Robin Hood in reverse fiscal policy. This policy denies the 60 million schoolchildren in the United States $1 billion in educational programs. At the same time it encourages record bank earnings because of alltime high interest rates and excess defense industry profits because of the alleged need for continued massive expenditures for military weapons systems.

How is it, that the President, whose budget has already been cut by the Congress by $5 billion, chose as his target the $1 billion extra allocated for the schoolchildren of our country rather than the $7 billion allocated for highway construction, the $7 billion for subsidies for rich farmers, the $5.5 billion to subsidize the SST and commercial aviation, the $4 billion cost overruns, and $1 billion for special tax privileges for the oil industry? Maybe the President considers educating our children more inflationary; or maybe it just is not important in the President's sense of priorities.

What really puzzles me is how an appropriations bill that is actually $2 billion lower than what the President requested can be inflationary because it contains $1 billion extra for education. Maybe the President considers educating low-income children inflationary.

There is something basically inconsistent about an administration which preaches self-help and then grabs away the books and educational programs from those motivated to learn and improve. There is something inherently wrong with a set of priorities which can decide that very little is too much to spend for the education of all its 60 million schoolchildren and the many millions more who derive personal enrichment from library programs. How can we, in good conscience, refuse to approve a desperately needed $1 billion for education when we so recently approved $70 billion for defense?

Inflation is not going to be cured by a Robin Hood in reverse economic policy. It is going to be cured when high interest rates are lowered and the war ended. It is going to be cured when the excess profits of banks and the defense industries are taxed away.

New York City's school-age population alone will lose $36 million if the President's veto is sustained, and all but a few million will be in programs that go to low-income children. This will mean a curtailment or radical cutting back of programs like that—

To give the low-income child a chance to start school on an equal footing with his middle-class neighbor;

To provide special instructors to teach remedial courses, and special facilities to aid the low-income student with college potential;

For pregnant school-age girls; and

For the use of paraprofessionals from the community, who can relate to the student body and find a rewarding career.

If the President's veto is sustained, many of the 30,000 paraprofessional school aides will lose their jobs in New York City.

The New York City Board of Education already has a $750 million to $1 billion deficit. Like many other school districts throughout the United States, the upholding of the Presidential veto would spell even greater fiscal chaos, and possibly even the closing of some public school systems.

The President in his veto message promised to "compromise" with the Congress if his veto is sustained by supporting a partial restoration of impacted aid funding in another bill. Impacted aid funds generally go to moderate or upper income schools as the President himself pointed out; but he made no reference to restoring any of the programs that benefit low-income or minority children. This cynical suggestion is, in my opinion, not worthy of the occupant of the office of the President, but is merely a ploy to gain some votes.

Maybe the President does not consider educating our children, or even educating the poor, to be inflationary after all. It appears that he just does not place a very high priority on the poor, the black, and the non-English-speaking residents of our central cities.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote to override President Nixon's veto. I do not accept the President's argument that the proposed expenditures for education are inflationary. They are inflationary to the extent that any Government expenditures are inflationary. The question we must answer is where in the budget should expenditures be made and where they should be cut back.

This is a unique bill. It is an all-American bill, because it provides funds to take care of the most important needs of the American people, their health, their welfare and the teaching of our young. What greater purpose is there? What programs have a higher priority?

The question as to whether there will be a deficit is not thrust upon the Congress by this bill. That is the President's choice. He can cut back other programs than those in this bill, or delay them or phase them over a longer period.

Why must there be approval for such doubtful programs as the ABM? If there is to be a choice between that project and education for our children, which is more vital? It is estimated the primary installation costs for the two ABM sites would approximate $8 billion. Charles Schultze, former Director of the Budget, recently estimated what the ABM approved funds might have been used for. This is what he said:

The current estimate on the two-site system the Congress approved last year is $8 billion, a figure which stands to increase substantially when the expanded version is announced. With that sum we could double our expenditures for air pollution control, double our expenditures for the National Cancer Institute, double our expenditures for the National Heart Institute, construct 200,000 additional hospitals beds, construct and equip 10,000 additional elementary and secondary school classrooms, and pay tuition, board, and dormitory costs for 500 thousand students in four-year public institutions of higher learning.

Priorities? Mr. Speaker, this administration is literally dismantling the excellent health research programs established over many years. I am shocked by what the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has done to research programs on children's diseases. The following are letters I have recently received which tell the story most graphically. They show also the efforts of the groups to survive and to continue their important work. These are the letters:

WILMETTE, ILL.,
*December 31, 1969.*

Congressman SIDNEY R. YATES,
*Chicago, Ill.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN YATES: Thank you very much for the time which you took today on the telephone. This will confirm our discussion, and outline a few of the matters we touched on.

On Wednesday, December 3, 1969, Peter Aylward and I appeared before Senator Warren Magnuson's Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Education and Welfare. The specific matter about which we had been urged to testify (by, among others, Doctor John Cooper, President of the Association of American Medical Colleges) was proposed termination of federal support (resulting in close down) for 19 clinical research centers across the country, particularly including the clinical research center at Children's Memorial Hospital in Chicago.

Briefly, $38,000,000.00 has been required and has in the past been appropriated for the operation of 93 clinical research centers in 77 hospitals across the country. Without going into detail, these centers are, in effect, miniature hospitals in themselves located in larger hospitals that provide facilities and resources for careful clinical research into human disease. The administration recommended an appropriation of $35,000,000.00, or, a cut of $3,000,000.00, which an advisory board determined would require the closing of 19 centers including the one at Children's.

In a broader sense Congressman Yates, countless federally funded research projects are gravely threatened by the administration's proposed health budget. Many of the cuts and holdbacks were reflected as you know in the House passed H.R. 13111, restored by the Senate, and compromised in the conference committee. No doubt the modified Labor, Health, Education and Welfare bill will be passed by the Senate, but the real question is whether or not some way can be found to compel the administration to spend the money which has been allocated.

The administration, as you suggested, may very well sign the bill and then simply refuse to spend it. Diseased children are not a particularly effective or vocal lobby group, and if publicity and "heat" is not brought to bear on what the administration is doing, few people will be the wiser.

Speaking of the close down of the clinical research centers, Doctor Roger Egeberg said "the Administration, in full confidence in the wisdom of its budget, has determined that the money if appropriated will not be spent." I attach a copy of this letter. Medical

research funds and clinical research center operations are being used as a device to control inflation. Briefly, as two ordinary people, Peter and I attempted to urge that in fiscal 1970 the administration satisfy the demands for expenditure control and tax relief in an area of lower national priority.

Reductions in research capabilities are further compounded by substantial and inflationary bites, and as a result, many projects are seriously crippled, others abandoned, and research teams forced to disperse. The administration's holdback position would intolerably deepen the crisis.

In my humble opinion what is needed, and desperately needed is for pressure of any kind available to us to be applied to the administration to review the holdback policies it has proposed, and perhaps the time is in fact ripe for the elected representatives to in some way communicate their opposition to the use of medical research funds as an inflationary control device. Let those members of the House agreeing with the administration's position go on public record in the glare of whatever publicity can be brought to bear.

I'd welcome the chance to sit down with you should you deem it helpful, and discuss any of the foregoing that may be of interest. I can supply you with whatever backup material you may require. We can discuss this further at your convenience, but I did want to get some of my thoughts down on paper.

Again my thanks for your interest, and may I wish you a Very Healthy and Successful 1970.

Very truly yours,

WILLARD L. SHONFELD,
*Attorney at Law.*

---

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
*Washington, D.C., October 1, 1969.*

DEAR MR. AYLWARD: This will acknowledge your letter of September 11, 1969. I sincerely appreciate your views on the matter of the proposed phase-down of the 19 general clinical research centers. You have my assurance that I am fully cognizant of the value of these centers and of the contributions which they have made toward the advancement of human health. The budget which has been submitted to the Congress by the Administration was prepared with the full knowledge of all of the competing, worthy demands on the Federal health dollar. The Administration has full confidence in the wisdom of its budget and I am, therefore, not prepared to give assurance that if the additional $3,964,000 is made available by the Congress, it will be used to support all of the currently supported 93 general clinical research centers.

When the appropriation and apportionment processes are completed and the level for fiscal year 1970 of the Department's total health effort is known, there will be an opportunity to review again the allocation of funds among all the activities. Hopefully, at that time, it will be possible to find ways of, at least partially, meeting the needs of all our meritorious programs.

Sincerely yours,

(S) JESSE L. STEINFELD, M.D.
(For Roger O. Egeberg, M.D., Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs.)

---

CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL,
*Columbus, Ohio, January 22, 1970.*

Hon. SIDNEY R. YATES,
*U.S. Congressman, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN YATES: To follow up our phone conversation of this afternoon, I am enclosing two presentations which, together, provide quite a bit of background on the Clinical Research Center problem.

One is a letter which you may have already seen. It was written by a Chicago-area attorney, Peter Aylward.

The second is a presentation which we sent out to approximately 12,000 people in our community. From the feedback we have received, a fair number of these people wrote to Washington.

Since your battle is our battle, we naturally wish you all possible success in the presentation which you are going to make on the floor of the House.

Thank you so much for your interest and kindness.

Sincerely,

WILLARD BAILEY,
*Director of Public Relations.*

---

GLEN ELLYN, ILL.,
*September 11, 1969.*

Re Proposed Phase-Down of Nineteen Clinical Research Centers.

ROGER O. EGEBERG, M.D.,
*Assistant Secretary, Health and Scientific Affairs, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR DOCTOR EGEBERG: This supplements my letter dated September 5, 1969 to Dr. William DeCesare, Chief, General Clinical Research Centers Branch, Division of Research Resources, National Institutes of Health, in which I requested certain specified information pursuant to 5 U.S.C., § 552. For the reasons set forth in detail below, I hereby respectfully request a representation by you, or by Secretary Finch if necessary, that the Department of Health, Education & Welfare will spend the full amount appropriated by Congress for the Clinical Research Centers Program. My understanding of the relevant facts is as follows:

The budget prepared by the former administration requested an appropriation of $38,964,000 for the continued operation of the ninety-three Clinical Research Centers. The revised budget, however, provided for only $35,000,000 to fund these Centers. Consequently, in light of the revised budget, the National Advisory Research Resources Council (the "Council") met on June 20, 1969 and reluctantly determined that in lieu of allocating the $3,964,000 reduction to all ninety-three Centers, which were already underfunded, it would take steps to terminate as many Centers as necessary to restore "efficient program operation." (The Resolution adopted by the Council is attached hereto as Exhibit A.) On June 26, 1969 the General Research Centers Advisory Committee (the "Committee"), which is advisory to the Council, established a rank order for terminating Centers. (Abbreviated minutes of the Committee meeting are attached hereto as Exhibit B.) On July 31, 1969 the Council determined that it had no choice but to terminate certain Centers. (A Resolution adopted by the Council at this meeting is attached hereto as Exhibit C.)

On July 24, 1969 the Appropriations Committee submitted House Report 91-391 to accompany House Resolution 13111—the appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education & Welfare. Since the House Appropriations Committee viewed the Clinical Research Program as "one of the most important activities of N.I.H." (the relevant portion of H.R. 91-391 is attached hereto as Exhibit D), the Committee specifically restored the full $3,964,000 to the Clinical Research Program. The House passed House Resolution 13111 on July 31, 1969, and although certain amendments were made prior to passage, the bill as passed by the House appropriated $38,964,000 for the Clinical Research Program—an amount sufficient to fund the continued operation of all ninety-three Clinical Research Centers.

In transmittal letters dated on or about August 15, 1969 Dr. DeCesare notified the following nineteen Clinical Research Centers that Federal funds may be withdrawn for the program year commencing October 1, 1969:

1. University of California at Los Angeles.
2. Children's Hospital of Los Angeles.
3. Medical College of Georgia.
4. Children's Memorial Hospital, Chicago.
5. University of Illinois College of Medicine, Chicago.
6. Indiana University School of Medicine.
7. University of Kentucky Medical Center.
8. University of Maryland School of Medicine.
9. Wayne State University Children's Hospital of Medicine.
10. University of Mississippi School of Medicine.
11. Albert Einstein College of Medicine, New York.
12. Albany Medical College of Union University, Albany.
13. State University of New York, Buffalo.
14. State University of New York, Syracuse.
15. Children's Hospital Research Foundation, Columbus, Ohio.
16. University of Cleveland.
17. Children's Memorial Hospital of the University of Oklahoma Medical Center.
18. Jefferson Medical College, Philadelphia.
19. Baylor University College of Medicine, Houston, Texas.

The notification letters to each of the above Centers was with minor variation substantially in the form of Exhibit E, attached hereto. Of the ninety-three Centers which are presently operational, nineteen Centers (or approximately 20 percent) specialize in clinical research on diseases of children. However, seven of the nineteen Centers listed above which will be affected by the cut back (or approximately 37 percent) specialize in clinical research on diseases of children. Thus, the number of children's research units proposed to be terminated is grossly disproportionate. During the program year ended September 30, 1968 the nineteen Centers listed above accounted for 4,100 admissions to beds and 37,500 patient days.

The first publicity on this situation was an article, attached hereto as Exhibit F, which appeared in the New York Times on Tuesday, September 9, 1969. The first publicity of the fact that your Department, and not Congress, may be responsible for the phase-down was an article, attached hereto as Exhibit G, which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times, on Wednesday, September 10, 1969.

Based on the foregoing facts, I respectfully request that you, or Secretary Finch if necessary, immediately represent that the Department will in fact expend the full amount appropriated by Congress for the Clinical Research Centers Program, and I further respectfully request that in light of the exigencies of time this representation be forwarded to the Project Directors of each of the nineteen Centers as soon as possible.

We both realize that the Senate will concur in the restoration of the $3,964,000 to the Clinical Research Centers Program. However, your Department has deluded the personnel in the nineteen Centers by claiming that the proposed phase-down (or termination) of the nineteen Centers is attributable to a lack of funds. This is simply not the case—if the nineteen Centers are reduced to skeletal operations or completely terminated, this will be attributable solely to the fact that your Department refuses to expend funds rightfully appropriated for this Program. Put in this light, the proposed cut-backs assume a different complexion:

First, by refusing to expend the $3,964,000 which Congress will appropriate, your Department will obviously be frustrating the clear intention of Congress. Second, although the Department's refusal to expend the $3,964,000 could be characterized as an "economy" measure, I refuse to believe that the nation's health must suffer whenever inflationary pressures appear. I also refuse to believe that the war against inflation will suffer even a perceptible set-back if

your Department expends the $3,964,000. Third, the fact that your Department apparently views the Clinical Research Centers Program as the Treasury Department has viewed the Investment Credit—as a program to be suspended or implemented based on the heat of the economy or the state of the war from time to time—raises serious questions as to our national goals and priorities. Can we, as a nation, afford to tell the 400 full-time employees of the nineteen Centers, the patients served by the Centers, and indeed the public at large that the $3,964,000 annual investment to fund the nineteen Centers is not a sound investment (and thus admit that the contributions these nineteen Centers make to the country is marginal at best), while at the same time our government spends $2 million a day (or approximately three-quarters of a billion dollars a year) on research for the Chemical, Biological, and Radiological Warfare Program? (Although I am not disposed to sardonic humor, a colleague suggested that you could obtain the hoped for $4 million simply by giving the Chemical Warfare people a long weekend.)

Fourth, whether by design or accident your Department may have caused irreversible set-backs in the Clinical Research Program, even if it acts now to rectify the problem. When participants in a research program are informed forty-five days prior to a program year that their project will either be completely terminated or cut back to skeletal proportions, one must reasonably expect that the "dispersion of the highly skilled personnel" (in the words of Council's Resolution) will commence immediately. For this reason alone it is imperative that your Department act as soon as possible to stem the flow of personnel. A further delay in the final determination of this matter is tantamount to a decision that your Department wishes most of the 400 full-time employees of the nineteen affected Centers to seek employment elsewhere. Fifth, I am deeply disturbed about the apparent reappearance of a spectre which tormented our land for five long years—the credibility gap. I simply note the lead paragraph in an AP dispatch from Washington on Tuesday, September 9, 1969 (the exact day, interestingly enough, that the New York Times published its story on the termination of the nineteen Centers):

"The Nixon administration has mapped a five-year Federal health program that places heaviest emphasis on improving the delivery of medical services, especially to the poor, expectant mothers and young children."

Can your Department conceivably place a "heavy emphasis" on medical services for young children, when as an economy measure it proposes not to expend $3,964,000 appropriated for the Clinical Research Program, thereby causing the termination of seven of the nineteen operational Clinical Research Centers which deal exclusively with diseases of children?

As you may well expect, no one will be satisfied by a response that your Department must await Senate action on H.R. 13111, before it can make a final determination on this matter. If your Department gives the representation I requested, I intend to informally poll the Senate Appropriations Committee as to their concurrence in the $3,964,000 restoration passed by the House. If the result of this poll indicates, as I am sure that it will, that the Senate will concur with the House on the $3,964,000, I intend to so notify the Project Directors of the nineteen affected Centers. Armed with the fact that the necessary funds will be appropriated and the representation of your Department that the funds will in fact be expended, they will then be able to reassure their staffs and return to work well in advance of the date of the enactment of H.R. 13111. Since as you know the program year commences on October 1, 1969, unless the staffs of these Centers receive immediate assurance that the full appropriation will be spent, significant and irreparable dispersion of staff will occur.

I must reiterate that although I am an attorney, I am acting in my own individual capacity as a private citizen. I am not acting on behalf of nor have I been retained by Children's Memorial Hospital in Chicago, nor any other Center. I am motivated by the thought that if one of your predecessors had terminated the research project which led to the break through on PKU, whether for reasons of "cost-effectiveness" or simple "economizing", the lives of my children would be indelibly altered.

I trust that you will give this matter your prompt and undivided attention.

Very truly yours,

PETER G. AYLWARD.

---

EXHIBIT A

NATIONAL ADVISORY RESEARCH RESOURCES COUNCIL, JUNE 20, 1969

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Council recognizes the unique value of the General Clinical Research Centers Program in making possible the conduct of high quality clinical research in academic institutions throughout the Nation; and

Whereas the centers provide the critical interface where benefits of advanced science and technology are effectively incorporated into improved patient care; and

Whereas the centers, as institutional resources available for inquiry and examination at all clinical levels, have substantially improved the quality of education for the entire medical community; and

Whereas the Council recognizes that grossly inadequate funding is being provided for the conduct of the General Clinical Research Centers Program; and

Whereas the Council further recognizes that the distribution of additional budgetary reductions among all Centers, already operating at reduced levels, will seriously compromise the objectives, productivity, and effectiveness of the entire Program; and

Whereas the Council recognizes that termination of Centers represents a serious loss for affected institutions, and that dispersion of highly skilled personnel is inevitable: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Council deplores the fact that it now appears necessary to begin preparation for the closing of a number of the clinical research resources supported by the Program, but finds no alternative except to recommend immediate action to terminate as many Centers as is necessary to restore efficient Program operation; and be it further

Resolved, That the Council is deeply concerned that serious consideration is now being given to option of a policy to bill research patients and third party insurance carriers as a measure to alleviate budgetary problems of the Program. Council has, on several occasions, examined this issue in depth and wishes to reiterate its strong opposition to this policy. Council recognizes the existence of occasional studies where billing for hospital services seems appropriate; however, Council believes that adoption of a general policy to bill and collect from research patients will undermine the entire conceptual basis of the Program and rapidly lead to the loss of Program effectiveness.

---

EXHIBIT B

SPECIAL SESSION GENERAL CLINICAL RESEARCH CENTER COMMITTEE MEETING, JUNE 26, 1969

A special session of the GCRC Committee met in New York on June 26th to establish a rank order for terminating centers in accordance with the June Council resolution which recommended closing a number of Centers to remain within the tight fiscal boundaries of the proposed GCRC budget.

The Committee reviewed 31 of the 93 existing centers. These 31 centers by the latest priority rating, constituted the lower one-third of the operating units. Using the most recent data on research expenditures, faculty effort, center usage patterns, alternate research bed support, bibliography, occupancy and publication figures these centers were ranked in descending order; number one being the least essential to retain and number 31 the most valuable of the group. Various factors were taken into consideration. Scientific merit was the primary criterion, however, value as an institutional resource and research potential were also considered.

Twenty-one centers were chosen for Council consideration. Centers ranked 22 through 31 were judged by the Committee clearly more essential to retain than those ranked 1 though 21.

---

EXHIBIT C

NATIONAL ADVISORY RESEARCH RESOURCES COUNCIL, JULY 31, 1969

RESOLUTION NO. 1

Whereas the National Advisory Research Resources Council met in special session on July 31, 1969, and with great difficulty and much concern concurred in the necessity of closing a number of Clinical Research Centers; and

Whereas this extraordinary action was forced upon the Council by the level of the proposed budget for the General Clinical Research Centers program; and

Whereas the Council views the closing of these centers as a major blow to the clinical research in this nation; and

Whereas the Council's recognition of the unique value of the General Clinical Research Centers program was stated in the Resolution adopted at its meeting on June 20, 1969 (copy attached): Therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the request of the National Advisory Research Resources Council that the seriousness of this situation be made known to all concerned in the Executive and Legislative Branches of the Federal Government.

---

[House of Representatives, Rept. No. 91-391]

EXHIBIT D

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1970

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare (except civil rights educational activities, Indian health activities, construction of Indian health facilities, emergency health activities, and assistance to refugees in the United States), the National Labor Relations Board, the National Mediation Board, including the National Railroad Adjustment Board, the Railroad Retirement Board, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, the United States Soldiers' Home, the Federal Radiation Council, the President's Committee on Consumer Interests, the National Commission on Product Safety, and the Inter-Agency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs.

*General Research and Services.*—The bill includes $73,658,000—an increase of $3,960,000 above the amount requested, and a decrease of $11,151,500 from the amount appropriated for 1969.

This appropriation supports general, noncategorical operating programs administered by the Division of Computer Research and Technology and the Division of Research Facilities and Resources.

The Division of Computer Research and Technology serves as a central resource of computer services for all of NIH. It collaborates widely with the programs of the categorical Institutes. This central facility now provides versatile, reliable computing service on a self-supporting, fee-for-service basis.

The Division's computer experts, engineers twenty-four hours per day, six days per week, and mathematicians work directly on research projects with physicians and other scientists in other Institutes and Divisions. To make its large computing capability more responsive to the needs of the NIH scientific staff, the Division is constantly adapting and augmenting the standard, commercially available technology. It offers intensive, unique training courses in the use of computers which are designed explicitly for the needs of the NIH staff. These activities are part of the Division's conscious multidisciplinary effort to bring computer science, computer related engineering, and applied mathematics to bear on biomedical research. The variety of productive applications of computers is greater at NIH than at most other scientific or administrative communities throughout the Nation.

NIH is to be congratulated for having developed a well-balanced resource that emphasizes both the practical, immediate use of computers and the research necessary to anticipate future needs and shape future uses of these versatile but exceedingly complex machines for biomedical research and education.

The Division of Research Facilities and Resources administers the general clinical research centers program, the animal resources program, and the special research resources program.

There are now 93 general clinical research centers located in 32 States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. During the past year 2,762 investigators used these resources and 2,525 physicians and 2,538 medical students received training in research techniques in these centers. As these research units are fairly expensive to operate they are only made available to institutions where the necessary scientific competence exists for a wide range of clinical research that makes substantial contributions to improved patient care.

The program has been hard hit by rising hospitalization costs which increased 55% between 1965 and 1969 and are expected to go up by another 15% during the next twelve months. Even though funds for this program were $4.5 million (15%) higher for 1969 than for 1968, the number of patient-bed-days it was possible to support dropped from 280,000 to 240,000. As the revised budget estimate for 1970 provided for the same amount, $35 million, as was available in 1969, it is estimated that patient-bed-days in these centers would drop to 185,000 if the revised budget were approved. The Committee views this as one of the most important activities of the N.I.H. and has increased the revised budget to $38,964,000, the amount contained in the original 1970 budget.

---

EXHIBIT E

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
*Bethesda, Md., August 15, 1969.*

DEAR DOCTOR: In the last few years program funds at the Federal level have, of necessity, been constrained for reasons of national fiscal policy. While a continuation of these constraints is anticipated for the foreseeable future, the exact dimensions for FY 70 will not be known until the current Congressional appropriations process has been completed, and final Executive Branch decisions on these sums have been made.

On the basis of recent reviews by the General Clinical Research Centers Committee and the National Advisory Research Resources Council, occasioned by this uncertain financial situation, is one of the centers under consideration for which support may not be available during the grant year beginning October 1, 1969. As yet no final decisions have been made, but you will be notified formally as soon as possible as to whether your support will be continued or must be withdrawn.

If it is decided that support must be withdrawn, a reduced level of funding for a phase-out period will be offered. This will allow time for completion of higher priority research protocols and relocation of key personnel whose salaries are currently charged to the grant. These centers will subsequently be phased down to an approved, unfunded status, but will be encouraged to continue in active clinical research if funds from sources other than the General Clinical Research Centers program can be utilized.

At this time it is necessary that your institution submit to the General Clinical Research Centers Branch, Division of Research Resources, NIH, by September 15, 1969, a one-year contingency plan of operation and a revised budget based on a proposed availability of funds roughly equal to 40 percent of your grant award for FY 1969. Plans may include the full salaries requested for your Program Director, one secretary, and limited dietary and/or laboratory personnel. This plan might also include bed support, up to one-half of the discrete beds now approved, administered according to scatter bed guidelines. Distribution of the funded research resources, including beds, must continue to be administered by your General Clinical Research Center Advisory Committee. We will review this situation through the remainder of the appropriation cycle and will inform you as soon as the funding picture is clarified.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM R. DECESARE, M.D.,
*Chief, General Clinical Research Centers Branch, Division of Research Resources.*

---

EXHIBIT F

[From the New York Times, Sept. 9, 1969]

19 CLINICAL UNITS FACING SHUTDOWN—MEDICAL RESEARCH CENTERS WARNED THEY MAY LOSE U.S. FUNDS NEXT YEAR

(By Harold M. Schmeck, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—The directors of 19 medical research centers throughout the nation have received letters from the National Institutes of Health warning them that they may have to close down next year because of lack of funds.

Most of the centers are affiliated with major medical schools, where they play an important role in the crucial final stage of medical research. This is the phase in which new ideas, drugs and devices that have been tested in the laboratory are first made available to patients.

In short, it is the phase where the benefits of advanced science and technology are first used to improve patient care.

The research units are called general clinical research centers. The National Institutes of Health supports 93 of them at present. Some have been in existence since 1960. All of those that may face closing next year have been operating for several years.

The centers have been described as "hospitals in miniature." Each is equipped to care for a few hospitalized patients at a time—the range is between four and 35. The care promising new concepts in medical and surgical treatment.

Much of the modern experience in organ transplantation has been gained in such centers. They have also contributed to improvements in care of shock patients and high-blood pressure cases and in understanding of many aspects of maternal and infant health.

Indeed, parents of the children who have been treated at one such center in Chicago have protested to their representatives in Washington on learning yesterday that the unit might lose its financial support. This center has been in operation for about five years at the Children's Memorial Hospital in Chicago.

Dr. Robert B. Lawson, professor and chairman of pediatrics there, said today that he had been shocked when he received the letter saying the center might have to be phased out during the next 12 months.

He said comparable facilities for dealing with infant and maternal health problems were scarce. Furthermore, he said, the hospital cannot afford to support the center through nongovernment funds.

In answer to a query today, Dr. William R. DeCesare of the National Institutes of Health confirmed that he had sent out letters to 19 of the 93 centers on Aug. 15.

RELUCTANCE EXPRESSED

Dr. DeCesare, chief of the general clinical research centers branch of the institutes' division of research resources, said that the step had been taken with great reluctance.

The letter said that no final decisions had been made but asked the institutions to draw up contingency plans for phasing out their Government-supported activities by Oct. 1 of next year.

During the fiscal year 1969, the 93 centers have been funded on a minimal basis with a total of $35 million.

As one planner explained, the choice was between substandard operation for all 93 centers and reduction in the total number so that the surviving centers could operate effectively.

The hard choice of which centers to consider dropping was made with the aid of two independent advisory groups—the National Advisory Research Resources Council and the General Clinical Research Centers Review Committee.

Four of the centers that may lose their Federal support are in New York State. They are at Albert Einstein College of Medicine in the Bronx; the Albany Medical College of Union University in Albany, and the State University of New York Medical Centers in Buffalo and Syracuse.

The others are situated in 12 other states. Seven of them specialize in clinical research on diseases of children.

The full list of 19 was supplied today by Dr. John A. D. Cooper, president of the Association of American Medical Colleges. All of the institutions at which the centers are situated are members of the association. Dr. Cooper said that his organization was deeply concerned over the probable cutback in clinical research centers.

"It will be a substantial setback in clinical research which aims at getting the real answers to disease," he said during an interview today.

OTHER CENTERS LISTED

He said that the centers were usually major research and training resources for their parent institutions and sometimes for their entire regions. They have had an important impact on medical education, he said, and on the effort to increase the ranks of medical manpower and effectiveness in delivery of health services to patients.

In addition to the four in New York, the centers that have received letters warning of a possible cutback are at:

University of California at Los Angeles; Children's Hospital of Los Angeles; Medical College of Georgia; Children's Memorial Hospital, Chicago University of Illinois College of Medicine, Chicago.

Also, Indiana University School of Medicine; University of Kentucky Medical Center; University of Maryland School of Medicine; Wayne State University Children's Hospital of Michigan; University of Mississippi School of Medicine.

Also, Children's Hospital Research Foundation of Columbus, Ohio; University of Cleveland Children's Memorial Hospital of the University of Oklahoma Medical Center; Jefferson Medical College in Philadelphia and

Baylor University College of Medicine in Houston.

EXHIBIT G

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Sept. 10, 1969]

TWO HOSPITALS HERE FACE SLASH IN RESEARCH FUNDS FROM UNITED STATES

(By Richard Foster)

Medical research at two Chicago hospitals is faced with severe cutbacks as a result of a Nixon administration reduction in spending.

The National Institutes of Health has sent letters to administrators of 19 of 93 general clinical research centers in the country directing them to make budgetary cuts for the year beginning Oct. 1.

The institutions affected here are the University of Illinois College of Medicine and Children's Memorial Hospital.

Dr. Malcolm M. Stanley, supervisor of the clinic at the College of Medicine, said he was told to make a 60 per cent cut.

A spokesman for Children's Memorial said a similar cut was ordered in its clinic by Dr. William R. DeCesare, of the National Institutes of Health.

Dr. Stanley said his budget under the NIH program runs about $313,000 a year. The Children's Memorial Clinic spends about $250,000 a year under its federal program, the spokesman said.

At the U. of I., research is conducted into kidney transplants, the effects of drugs on the body, and the "basic mechanisms of various diseases," Dr. Stanley said.

The Children's Memorial spokesman said its metabolic research program will be jeopardized if the cutbacks occur.

Most of the 93 centers supported by the NIH are affiliated with major medical schools and play an important role in the final stage of medical research.

This is the phase in which new ideas, drugs and devices that have been tested in the laboratory are first made available to patients.

Some of the centers have been in operation since 1960. The U. of I. facility is seven years old; the Children's Memorial clinic is in its third year of operation.

Former President Lyndon B. Johnson proposed an appropriation of $39,000,000 to finance the centers after Oct. 1. But President Nixon ordered the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to trim that to $35,000,000.

It is the projected loss of that $4,000,000 that endangers the function of the 19 centers.

The House of Representatives voted to restore the $4,000,000 and that bill is now before a Senate committee. But some Chicago doctors are concerned that an economy-minded President will not spend the entire $39,000,000 in the next year even if it is approved by Congress.

Dr. Stanley said that he was given short notice. He said he received a letter from Dr. DeCesare about the middle of August and was told to submit his revised budget within a month.

"We're going to have to make a list of priorities and eliminate those functions which aren't so important," he said. "The trouble is, all of them are important."

Much of the modern experience in organ transplants has been gained in such centers, medical authorities said.

The centers also have contributed to improvements in care of shock patients and high blood pressure cases and in promoting maternal and infant health.

CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL,
*Columbus, Ohio, October 1969.*

DEAR FRIEND OF CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL: The Clinical Study Center at Children's Hospital is in imminent danger of being abolished, due to drastic cutbacks resulting from the federal government's economy program. In fact, beginning October 1 of this year, the program is operating at 40 percent of last year's budget—a 60 percent cut! And, according to information we have received from Washington, this year is to be a phase-out period, with the program's funds being cut off entirely on October 1, 1970.

We are writing to ask your help in trying to prevent this serious loss. You will find the details of the problem on the following pages. Please write to the federal officials listed below, asking them to take appropriate measures to prevent elimination of the Center.

Your interest and help could have great impact on the health of our children, and will be deeply appreciated.

Sincerely,

CLIFFORD R. ROSTOMILY,
*Administrator.*

BRUCE D. GRAHAM, M.D.
*Chief of Staff, Chairman, Department of Pediatrics, College of Medicine, Ohio State University.*

Key Federal Officials:

The Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Robert P. Mayo, Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C.

The Honorable William B. Saxbe, U.S. Senator, New Senate Office Building, room 1205, Washington, D.C.

The Honorable Stephen M. Young, U.S. Senator, Old Senate Office Building, room 458, Washington, D.C.

A SUMMARY OF CURRENT PROBLEMS FACING THE CLINICAL STUDY CENTER AT CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL, COLUMBUS

On December 7, 1964 the first patient was admitted to the newly opened Clinical Study Center at Children's Hospital. The Center had been established in 1962 under a seven-year grant from the General Clinical Research Centers Branch, Division of Research Facilities and Resources, National Institutes of Health. The first two years of the grant saw remodeling of 7,515 square feet of the Hospital's Sellers Wing—formerly the polio area—to provide facilities which include a six-bed patient-care and clinical-study nursing unit, a therapeutic dietary department and a research laboratory equipped with the most modern and sophisticated equipment available.

Clinical Study Center support under this program has been given to medical schools and high-quality teaching hospitals to stimulate interdepartmental investigation of new forms of diagnosis and treatment for any form of disease.

The Center at Children's Hospital has concentrated primarily, but not exclusively, on metabolic and endocrine disorders of children. Among the disorders which have received considerable study in the Center are: disorders of the glands in children, faulty absorption of food, inherited disorders of a metabolic nature, preparation of patients with terminal kidney problems for organ transplantation, management of liver failure in children, and unusual blood disorders.

Three examples of the results of our work are cited below:

We have investigated many forms of treatment for laryngeal papillomatosis, a children's disease involving wart-like growths on the larynx, impairing the voice and threatening life by inhibiting respiration. From our studies, we have developed an ultrasound technique, a new form of therapy. Of the 71 children treated with ultra sound, about 90 percent have been cured—a far higher rate of cure than has been obtained previously with any other form of treatment.

A ten-month-old child was in circulatory failure, in shock and had low blood sugar, convulsions and extremely acid blood. Emergency care was given by physicians in another institution, and when their diagnostic facilities were exhausted the patent was referred to us. Thanks to the facilities available in the Center, it was determined that he had an unusual disease. At that time, only three or four known children in the world had this condition. At the present time, about 50 to 75 percent of the children known with the disease are dead and many others are mentally retarded. The studies performed in the Center, allowing a proper diagnosis, permitted us to give adequate management. The child is now progressing well, developing well, leading a normal life for an infant, and is without handicap.

A seven-year-old who, practically since birth, did not adequately absorb food and had been studied by many doctors in other hospitals several times, continued with her disability. Through the studies performed in our Center, she was found to be intolerant of table sugar. With just the dietary treatment, consisting of a normal diet without table sugar, she was able to absorb normally, and is now a healthy girl without disability.

From our opening in December of 1964 until the date of this letter, 599 patients have been admitted to our Center, and they have received nearly 7,000 days of care and intensive study.

Now, however, our program is being seriously threatened, and we are gravely concerned that our work is to be summarily terminated.

As mentioned above, our initial grant was awarded for seven years, to end September 30, 1969. One year ago, following a site visit by representatives of the General Clinical Research Centers Committee, we made application and received approval for a three-year extension of our program.

Signs of impending difficulty first appeared when, due to limited funds, our October 1, 1968–September 30, 1969 budget request was cut by about ten percent (from $249,514 to $221,690).

Then, on August 15 of this year we received a letter informing us that our Clinical Study Center is one of 19 (out of 93 in the United States) for which support may not be available after October 1, 1969. The letter cited as reasons for the cutback current economic conditions and the Administration's efforts to cut federal spending. It explained that, if support must be withdrawn, a reduced budget for a phase-out period will be offered. In view of this, the letter recommended that we present a one-year contingency plan and a revised budget based on 40 percent of last year's allocation—about $99,806 for 1969–70.

Clearly, the 60 percent cut, while nominally keeping our doors open for a year, would, for all practical purposes, destroy our program. And, apparently, our program is to be totally eliminated next October 1, cutting off the new knowledge being gained from our studies, and disbanding the excellent, highly specialized staff we have assembled.

As a result, we are most urgently seeking your help.

An effective, massive letter-writing campaign is made up of many, many individual letters. Our present campaign will only be effective if *you* write letters in support of our cause. Please take the time to write!

The answer, Mr. Speaker, is up to the President. Inflation is still a threat but it will not be conquered by vetoing this bill. I believe the President has been misadvised. This bill is too important to the people of our Nation to be killed.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Congress sent to the President a Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bill which had been approved by an overwhelming majority in both Houses of Congress.

Later on Monday, President Nixon announced to the Nation that he must veto this legislation in order to combat inflation. This veto, if sustained, will have

the effect of destroying much of the progress we have achieved in the vital areas of education and health. In my own State of New York, there would be a loss of $130 million in allocated aid, which in turn deprives New York City of appropriately $65 million.

Many schools would be forced to shut down completely. More than 200,000 young people would be cut off from vocational education programs, and some 115,000 college students would be forced out of institutions due to the termination of their loans. Almost 10,000 potential teachers would be denied the training they would have received under the Education Professions Development Act. Our desperate need for doctors would be felt even more intensely as several thousand potential medical students would lose opportunities for loans.

The health research organizations, which have made such commendable progress in their quest to find cures for the major crippling and killing diseases such as cancer and circulatory ailments, would be severely handicapped. In the National Cancer Institute alone, this veto would effect a 40-percent cutback in the projects it had begun in 1966.

I must respectfully disagree with President Nixon's argument that these funds are misdirected. Does America have a more meaningful commitment than the education of her children? Is there anything more precious than life itself—the human condition which will be jeopardized for millions of persons now clinging to the hope that tomorrow a cure will be found for their infirmities? I think not.

While the President, and the Congress, are obligated to take every action within reason to curb inflation, I feel that we are exercising a distinct lack of reason, as well as compassion, when we consider reducing appropriations at the expense of the young and the afflicted.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's veto of the appropriations bill for the Labor Department and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare shows the imbalance in the administration's sense of priorities. The veto of the $19.7 billion bill is supposed to be an act of "responsible government"—this is the phrase used by Bryce N. Harlow, the President's counselor, in his letter of January 5 to Republican Members of Congress appealing for their support in sustaining the veto.

The administration's assessment of responsibility is a provocative one. It not only demonstrates the administration's misplaced perception of what our national needs are but, as well, employs pure partisanship to label the proponents of the appropriations bill as profligate, thereby diverting attention from the real issue—the health and education needs of our people.

My assessment of responsible government is a different one. Consequently, I intend to vote to override the President's veto.

The President requested $1.3 billion less for Labor-HEW than Congress has appropriated. However, the fact is that Congress cut $5.6 billion from the total Nixon budget requests. Of this amount, $3.2 billion was cut from military spending. And another billion was cut from the foreign assistance appropriation. I suppose the President is now telling us that had Congress met his requests and appropriated the additional $3.2 billion for military spending, he would then have exercised his veto. For that, I would have commended him.

No indictment lies against the Congress, then, for being profligate. The realities of the situation are that Congress has cut far more from the President's budget requests than the amount by which the Labor-HEW appropriation exceeds his request for fiscal year 1970 funds.

I think it clear that Congress has not acted in an inflationary manner. In reality—and reality is something the administration has worked hard to obscure by framing the fight in terms of the false issue of inflation—the Congress has not appropriated enough, rather than too much. The President's urban education task force sent its report—the Riles report—to the Office of Education on January 5. The President's own task force recommends spending at least $1 to $2 billion more than we have appropriated this year. It urges a target of $7 to $14 billion more per year by 1974, and recommends spending an additional $500 per pupil per year.

Nor is the task force's voice a solitary one. The President's Commissioner of Education, James E. Allen, Jr., has recently expressed public dissatisfaction with education's place among the administration's domestic priorities.

What Congress has done is to recognize the dictates of responsible Government by responding to the needs of the people. Thus, in comparison to the administration's budget requests, we have provided $170 million more for elementary and secondary education programs, $398 million more for school assistance in federally affected areas, $210 million more for vocational services programs, $41 million more for library and community services programs, and $14 million more for education of the handicapped programs. In the health field, $104.5 million has been added for hospital construction, $4 million for narcotic addiction and alcoholism treatment, $10 million for the Cancer Institute, $11 million for the Heart Institute, and $6.5 million for the construction of community mental health centers.

Should the President's veto be sustained, it has been estimated that New York City, alone, will lose $35.8 million in education funds, and over $20 million in health research and care would be lost.

Accurate criticism would challenge Congress' failure to do more, and the administration's failure to ask for more. Actually, this failure is not an isolated phenomenon—it is just a symptom of the real danger which the President's veto signals: a serious misperception of our domestic needs. The most recent articulation of this misperception was presented by the President in his state of the Union message, when he said:

> To present and stay within a balanced budget requires hard decisions. It means rejecting spending programs which would benefit some of the people when their net effect would result in price increases for all the people.

I confess that I cannot comprehend how seeking a cure for cancer becomes a matter of cost analysis calculations.

Mr. Speaker, despite this administration's view, responsible Government is, in the final analysis, Government which responds to the needs of the Nation. Its needs are not served by the President's veto of the Labor-HEW appropriations bill.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, before making up my mind on how to vote on whether to sustain or override the President's veto of the pending appropriation bill, I felt that some analysis should be made of the application of the President's statements to the situation in a specific area of West Virginia.

I am the first to agree with the President that late funding of education programs is a very disruptive practice, and we must work diligently toward funding these programs early enough in the year so sensible planning can result in the most effective expenditures. But I want to add a few words about timing. One of the most effective times to spend title I ESEA funds for disadvantaged students is in the summer. During the summer, disadvantaged students can be isolated so that 100-percent concentration can be placed on overcoming their deficiencies. Also, the most effective teachers in a school system can be employed to work with these students. Many school systems have summer title I programs to concentrate on those educationally disadvantaged students that have fallen behind during the school year. Therefore, the increased appropriations in title I can be very effectively utilized. They must be appropriated to insure that thousands of disadvantaged students throughout the Nation will have the opportunity to attend school this summer to overcome their deficiencies.

In the case of impacted areas aid, these funds are already in the budgets of local systems, and this money is vital for some systems to keep their school doors open for the remainder of the school year.

The President contends that the funds in the pending bill are being devoted to the same old programs and for the wrong purposes. He expressed the thought that more should be devoted to reading programs. The truth is that a majority of title I funds is spent on reading programs, and the majority of these are not the same old programs. Many are new, innovative, and are producing remarkable results in West Virginia.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Vocational education is just getting on the right track, with concentration on the comprehensive high school. Results in West Virginia are very good. The vocational funds in H.R. 13111 are vital to the continued success of the vocational education programs in our Nation. To reduce these funds has the effect of throwing away years of hard work and sound experimentation in vocational education.

Misuse of title I ESEA funds has been in the headlines recently. As a matter of fact, these accounts have been unfair to a majority of the school systems in this country. We should heed the ad-

monition we hear so much these days about the "silent majority," and not be diverted from our main goals by spectacular failures among a minority of the schools. After 5 years of experience, and some admitted failures with title I, local school administrators are now becoming very effective in utilizing title I money to meet the needs of the educationally disadvantaged student. The money is getting to the pupil.

Going back to vocational education, there are many fine examples in West Virginia. In my own congressional district, there is a fine vocational educational training program at Parkersburg South High School in Parkersburg, W. Va.—one of the outstanding schools in my State. Students there built a complete ranch-style house from scratch, including plumbing, electrical-wiring, plastering, even to the point of building the furniture for it. The students learned to lay brick, to wire the house, to install plumbing, paint it, and roof it. Girls take a complete food handling program under the comprehensive vocational education high school training. They prepare the menus, prepare the food, and serve it to other students, to faculty and to visiting parents at this restaurant facility located right in the school and apart from the cafeteria.

SUMMER PROGRAMS FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

In Wood County, W. Va., the first- and second-grade students who failed during the regular term of school, were enrolled in a special summer reading course. There were 250 youngsters from all over the county. Under a new approach to teaching reading skills, 80 of these students gained sufficient skill to be promoted while the others showed marked improvement.

Another program in Wood County was one which enabled 50 youngsters in grades three through six, to spend a week in camp. This program lasted 6 weeks and covered 300 students who were taught personal hygiene such as brushing their teeth and bathing. The purpose of the program, which also offered classes in math and science during the weeklong stay, was to teach these students to know themselves and to live with others.

A followup survey during the following school year by school nurses showed a majority of these students continued to practice the hygiene habits they learned at summer camp.

These are some of the real worthwhile programs which will be wiped out if the President's veto is not overridden. I believe that to sustain the President's veto will be to deny many thousands of young Americans the opportunity to become successful and productive citizens. I hope that the veto will be overridden, and that in the fight against inflation we urge the President to use the credit tools which Congress has supplied him, and also cut Federal spending in the military areas—including Vietnam and Europe—where the expenditures produce far and away more inflation pressure than the paltry funds devoted to education.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to indicate my support of the House- and Senate-approved bill for Labor and HEW appropriations. In my view the issue is not the President's desire to control inflation, which I strongly applaud. The issue is more far reaching than that.

It is apparent, I believe, in the seeming contradiction between this eloquent thought in the President's state of the Union address:

> Ours had become as it continues to be—and should remain—a society of large expectations.

And the words of the President's task force on urban education, which apply with equal force to the state of education in general:

> The schools of our cities are again opening their doors to a vast number of students with increasingly more complex education needs. These students hold fewer expectations of having these needs met than ever before.

Thus, my concern is for the expectations and the needs of the youth to whom superior public education is so important; my concern is for the millions of Americans who depend on health care funded by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; my concern is for the basic research projects which will lead to cures for crippling and debilitating diseases—heart, cancer, emphysema, arthritis, and countless others—and for the pure research which can uncover untold medical mysteries of disease; my concern is also that we have a sound economy in this country and that the tax dollar be wisely spent.

The Congress has reduced the President's budget request for fiscal 1970 by $5.6 billion in defense spending and $1 billion in foreign aid. The President is getting even less than he asked for in fiscal 1970 appropriations. The Congress has used the cutting knife with a heavy hand this year in the interests of curbing inflation, a terrible ill which is affecting the lives of all Americans. But why should the cutting knife be applied unsparingly to education, health needs, and medical research when other competing applicants for the taxpayer's dollar are not similarly reduced? Should research projects which require years for conclusion be terminated when they are just beginning to bear fruit? I believe that reductions in the congressional appropriations bill for HEW and Labor is a very poor assignment of priorities. There must be reform in education as in other fields, but not at the expense of total disruption.

Let me suggest what this veto means in very real terms to the educational projects in my 10th Congressional District of Massachusetts: The impact of a veto of Federal funds already committed to educational needs will be felt by the overburdened taxpayer of my district, since educational obligations will have to be met by increasing local taxes.

There are many vital education programs now beginning to make substantial contributions to the people of my district. Examples of these are the supplementary service programs conducted under title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Project Spoke is a title III ESEA program for the communities of Norton, Foxboro, Mansfield, North Attleboro, Walpole, and Easton, with some 20,000 pupils. The Spoke center in Norton is the "hub" of the program, a centralized location where teachers are instructed in new audiovisual aid techniques and in related areas.

Yet George A. MacArthur, superintendent of schools for the town of Norton, has written me to assert that:

> The Town of Norton, with a limited tax base, is desperately in need of the funds provided under ESEA and NDEA . . . If this bill is vetoed by the President, the severe cutback in Title III of ESEA could quite possibly mean the closing of our SPOKE Center which has been a stimulant to Norton and five surrounding communities.

The Presidential veto would mean a cut of 30 percent in the current annual budget of about $180,000 for Project Spoke.

Project Pride serves Fall River, a city with a heavy property tax and a high school threatened with loss of accreditation because of its inadequate facilities. In this economically disadvantaged city, the need is urgent for effective and orderly educational progress. About half of Project Pride's current $170,000 budget is devoted to an improved reading program. The other half is used for a program called English as a Second Language, directed toward young immigrant children of which there are many.

The Presidential veto would mean a cut of 30 percent in the budget of some $170,000 for Project Pride.

Project Contemporary Competitiveness serves Taunton, Middleboro, Raynham, Berkley, Dighton, and Rehoboth under a $132,000 budget. It includes a computer program to assist in lowering overall education costs for participating communities. It supports a summer program for ninth- and 10th-grade students who demonstrate special academic aptitude and a teaching intern program for Bridgewater State College students.

The Presidential veto would mean a cut of 30 percent in the $132,000 budget for Project Contemporary Competitiveness.

Project TEC serves seven communities near Wellesley, in the northern part of my district. It is a special educational project including science and special study programs. Its budget is $120,000.

The Presidential veto would mean a cut of 30 perecnt in the current budget of $120,000 for Project TEC.

Project Local serves Westwood, Wellesley, Needham, and Natick, with hopes of extending its program, which uses computers in the classroom for teaching mathematics and science, to other communities.

The Presidential veto would mean a cut of 30 percent in the budget of some $70,000 for Project Local.

In addition, the President's veto eliminates all impacted areas funds for B students, or those who do not live on a Federal installation, for Fall River, Dover, Middleboro, Natick, Rehoboth, Sharon, Sherborn, Swansea, and Westwood. Massachusetts will lose an estimated $18 million in all educational funding. Fall River, whose needs are among the most critical,

will lose some $200,000. What will this mean to the Fall River tax rate, which already imposes a heavy burden on its taxpayers?

Clearly this is not the time for retrenchment or retreat in the advancement of essential educational improvements. Neither is it the time in a tight economy to fund programs which really are not effective. Nor is this the time to set back the already severely reduced ongoing medical research seeking cures for cancer and heart disease, or the training of those who will be tomorrow's leaders in fields of health, or the first steps toward a national effort to improve the environment.

There must be priorities for Government spending, and I personally assign high priorities to education and health. Nothing is more vital to a democracy than a strong educational system. But, simultaneously, let us not forget to ask the most difficult questions.

The solution to a reordering of our national priorities, and to reform within the programs themselves, will not be found through the disruption of programs but through accurate measurement and evaluation of their parts. Are they measuring up? Are they really benefiting the citizens of our Nation?

They should not be summarily discarded nor should they be shielded from critical scrutiny.

Without a good measuring stick, how can they be judged? Finding the correct measuring stick is the task which will not wait.

In the interim, I consider it soundest to cast my vote for continuing our present human investment as embodied in the Labor-HEW appropriation bill.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, it is utterly absurd to think that $1 billion for educational programs is a dangerous inflationary factor.

Out of a total economy now approaching the $1 trillion mark, in a Federal budget of nearly $200 billion, we are told that an additional $1 billion allocated for education rates as a key inflationary pressure.

I say that is a false pretense. No matter how I look at it, I think it takes a great deal of economic hocus-pocus to translate that extra billion for education into some sort of causal relationship to current inflation.

In fact, I believe denying these education funds represent even more a threat to the economy. According to economic historians and economic growth theorists, the main element in this Nation's amazing social and economic development and strength has been its continuing massive allocation of resources for education. Statistics indicate that the gains society receives from each dollar spent for education are consistently higher than from virtually all other Government programs.

We cannot afford to halt this progress now—and certainly not because of the phony grounds that are being used to justify President Nixon's veto of this bill.

If similar budgetary controls were placed on other expenditures—the $80 billion defense budget, the subsidies to huge farm complexes, the supersonic transport program, the highway program, the pork barrel public works program are just a few areas which come immediately to mind—then I could see some merit in the arguments calling for diligent attacks on Federal overspending.

But there is no symmetry at all in the Nixon administration approach which applies a meat-ax to education, health, job training, and income maintenance while blindly approving—even increasing—these blatantly wasteful spending drains.

And so, as a perspective, I think three points must be made in accord with today's vote.

First, who pays for this action—or, in more apt terms, does the average citizen gain from sustaining the President's veto? For me, the answer is that we all lose.

Educational systems across the Nation already are hard pressed to maintain current programs, much less expand to meet growing needs. A shortfall in Federal educational aid then will lead to either a drastic cutback in vital education programs or an increase in State and local taxes to finance school systems. And both of these choices should be unacceptable to most Americans. In the end, the average citizen loses if this veto is upheld.

My second point relates to the President's accusation that the appropriation bill passed by the Congress is inflationary. I do not disagree that continual deficit spending by the Federal Government eventually is inflationary. That is a lesson we learn in introductory economic courses, and certainly, over the past 4 years, the record is clear that unrestrained Federal spending has been a prime factor behind spiraling price-level increases.

For example, between fiscal 1965 and fiscal 1968, Federal spending rose 52 percent—from a fiscal 1965 budget of $118 billion to nearly $179 billion in fiscal 1968—a jump of some $61 billion. Yet, of that $61 billion, almost $31 billion went for increased defense expenditures—largely for Southeast Asia. As a comparison, over the same period, the education and manpower training budget rose $4.5 billion.

Sustained ballooning of the national defense budget must be blamed for most of the imbalance in the Federal budget—and, thus, for inflation. Of course, the absolute amount of defense spending is the biggest factor, but, in addition, high defense expenditures have serious qualitative effects as well.

As I mentioned earlier, economic theory holds that the social benefits to society are less from each marginal dollar invested in defense than they would be if allocated to education. While there is some spillover in technological and other advances from the military to the civilian economy, the end use of most defense spending does little to add to future economic growth and development.

Marginal guns, marginal rockets, marginal tanks, marginal soldiers, these must be matched against marginal schools, marginal hospitals, marginal training programs—and I am puzzled by attempts to pressure us into believing that society gains more from the former than from social programs.

On another level, the huge—and quick—need for resources to meet the expanding defense budget for both Vietnam and the myriad of weapons systems and programs meant over the past 4 years that resources would be shifted from other sectors to the defense sector in order to meet rising demand levels.

As resources were shifted away from other sectors into defense, excess demand developed in nondefense sectors. The situation became twofold. Resource shifting meant that nondefense production costs would rise; and, consumers, having less nondefense goods available, tended to up the prices they were willing to pay for these goods. The result was to create inflationary pressures eminating from both suppliers and consumers.

Thus, if there is a spending key to inflation, the place to concentrate is not education, but defense. And this brings me to my third point, the matter of priorities.

The President's willingness to scrimp on education while allowing an open hand for defense shows once again his determination of priorities.

I believe he is wrong. Very wrong.

Over the past years I have argued that dedication to the belief that this country must police the world would lead to a total breakdown of American society. Whatever priorities existed—it seems foolish at times even to label many of our policies the result of some rational decisionmaking—focused more on international bogeymen than on present and real dangers here and abroad.

Now, too late, we know it is impossible to buy world peace. It has failed as a policy in Southeast Asia, it has failed in Latin America. It probably will fail elsewhere, for peace does not come from money transactions.

Yet this has been a terribly bitter lesson. In learning it, we have spent the lives of over 40,000 Americans—and untold thousands of Vietnamese—we have spent billions of scarce dollars, we have alienated much of the world, and now, also, we are realizing that we have bankrupted our own economy—if not our entire society.

And so, today's vote takes on even more importance. It can be the start of a new redirection of American priorities, or it can be just another step down the same tired road. The question is not just education; it is not just inflation. It is that of overall priorities.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I originally voted for this increased HEW appropriations bill because I conscientiously believed it was not inflationary, and because I conscientiously believed that the continued and expanded education of our youth and the health of the American people merited the very highest priority consideration in any realistic order of rational spending of the taxpayers' money in the national interest.

I intend to vote to override the President's veto for the same conscientious reasons, with the additional reason that I believe our Chief Executive conscientiously meant what he said to the American people, as a White House candidate, back on October 1, 1968. In a national

address, he expressed to the American people, on that date and occasion, this judgment and implied pledge, and I quote:

When we talk about cutting the expenses of Government, either Federal, State or local, the one area we can't shortchange is education.

I do not think the allegation, that the increased funding for education and health in this bill is inflationary, is valid. Because of the simple, basic, commonsense economic principle that teaches that spending money for productive purposes, such as education and health, is not inflationary at all. On the other hand, it is very clear that spending for nonproductive purposes, such as destruction in war, is inflationary. I doubt very much that anyone here would be inclined to argue against the basic proposition that educated and healthy manpower is the fundamental source of this country's productivity, now and forever. I rather think that the vast majority of American citizens would openly agree that health and education are two of the foundation pillars of this Nation's political, economic, and social progress and development. May I say that it is a matter of great objective interest and puzzlement that the President has seen fit to attempt to connect the adequate funding for national education and health programs with a rather sudden concern about inflation forces that have been unfortunately increasing quite sharply over the past 12 months. In view of this sudden concern for inflation, a great many expert economists, as well as average citizens, find it quite ironic that, throughout this period, no wage-and-price guidelines admonitions or other inflationary restraint leadership has yet emanated from the White House. They find it quite ironic that when the administration appeals for the astronomical funding of ABM, advanced supersonic missiles and air transportation, space exploration and so many other dubious projections, no inflationary fears at all are associated with their tremendous and mostly nonproductive costs.

Mr. Speaker, I further do not believe that administration allegations and claims that the $1.3 billion in education and health funds added to the budget is dangerously inflationary can be justified in the face of the hard and cold fact that the Congress actually accomplished a total cut of $5.6 billion in the President's overall budget.

Mr. Speaker, like all other Members here, I have been contacted by multitudinous educational and medical units within my own State and also a great many throughout the country. The vast percentage of them have urged that this veto be overridden in the regional and national interest. These urgings and appeals represent the voices and convictions of respected authority.

In my own State, it is emphasized that if the provision currently in this bill are not retained, our Commonwealth will be deprived of some $21 million in Federal funds for education, which have already been projected and allocated in local budgets. It is emphasized that in my area, a heart study is being eliminated at a time when eminent medical spokesmen, such as Dr. Paul Dudley White, have testified this facility, in Framingham, Mass., is right at the peak of its most useful and productive medical stage. It is emphasized that in the area of impacted aid, that has been singled out for special criticism, that whatever limited revision might be justified, any immediate and sharp reduction would impose severe hardships upon the affected city and town taxpayers and require an additional tax upon already overburdened property owners.

School and city and town officials have already and rightfully anticipated the reception of these funds in their projected community budgets, and whatever retractions are being planned by the administration in this item, I would most earnestly urge, as a matter of just, reasonable and responsible action, that the reductions be gradually imposed with ample notification for budget adjustment. It is emphasized by the citizens and officials in one of the towns in my district that they are currently being deprived of nearly $100,000 of payment in lieu of taxes on Federal property that is being privately operated within the town.

This deprivation is occurring, mind you, at a time when the General Accounting Office reports that our Defense and State Departments have paid out, to foreign allies, from mid-1966 through mid-1968, $55.6 million in real estate taxes and for lease and rental costs on U.S.-financed construction projects and buildings to house U.S. personnel involved in our overall war effort on behalf of these allies. The General Accounting Office estimates that "somewhere between $28 million and $34 million" was paid in taxes to the South Vietnamese Government during this 2-year period. These taxes are still being paid to these allies on the same basis.

In other words, it is obvious that, although our American youths are fighting and dying, and tremendous sums of the American taxpayers' money are being expended for the freedom and safety of the South Vietnamese people, that Government, and others, still insists on collecting more of the American people's money as taxes on the very property and equipment in their countries being used by American representatives to fight their war and maintain their security. In the light of these facts and circumstances, our people can well be excused for wondering if these expenditures do not directly contribute to our inflationary difficulties and for further wondering why the voices of the administration are so lowered on these counts that, indeed, no sound can be heard.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, we are being called upon today to nonpolitically and conscientiously respond to a very serious, fundamental question. It is also a very simple question: In this Nation, where there is common agreement that our domestic needs are tremendously urgent now, which is more inflationary or vitally important to the national welfare: $258.3 million for the Hill-Burton hospital construction program or $1.5 billion for a start on a new ABM program; $1.4 billion for institutions of higher education, $488.7 million for vocational education and several millions for libraries and library equipment, or new weapons systems costing more than $20 billion over contract figures in a country which already has three separate and independent nuclear overkill systems; a comparatively few millions for medical, health research breakthroughs or an initiating commitment of untold billions for supersonic transportation of very dubious value which, in any case, the average citizen will very likely never use?

Whatever resultant response may be made to this question today, I deeply believe that the substance of this question very clearly and objectively emphasizes the absolute necessity of this administration to scrupulously and prudently review and reorder its recommendations and actions for the priority spending of the American taxpayers' money in the National interest and welfare. Certainly a claim that the expenditure of $1.3 billion reflects a very dangerous inflationary influence, in relation to a total national budget of some $198 billion, imposes a great strain upon even the most prejudiced imagination.

Mr. Speaker, beyond the reasons I have already outlined, my answer to the question is based on the yardstick for executive action advocated by our late and revered President Eisenhower. His sole yardstick for just executive and legislative action was, and I quote, "Is this good for all Americans?" On that standard of judgment, my answer is Yes, this appropriations bill before us is, indeed, good for the continued education and health preservation of every American and I shall vote for such continuation and preservation, in the national interest.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, after much deliberation I have decided to support the President's veto of H.R. 13111. Through the expressions of opposition, as well as support, which come from our respective districts, we are all aware of the pressures connected with such a decision. We are also aware of the obligation we have to approach this problem responsibly and with the best interests of our districts and our country in mind.

I am satisfied that by sustaining the President's veto I am doing what is best for the majority of the people in my congressional district as well as throughout the country.

This decision has not been made casually. There are many issues pressing with this bill that relate directly to the problems of New Hampshire's First Congressional District. I rely heavily on President Nixon's assurance that impacted area schools will be funded at a level not less than 95 percent of their 1969 budget.

It is important, therefore, to emphasize certain facts in connection with this bill.

First, there are only 5 months remaining in the fiscal year to which the funds in this bill will apply. A sudden flood of hundreds of millions of dollars into programs formulated for a year but for which only 5 months remain in the fiscal year, can only result in wasteful and nonessential expenditures. Money appropriated must be spent wisely and it is only through a new bill that this can be done. Congress should provide programs

in this field that can be executed with some discretion in the executive branch and not arbitrarily dictated. We must also act to restructure programs proven to be inadequate.

It must be realized that the expenditures for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare even without this proposed excessive increase are rapidly rising. According to the President's message, outlays will rise in 1970 by 13 percent and increase further in 1971.

To quote President Nixon:

> For the first time in 20 years, next year's budget will provide more funds for human resources than for defense.

Thirdly, this is a critical year and a critical era in the realm of Federal spending. As the President said:

> These increases are excessive in a period of serious inflationary pressures. We must draw the line and stick to it if we are to stabilize the economy.

The Nixon administration is proeducation—the record proves it. The President's actions will continue to show that he is on the side of improved education for our Nation's children.

Yet, clearly, our President is anti-inflation. He has taken a courageous step against deficit spending and the evils of inflation. And we, as well as the people, must support him in this effort which is in the best interests of all our citizens.

It should be recognized that the adoption of an increase in educational outlays of the magnitude of H.R. 13111—$1.262 billion—would force ultimate major reductions in health and medical research and other desirable programs for the next fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, there is no greater cause of frustration and hardship in America today than that resulting from a lopsided economy. The President has taken great steps to stabilize the economy and restore some semblance of fiscal integrity to our country. Recourse to such action is not as painful as inflation itself, and no cause deserves greater support from the American people and the Congress.

The doors to our schools will not close because of this veto. No child will be without a place of learning. Education will be adequately funded, programs will be improved and new ideas initiated.

The real issue and the real difficulty before us can best be met by supporting and rewarding the President's efforts to halt runaway inflation. This is the obligation we are being called upon to meet for the future of our children and our country. I shall join in the struggle for a sounder, stronger America.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, concerning the pending bill, H.R. 13111, there are rights and wrongs on both sides of the issue. There are strong points and weak points in the arguments advanced by administration supporters on the one hand and educators on the other. I have carefully and thoroughly studied the issue in order to determine where the real merits lie. And I see no clear-cut answer.

The President is right when he warns against the inflationary impact of more than $1 billion in increased Federal spending.

The educators are right when they insist upon the priority importance of improved education and warn against the danger to education of drastically reduced appropriations.

It is all too apparent, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot resolve this issue by adopting completely one side or the other. The two are mutually exclusive so long as each side insists on 100 percent of its position.

This is a classic example in the American political tradition of a situation in which a workable compromise is required. I believe a compromise is desirable and I believe that we can achieve it. Unfortunately, the only way of achieving it is to appear to take—on the strength of this afternoon's vote—the President's position as against that of the educators.

But this is illusory. If Congress votes to override the President's veto of the Labor-HEW appropriations bill, then the administration will have no choice, in the case of the added education funds, but to allocate the entire amount of those funds during the present fiscal year. The President insists, with impressive legal support, that he could not exercise the degree of judgment required in an inflationary situation to control the spending of appropriated funds for most educational programs. For better or worse, therefore, to override the President's veto would be to reject the possibility of the necessary compromise.

Sustaining the President's veto, on the other hand, will provide the means by which the Congress and the administration can harmonize the two valid interests of promoting education and fighting inflation. Assuming the veto is sustained, Congress will be required to draft, report, and pass a revised Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bill. In doing so, Congress will have the option of setting the revised spending figures, especially for the disputed health and education programs, at the levels we determine to be desirable. I believe that in determining these spending levels, we can agree on figures which, while significantly higher than the education and health expenditures proposed in the President's budget request, will nevertheless be acceptable to the administration.

None of us knows now whether those levels will be 75 percent of the amounts added by the conference report, or 50 or 25 percent. But I believe they can and should be as high as we can keep them. They should reflect what this Congress has already determined: that education and health should receive the highest priority. By the same token, the new figures should be determined only after a further intensive effort by the Congress to allocate education funds and health funds to those programs which serve the greatest need.

In this respect, I believe the President's opposition to increased funding for the impacted area aid program is thoroughly sound. The $400 million increase in this one category alone accounted for approximately one-third of the spending increase now in dispute. While I recognize the political difficulties in eliminating impact aid entirely I do hope that we can better control it in the revised version of the legislation.

A compromise, Mr. Speaker, is a thoroughly respectable—indeed an essential—means of resolving disputed public issues. We cannot have unity or cooperation or effective government if the parties to such disputed issues cannot each see the value in the other's position and reach a mutually satisfactory solution.

This principle is eminently applicable to the present situation. If we are to control inflation, if we are to prevent this destructive force from robbing us of our ability to support ourselves and our society, then we must respect the President's leadership in the effort to control inflation.

To a great extent, the fight against inflation is psychological and the President's leadership in the fight is symbolic. The spending of an extra billion dollars for education will not, by itself, throw this Nation into a new inflationary spiral. By the same token, if the President is to remain convincing about his determination to control Federal spending as a means of reducing inflation, then a defeat for the President on an issue of this magnitude could only serve to convince the country that Congress was no longer interested in opposing inflation. Right or wrong, such an impression or image or appearance, either of disinterest or inability to control spending, would destroy public restraint in terms of investment and spending—restraint which is necessary to achieve the objective of stable prices.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I think we can serve the needs and interests of all our people—their need for better education and their interest in opposing inflation—by supporting the President in the present circumstances by a vote to sustain his veto and by setting spending levels for education and health in a revised appropriation bill at levels which reflect their high priority.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today is a historic day.

The event is to consider the future education of our people. It is a day in which education may suffer a severe trail. If we falter we must catch the trail and extend ourselves in starting a new course.

Education is an endless task. From the time of Roger Williams to the present moment there has been nothing but vexation, trouble, and problems in dealing with educational operations. Here we seem to be vexed with the same problems and these are too numerous and too difficult to identify or catalog. We know of our responsibilities, we must know of our duties, we must know of our total requirements, yet we fret around with frivolous questions.

We speak about the compassions for ill health, we speak of our concern for the mentally retarded, we contribute to the causes of the ill fortunate. These are worthy of our attention. All of these multiply and become the residual causes of a lack of general education. Our strength, our zealousness and our total duty is to make educational opportunity such that every child can be duly instructed to his full responses—all of our strength, our zealousness, and our total capabilities.

Looking over our shoulder should not be our first requirement but it should be a good direction for our tomorrow. Our children will need the full consequences of our best benefits and our gains for themselves where they will have a new morning. This would be an encouragement for them to be profitable and worth while to themselves and to their community.

The echoes of the past should direct us to a better course. It should remind us of the misfortunes of the uneducated. It should teach us the most profitable gains are in seeing that our future population acquires the best possible educational advantage.

No public endeavor could be more worth while nor more rewarding to any one in this day than those of us who invest in the new generation.

The most valid investment is in our new, oncoming generation.

Therefore, I shall vote to override the President's veto.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, in the early days of this Nation's greatness, Benjamin Franklin remarked that "an investment in knowledge always pays the best interest." Americans have long acknowledged the wisdom of this advice. The vastness and strength of our system of public education is unparalleled in the history of mankind. American public schools are the secret of this country's growth to greatness. Public schools are the source of its energy, enterprise, and know-how.

The $234 million in additional funds voted by the Congress for health programs are vital if we are to continue ongoing programs at their present level. The cuts called for by the President would mean $28.6 million less for medical research. We cannot afford to stop the quest to find cures for major crippling and killing diseases such as cancer and circulatory ailments.

The National Institutes of Health would have to cut by 40 percent the number of research projects it began in 1966 if the President's veto were sustained.

I cannot believe that the Members of this Congress would allow the possibility of some 50,000 unnecessary deaths to occur in the next 12 months because inadequate funds resulted in a lack of trained personnel for coronary care units in hospitals.

Sustaining the Presidential veto would mean that $104.4 million less would be allocated for hospital construction. I simply could not have it on my conscience to know that patients will be dying needlessly because there were not sufficient personnel and facilities to care for them.

We desperately need more doctors. We cannot afford to lose the thousands of potential doctors that would be lost because there would be no money for loans so they could attend medical school.

President Nixon, in his veto message, stated that the increased HEW appropriation voted by the Congress is, and I quote, "the wrong amendment for the wrong purpose and at the wrong time." Yet our schools are facing a fiscal crisis of frightening proportions. Many schools in Ohio were closed during part of last year for lack of funds. Education in some of our largest cities is threatened by the possibility of virtual bankruptcy.

In his veto message, President Nixon stated that "we spend more for health and education than any Nation in the world." U.N. statistics show, however, that 11 other countries and territories spend a greater percent of their national income on education than we do. This brings us to the urgent question of national priorities.

In 1968, during the campaign, Nixon warned that if we fail to educate America's youth, "no success we have is worth keeping." Yet, despite its key role in the Nation's future progress and despite the President's campaign promises and commitments, education has obviously been assigned a low priority by the administration on the national agenda. When highways, defense contracts and supersonic air transport take precedence over schools, we must stop and ask ourselves whether this is the price we wish to pay to try and halt inflation.

I would like to point out that the additional appropriation we voted for health, education, and welfare, is nearly $333 million less than the amount requested by the Office of Education itself. We cannot afford to spend less. Instead, we should be asking, how much more can we allocate to our childrens' future?

The authorizations included in education legislation are not arbitrary figures to be pared in order to conform to political considerations. They represent the amounts which education experts have indicated are needed in order to do the job.

Full funding of education programs is one of the prime keys to the solution of virtually every major domestic problem we face today. Crime, poverty, racial discrimination—all these could be vastly alleviated by the application of knowledge and the availability of educational opportunity.

The Presidential ceto of the HEW appropriations was prompted by three considerations which I wish to dispute. The first is inflation.

All Federal spending could be labeled inflationary, Mr. Speaker. The $1 billion increase which we voted for education, however, constitutes but one-half of 1 percent of a $200 billion budget.

The question is, why do we draw the line here? My colleague, Representative JOHN ANDERSON of Illinois, was quoted recently as saying: "This vote—to override the veto—will set the tone for the balance of the session." He added that White House spokesmen fear "the dam would burst" on other spending issues if this bill is passed over the President's veto.

In other words, it is beginning to appear that opposition to the HEW appropriations bill is based not so much on the merit of the bill itself, as on the political implications of its passage.

We must also consider the fiscal consequences of curtailed sending, not just on our economy as a whole, but on the schools themselves. The New York Times outlined these consequences when it stated:

> Spokesmen for the nation's school boards have warned that reduced Federal subsidy would force some schools to curtail the academic year or cut out vital services. This is dramatic testimony that Federal default, if it is not to jeopardize many children's schooling would have to be met by increased local spending. Such a course, while having no effect in curbing inflation, would make a mockery of administration promises to help the States and localities in tackling social ills and urban decay.

It is evident to me, that cuts in school spending will not solve the problem of inflation. Cuts in education will only serve to aggravate our existing social ills. Concerning the President's second charge, that Federal aid to education is misdirected and ineffective, it seems to me that cutbacks justified on this basis punish our schools for the errors of others.

It is up to the administration to insure that the funds Congress appropriates are justly and efficiently distributed and properly utilized. The results of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs have amply justified the faith of Congress in the abilities of this Nation's educators.

Given adequate funding and constructive guidance from the Office of Education, Federal aid to the schools can accomplish far more than it has to date. With additional experience and knowledge, we can improve on our existing laws. However, to refuse to properly fund these programs because they may not have lived up to some expectations, is to throw out the baby with the bath.

The President pointed out that we are now nearly three-quarters of the way through the school year. In his view, late funding means wasteful spending. What he failed to say was that our schoolmen have had to learn to adjust their spending to take our habitually late funding into account. Spending cuts now would leave the schools with a vast deficit.

For example, Chairman PERKINS of the House Education and Labor Committee pointed out recently that some States make a commitment for programs for this fiscal year based on the assumption that Federal funding would be available. Local programs are now started and underway.

If funds are cut from last year, the school districts will be forced to borrow funds to make up the deficit. This means that State and local taxes must be raised. Subsequently, programs for the next year will be cut unless Federal funding is available.

New York does not operate under a system of reimbursement, so there has been no reason to cut back: What happens is simply that certain necessary programs are not started. Therefore, New York State has been limited this year in moving toward the goals outlined in the State plan for vocational education programs.

The $1 billion increase which the President has vetoed has been tentatively included in school budgets throughout the country. I can assure you that it will not provide our educators with an embarrassment of riches which cannot properly be spent. Rather, the funds are desperately needed if essential programs are to be continued. As the New York Times said:

> The evidence is overwhelming that the deficiencies in the nation's education and

health cannot be corrected by expenditure of less money. No amount of political rationalizing can alter the fact that the veto would be a blow against the very foundation of domestic strength.

Education and health are truly our best defense and hope for the future. The decade of the 1960's, with its landmark education legislation, has recognized this fact in word. Let us hope, as we enter the 1970's, that we will now mark it in deed as well.

I urge my fellow Members to vote on this issue, not as a vote against the President, but as a vote for the Nation's children and a better future for all Americans.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, after thoughtful consideration, I have decided to support President Nixon's veto of the Health, Education, Welfare appropriations bill. My position has been complicated by my earlier vote for passage of the HEW appropriation bill. I felt then that cuts in funds for foreign aid and defense might justify additions for health, education, and welfare programs.

Following careful study and deliberation of all factors involved, including my longtime support of health, education, and welfare programs, my conclusion is to support the President in a frontal assault on inflationary pressures.

I agree with President Nixon that some of the funds added by Congress are for low-priority programs. As a result of the shameful 7-month delay by Congress in passing this appropriations bill, expenditure of some funds added by Congress would result in waste and inefficiency as agencies rush to spend the money before June. Furthermore, the Nelson amendment, added after I voted for this bill, would bar any meaningful creativity in many of the poverty programs.

In the face of rampant inflation, we cannot afford the luxury of low-priority, last-minute spending which could feed and encourage further inflation. I am not against health, education, and welfare programs and my record proves it. I am against inflation, and my record proves that, too.

There has been a great deal of discussion about this matter, and I certainly don't intend to either repeat or review all of it. I do wish to discuss briefly some of the factors which have influenced my decision.

First of all, the attacks on the President's veto and those who would sustain it have, in my opinion, reached regrettable heights of demagoguery. Although this is an election year and the two-party system has served us well, the problems of inflation and the problems of improving the quality of our health, education, and welfare programs needs debate and discussion and not wildly irresponsible demagogic outbursts.

Although it has been said that the Congress cut $7½ billion from the President's budget last year, the Bureau of the Budget has denied this assertion. As the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL) pointed out in the RECORD yesterday, we actually added $4.4 billion in budget authorizations and $3.5 billion in outlays to President Nixon's proposed budget for 1970. I have also been particularly impressed by those who have pointed out that there is nothing in this appropriation bill that will lead directly to an actual improvement in the quality of education or the other programs. Quantity, yes, but is it not fair to ask if quality is not far more important in view of the vast shortcomings that characterize so many of our Washington-oriented endeavors?

There are those who would have you believe that the HEW appropriations bill is equitable. Yet how can they explain giving millions of dollars to relatively few children in one of the richest countries in America such as Montgomery County, Md., while providing far less to many more children in poorer counties in the United States?

It has been alleged that all of the money in this bill will be lost. This, of course, is an outrageous misstatement of fact. As the President stated, no school will need to be closed and no child will be denied an education, and, indeed, none of the programs supported by this bill will cease. If the President's veto is sustained, as I am hopeful it will be, in a relatively short time, a new bill can be put together and hopefully a more responsible one. The President's proposed budget requests for HEW for 1970 was more than a billion dollars more than for 1969. It is thus irresponsible and untrue to suggest that he will not approve a bill which will be generous in this area.

In conclusion, I have been unfavorably impressed by the tactics of the organizations which would seek to override the President's veto. The distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AYRES) discussed these procedures at length in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD yesterday and there is no need for me to repeat them.

I am pleased to report that the educators from my State expressed disapproval of the congressional contact procedures and instructions to participate in Operation Override. The fact remains, however, that these procedures and tactics are a matter of record. To those of us who had extreme reservations about the recent moratorium because we feel that decisions in a democracy should be made by elected officials in accordance with law, it is particularly distressing to find those who are charged with administering the health, education, and welfare programs of this Nation being urged to resort to some of the despicable tactics advocated by the lobby which was put together to bludgeon this body into subservience.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the emotional pressures at this time are obviously intended to cause members to abandon their legislative responsibilities to the people of their districts and the Nation and simply to choose up sides for or against President Nixon.

We have the constitutional responsibility to act on the merits of the legislation, giving consideration to the objections of the President to its enactment. This is the largest spending bill for HEW ever to be passed by this body—and at a time when HEW is in flagrant violation of the restrictions which we imposed on its use of the funds appropriated last year.

The issue is not as simple as it has been made to appear for political purposes. A vote to override the veto is not necessarily a vote for inflation—for we have enacted other more inflationary measures. A vote to sustain the veto is not a vote against either education, or health, or even the war on poverty—for we have made provision for all three.

The most dishonest propaganda being drummed into the ears of the American people is the insinuation that if we do not override this veto—if we do not enact this particular appropriation bill—HEW will have no money with which to operate. Every Member of this body knows that if the veto is sustained there will be immediate steps taken to report and pass a new appropriation bill. We know what the American people have not been told—that substantial agreement on the amounts in that bill has already been reached in discussions between the administration and the leadership of both parties in the Congress.

The real battle is not the sham in which we are engaged here on the floor today, for that result is a foregone conclusion. The real significance of this entire operation is the attempt being conducted by the far left, through the controlled news media, to confuse and mislead the honest and unsuspecting American people.

The whole operation is another attempt to create an artificial issue of "priorities" by repeated charges that the "haves" simply will not share the fruits of their labors with the "have-nots."

Any idea that public education will grind to a halt without massive infusions of Federal funds is only an indication of the extent to which we have already been brainwashed, for it is only in the few past years that our schools have been conditioned to a dependence on money with Washington strings. Until this decade public schools were financed, operated, and controlled by the people whose children they educated—at local and State levels.

Much of the money appropriated in this bill, if it were to be used in my district, would be used to destroy the public schools there. The funds would be used, in violation of law, for such schemes as busing pupils, closing schools, and forcing racial assignments of teachers, principals and students, which we have prohibited. It contains funds for unwanted, educationally dishonest, propaganda material, distortions of history and science, which cannot be used in the schools except in a program of brainwashing.

Many of the good people in my district—and in the districts of many other members—have been forced to withdraw their children from the schools which they built and paid for with their hard-earned money. They are now building—and paying for—new and decent schools in which their children will be educated, not brainwashed. To such people, this appropriation bill represents lavish expenditure of their tax moneys for schools which are useless to them.

To those of us in this situation—representing districts where public education has been so assaulted—a vote to

override the President's veto might be misunderstood by those in authority to be a vote of approval for the nefarious activities of Secretary Finch, the President's close friend. Worse yet, it might be construed as approval of Finch's continuation of his illegal activities in bringing about integration of our schools no matter what the cost.

Because this was an atrocious bill when it came before this body, I opposed its final passage. When it was made even worse in the other body, I opposed the Senate amendments and voted against the adoption of the conference report. In each case, the majority thought otherwise, and the measure went to the White House.

While I frequently disagree with the President, I am pleased to see that he, too, thinks this to be bad legislation. In such a case he has the right to withhold his approval and return the act to us, stating his reasons for disapproval. He has done so.

Mr. Speaker, consistent with my opposition to the measure from the beginning, I shall vote to sustain President Nixon's veto, because this is the proper way to strike down this bad legislation.

We can then get about the business of properly appropriating funds for the legitimate operation of the departments concerned.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I intend to support the motion of the chairman of our Appropriations Committee to override the recent veto of the Chief Executive of H.R. 13111.

I am reluctant that we have to have such a confrontation with our President. This is the fourth President to whom it has been my privilege to serve as a Member of Congress. I supported Mr. Eisenhower more than I opposed him. I was a great admirer of John F. Kennedy. I differed with President Johnson on several matters. Under all four I have always tried to apply the guideline that I will support our President when I think he is right and will oppose him when I think he is wrong.

In his veto of H.R. 13111 on television Mr. Nixon said the HEW appropriation was in the wrong amount, for the wrong purpose, and at the wrong time. The true facts are he reached this conclusion through wrong reasoning, wrongly arrived at, and wrongly stated.

The entire thrust of his objections to the bill is that it is inflationary. In our opinion, this allegation is patently without substance. The reason is this $1.1 billion added by the Congress during the debate on the appropriation bill is not large enough to have any real influence on inflation. Bear these facts in mind and weigh them carefully. One billion dollars is one-half of 1 percent of the total of our $200 billion Federal budget. One billion dollars is less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the gross national product for 1970. Put into its proper perspective, this is $1 billion out of $200 billion; $1 out of $200 or 1 penny out of 200 pennies. Who can be gullible enough to think that this item alone will have a serious impact upon the control of inflation?

Another reason Mr. Nixon's arguments to sustain his veto are false and illogical is that the dollar mark is a label that is completely interchangeable. Money does not bear a Democratic or Republican label. Any one dollar is neither less inflationary nor more inflationary than any other dollar. There is no difference between dollars. The best rebuttal to Mr. Nixon's television plea to the Nation to sustain his veto and thus fight inflation is to pose to him the question why $1 billion for schools, libraries, colleges, vocational education, handicapped children, mentally retarded and control of air and water pollution is any more inflationary than an equal $1 billion for foreign aid, space, Office of Economic Opportunity, or the Department of Defense?

In the light of the foregoing analysis, no matter how you slice it, even though the administration may say it is moved by concern for fiscal responsibility who can deny this same administration seems to indicate it has a singular lack of concern for education?

The President made a dramatic television appearance. It is the first and only time in history that a legislative measure was vetoed on television. In the opinion of many of us the arguments were not really persuasive. They were oversimplified. Worst of all, he spoke only in broad generalities.

The point the President either overlooked or left out of account by his careful intention was the fact the Congress had approved a smaller overall sum than his own budget had recommended for the HEW appropriation. Who can deny Mr. Nixon requested $19,834,000,000? Congress appropriated only $19,747,000,000 or a reduction from Mr. Nixon's own budget request of approximately $86,900,000. Bear in mind that even with the inclusion of the controversial $1.1 billion added on the floor of the House and Senate for the various categories of Federal assistance to education, the final figure is still nearly $87 million under the Nixon budgetary request made after he took office. If there is anything inflationary about the sums enacted by Congress they are certainly less inflationary than that requested by the Nixon budget which he submitted in the spring of 1969.

One point Mr. Nixon saw fit to emphasize in his television appearance is that we are so far along in the fiscal year the money we appropriate for schools will be squandered in a 5-month spending spree. Surely he has not forgotten that the hard-pressed school administrators and those school board members who serve in a thankless job relied upon the Congress after the passage of the Joelson and Cohelan amendments. In any event they had a right to rely on the commitment of the Congress after the final adoption of this conference report. The true facts are that in reliance on this action by the Congress most of this money has already been spent. These districts have used other money in anticipation of replacing these when this appropriation was finally approved.

What if the veto is sustained? The only alternative is that many school districts will be forced to retrench. They may have to eliminate some projects already budgeted. Some school districts will have to close in May, and others in April. Some may even have to teach part of their students one half day and others the rest of the day. Some will have to lay off teachers. The number of students in each classroom may have to be increased. Overall it is not a pretty picture.

Quite a lot has been said concerning aid to federally impacted schools. Certain editorialists and cartoonists have seen fit to make snide remarks about federally impacted aid. Most of these writers are seated in their ivory towers in Washington or some eastern seaboard city. Their comments may have some meaning or application as to affluent Montgomery County in Maryland or Alexandria in Arlington County in Virginia. If these two localities as recipients happen to be irritants then surely this good and worthwhile program should be amended without abolishing its most worthwhile and necessary applications all across the United States.

Make no mistake about it, category A and B students who appear at schoolhouse doors present a real problem, which is not of the creation or choosing of the schools themselves. Category A and B children are not unreal or imaginary. These children are not a dream. Instead they become a nightmare unless there is some provision for Federal assistance.

The impacted area program has been in existence since 1960. The record will clearly show Mr. Nixon was a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor when this bill was drafted. If Category B was improper then why did he include it in the bill? No; impacted area aid is not some sort of Federal welfare or relief or some kind of Federal boondoggle. It is purely and simply a payment in lieu of lost local taxes.

In the Fourth Congressional District there are 2,440 category A children and 17,900 category B children. There are over 40 school districts affected and if this aid is extinguished our school districts will lose $3,570,000 in Federal assistance. If this veto is sustained there remain only a few alternatives. These include the curtailment of services by cutting the school year or else close the doors a part of each day to part of the student body.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to cast my vote to override the Chief Executive's veto. The reason is, overall, and considered as a whole our appropriation bills are not inflationary. I agree with the President, when he says inflation is a very real danger. I also agree control of Government expenditures is one of the best ways to curb inflation. The record will show I have taken positive action in this direction. I opposed the space authorization and appropriation of $3.7 billion. I opposed the foreign aid authorization and appropriation of $2.5 billion. I opposed the Office of Economic Opportunity authorization of $1.9 billion. These three items add up to $8.1 billion. I have supported $7.1 billion in reductions by our Appropriations Committee in separate and unduplicated items. By reducing the

President's total budget request by $7 billion and opposing outright another $8.1 billion in appropriations these sums add up to a total of $15.1 billion in appropriations which I have voted to save or defer during the first session of the 91st Congress.

Repeating, the overall record of the Congress and most of its Members, was not inflationary. The issue clearly then is not one of inflation but the health and education of our people. When the roll is called a vote to sustain the veto might save some money in a few categories today. The other alternative is to vote to override the veto. This is a vote for investment in the future of the American people. My vote will be for the future.

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, it has not been easy for me to decide how to cast my vote on the Presidential veto of the Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bill, H.R. 13111. I have spent a great deal of time listening to the arguments on both sides of the issue. I have weighed these arguments carefully in my own mind. I have concluded that the best interests of America demand that I vote to sustain the Presidential veto.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to outline my reasoning in arriving at this decision. The issue is of such importance and concern to the people that I represent that I believe an explanation is in order.

There is no one, Mr. Speaker, who is more concerned about the needs of our people in the fields of education and health than I. I have been a consistent and enthusiastic supporter of governmental cooperation and assistance among all levels of government to provide the best quality of education and medical care for all our citizens. I acknowledge the importance of the Federal role in these areas. Education and health are priority requirements. As the President said:

> The issue is not whether some of us are for education and health programs and others against.

Why then do I believe that the best interests of education and the American people require that the President's veto be sustained?

First, let me explain that I voted for the increased appropriations for the Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations when it first came before the House of Representatives as the Joelson amendment on July 31, 1969. At the time, I believed that there were good arguments in favor of this increase. However, I also had some very serious reservations about the allocation of money to specific programs within the HEW budget.

Particularly, I was very disturbed over the huge amount appropriated for the program known as impacted aid. Among other increases, most of which I considered meritorious, the Joelson amendment appropriated $400 million more than the President requested for impacted areas—school districts having a high percentage of Federal employees who send their children to local schools.

In theory, impact aid makes sense. In practice, however, it has resulted in a huge windfall to the wealthy suburban counties surrounding the District of Columbia.

The Federal program of impact aid began, Mr. Speaker, in 1950 when the 81st Congress enacted Public Laws 815 and 874 initiating a Federal policy to assist school districts financially burdened as a result of new or expanded Federal activities in local areas—largely a byproduct of the Korean war.

The impact aid program authorizes two categories of payments to local school systems meeting two separate conditions of eligibility. To receive impact funds under category A, a local school district must be attended by children who reside with their parents on Federal property.

Category B funds go to school districts attended by children whose parents are simply employed by the Federal Government. The logic behind impact aid is that local school systems are entitled to compensation for the burden that tax exempt Federal property and installations place on local tax resources.

There is little dispute, Mr. Speaker, that local school systems, responsible for educating children who reside with their parents on tax-exempt Federal property—category A—should receive compensation in lieu of taxes to help support the cost of educating these children.

The controversy, however, surrounds the provision authorizing payments to school systems attended by children whose families are employed by the Government, but who live off Federal property and pay their share of local taxes—category B. It is the latter category of impact aid which has turned into a monstrous boondoggle for the school systems in the wealthy bedroom suburbs around the Nation's Capital.

Realizing the inequity in this program, President Nixon cut out funds for category B impact aid in his budget request. He requested only $190 million for impact aid under category A. Originally, the House Appropriations Committee endorsed this cutback.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the category B funds were restored on the floor of the House on July 31 with the passage of the Joelson amendment. The category B aid was restored in this amendment as a "sweetener" to encourage the passage of a bill increasing the funding of a broad spectrum of education programs.

I supported the Joelson amendment at that time because I believed that the increased aid for education was valuable and that it could be used effectively. At the same time, however, I said that we must devise a better and more equitable formula for the distribution of impact aid, particularly category B aid. I believe that the distribution formula should take into account differences in salaries, property values, and the concentration of Government employees in areas that are to receive aid.

I have been pleased, therefore, to see the President denounce this program and call for its restructuring. I support him in this effort even though four towns in my district are recipients of impact funds.

But this does not explain why I voted to sustain the President's veto. The most compelling reason was one which the President enunciated in his veto message. And that is it is now 6 months since the House passed the Joelson amendment. Only 5 months remain in fiscal 1970.

As the President pointed out, nearly nine-tenths of the $1.1 billion increase is for mandatory programs. The President could not hold back these funds once the appropriations bill was signed into law.

As the President said:

> Left without any latitude in these areas, we may be faced with the need to make offsetting and disproportionate reductions in high-priority programs. Because so much of the budget at this time of the year is already committed, the areas remaining where offsetting reductions can be made are limited. To a disturbing degree, they consist of health service programs, scientific research, manpower training, food and nutrition, and other programs that continue to be identified by the Administration and the Congress as vital to the Nation's needs.

This would be a tragedy if in the interest of better education and health programs, we were to severely damage the very programs to which we have designated the highest priority.

And it would be even more tragic if the increased money which was allocated to the mandatory programs could not be effectively and wisely spent in the 5 short months remaining in fiscal 1970.

In addition, the fiscal picture has changed since the September budget review which indicated a $5.8 billion surplus. The picture has deteriorated, rather than improved. This is the result of:

First. A failure to provide $1 billion in requested revenues.

Second. An increase in social security benefits by 15 percent instead of the 10-percent increase recommended by the President resulting in an expenditure over revenue of $1.1 billion.

Third. A $552 million increase in the Public Works bill over the budget and a $250 million increase in the Agriculture appropriations bill.

Fourth. And a significant increase in uncontrollable expenditures which are as follows: Interest on public debt, up $800 million; medicare payments, up $350 million; unemployment benefits, up $500 million; and retirement funds, up $100 million.

This is a grim fiscal background in which to consider the financial aspects of the increase in HEW appropriations.

Furthermore, I am beginning to have doubts whether the extra education money provided in the appropriations bill would have any impact on improving the quality of America's educational system. I have the feeling that we may have reached a point of diminishing returns in our education funding.

Instead of continuing to pour good money into doubtful programs, I think it is time to take a good look at our entire educational system. I think it is time to raise some questions about its effectiveness and its directions and about the goals we have set for American education.

That is why I look forward to the President's message on education. There have been reports that President Nixon intends to appoint a commission to sug-

gest changes in the Federal financing of educational programs. I think we need such a study.

And finally, it is clear that inflation is still with us. While there are indications that we are beginning to make gains in the fight against the rising cost of living, I had hoped that our success would have been greater at this point. There is no doubt that our inflation was even worse than most experts predicted. It has certainly been persistent.

Although I believe we are finally on the right track in curbing inflation, we must continue to be cautious in our spending policies. Both the Nixon administration and the Congress have made a substantial effort to reassess and reorient priorities. This has been no easy job. But we have begun the task, and we will continue.

It is my considered judgment, however, that now is the wrong time for excessive, ill-timed, or wrongly directed spending if the entire Nation is not to suffer. The fact that only 5 months remain in fiscal 1970, combined with the magnitude of the HEW increase and the fact that so much of the increase is not discretionary, but mandatory, have lead me to conclude that it is in the best interest of the country at large to vote to sustain the President's veto of H.R. 13111.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to reaffirm my continuing support for full Federal funding of our Nation's vital education and health programs.

Certainly, one of the highlights of the 91st Congress has been our success in asserting a major leadership role in beginning the process of reordering our national priorities to focus more directly on the many urgent domestic challenges facing the United States today.

The repeated actions of both House and Senate in approving additional funding for public education and health care programs are an encouraging evidence that Congress is not content to sit back and allow our national priorities to be set by outside considerations.

We are starting to insist that the real needs of 20th century urban America be recognized, and that the Nation's resources be reallocated to meet those needs.

For this reason, I was deeply disappointed at the President's decision to veto H.R. 13111, the Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1970, on the ground that it contained some $1.3 billion in funds more than requested by the administration: for handicapped children, vocational education, the disadvantaged, library services, impact area aid, higher education, construction, and student loans. The bill also contains add-on amounts for air pollution control, hospital construction, and medical research to find cures for heart disease and cancer.

In my opinion, there is no more critical area of concern than that of education for our youth, and no more vital an investment in the future of the country than providing full educational opportunity for all our citizens.

However, the growing cost of providing such an educational environment in heavily populated urban centers, like Los Angeles, where there is an ever-increasing demand for more schools and teachers, has placed a tremendous strain on existing sources of State and local tax revenues.

Without substantial Federal financial assistance, our major metropolitan centers would simply be unable to support adequate school systems under current conditions.

So, I was happy to have been able to offer my full and enthusiastic backing to this legislative effort to obtain sufficient Federal funding in the area of education and health care.

IMPORTANCE TO CALIFORNIA

H.R. 13111 would mean more than $150 million in urgently needed additional funds for the State of California alone.

Our financially hard-pressed Los Angeles Unified School District would also benefit from some $15 million included in this congressional appropriation—a real help to the overburdened property taxpayers of the community.

Perhaps the best indication of the importance of H.R. 13111 to the residents of California is the fact that one-sixth of all impact aid funds in the bill goes to our State. Under the administration's proposal California would get only $25 million in impacted aid compared to $90 million under the bill passed by Congress.

Education has traditionally had a high priority in the Golden State. Over many years our citizens have demanded and have shown a willingness to support high standards of education at all levels.

But, now, increasing pressures on our local and State funds, plus a steady growth of new population from other States and nations, have precipitated educational crises in many local school districts—and now in the State itself.

Many of the local demands on our schools are actually national in character—equality of opportunity for those who have been educationally disadvantaged, training of teachers for new skills and techniques, the impact of Federal installations, the problems of many thousands of children from homes where a language other than English is spoken.

TASK FORCE ON URBAN EDUCATION

The truly national scope of the problem is further documented by the hard-hitting final report of the blue-ribbon Task Force on Urban Education, submitted to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare earlier this month.

With California State associate superintendent of public instruction, Wilson C. Riles, serving as chairman, the Urban Education Task Force declared its intention to underscore the urgency of dealing with urban educational needs as a "major national priority," and charged that education in this country has never been assigned an adequate priority in terms of financial, human, and material resources.

The Riles report pulled no punches in stating its unanimous conclusion that vastly increased amounts of Federal money were imperative to confront the task at hand, and it strongly urged that the problem of urban areas be considered as the major priority of the administration's domestic programs.

Within this priority, the report asserts that education—broadly conceived and with new constituencies involved—should become a first consideration, and that significantly increased levels of funding are needed, far exceeding what current congressional appropriations—or even authorizations—now make possible.

In terms of specifics, the Riles report called for an approximate $7 billion annual increase in Federal aid to education immediately—with that figure to rise to over $14 billion within 5 years.

By comparison, therefore, the $1.3 billion additional appropriation approved by Congress in H.R. 13111, though significant, would not appear to be more than a good start toward meeting America's educational needs as visualized by HEW's own Urban Education Task Force.

INFLATIONARY EFFECT: A FALSE ARGUMENT

Moreover, the argument that this particular appropriation for education and health care is inflationary, seems to me to be a false argument.

First of all, let us put the figures in some perspective. The slightly more than $1 billion involved in the President's veto represents only about one two-hundredths of our total Federal budget this year, and about one-thousandth of our Nation's current gross national product of nearly a trillion dollars a year.

So the amount in question is simply too small to have any appreciable or discernible effect on the economy as a whole. The President's own economic adviser, Dr. Herbert Stein, just 8 weeks ago, observed that a shift of $28 billion in the Federal budget had surprisingly little effect on the national economy.

And Gardner Ackley, former Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, has pointed out that the American economy does not respond to slight budgetary adjustments. This of course, is to our benefit. For, if in fact, $1 billion, plus or minus, could make a major difference, we would be experiencing violent economic surges on a continuing basis. Such surges are not in evidence. Even our congressional cut of $5.6 billion in the President's budget requests has not made a strong impact as yet. So how, may I ask, can $1 billion have any significant effect under present circumstances?

The veto of this appropriation bill will certainly not halt the rampant forces of inflation. But it could well deny educational opportunities to millions of American schoolchildren.

A MATTER OF PRIORITIES

Of course, every penny the Federal Government spends has some effect on our Nation's economy. Naturally, this principle also applies to every expenditure of State and local governments across the country; and, in fact, to every outlay made by America's commercial and industrial business firms, and even to those made by individual citizens.

It would appear to be a rather difficult task for the President to distinguish between the precise inflationary effect of

any one of these specific expenditures, as compared with that of any other. If the total effect of all Government and private spending is inflationary, however, it would obviously be necessary to establish an order of priorities to determine which expenditures to allow, and which to curtail.

In his decision to veto H.R. 13111, this is exactly what the President has done. He has decided that money spent on education and health care has a lower national priority, and, therefore, can be eliminated more readily in the fight against inflation than Federal funds expended or reduced taxes collected in such areas as farm subsidies, special gas and oil industry tax benefits, the supersonic transport, public works programs, the space effort, defense procurements, and maritime shipbuilding subsidies.

This is the crux of the matter.

By not vetoing appropriation bills and tax measures relating to these areas, by not submitting reduced budget requests for these programs, and by not impounding and refusing to spend appropriated funds for these purposes, the President has publicly taken the position that, in the judgment of his administration, they rank higher in order of importance to the overall public good than education and health care expenditures.

Such a downgrading of education stands out in rather stark contrast to the sentiments expressed by the future President in the closing days of the 1968 election campaign, when he stated:

When I look at American education, I do not see schools, but children, and young men and women—young Americans who deserve the chance to make a life for themselves and ensure the progress of their country. If we fail in this, no success we have is worth the keeping.

These noble words were followed up with a magnificent and highly effective pledge contained in a signed nationwide appeal for support issued through the Teachers for Nixon-Agnew organization, calling for an action program for education to help achieve the American dream, and stating unequivocally that:

When we talk about cutting the expense of government—either Federal, State or local—the one area we can't short-change is education.

CONGRESSIONAL INITIATIVE

Ironically, it is the Congress that is now acting to fulfill the President's eloquent campaign pledge not to short-change education, and it is the Congress that has also acted to reduce Federal Government spending.

The 91st Congress, in fact, has passed 14 appropriation bills making a total cut of $5.6 billion in the President's budget. It cut $7.6 billion from the budget in 10 appropriation bills, and added approximately $2 billion in four bills—including the HEW measure.

In other words, Congress has taken the initiative and gone beyond the administration's requests for fiscal restraint. In cutting the administration's budget, however, the Congress has exercised its own sense of priorities, and stressed the importance of areas of crucial need, such as education and health.

The issue, then, is not a so-called inflationary increase in Federal spending, but the congressional determination of national priorities and the Government's willingness to finance urgently needed domestic programs.

I am convinced that cuts in Federal spending that adversely affect America's children and the quality of its health care simply cannot be justified. To call for such cuts in the name of economy is to seriously misunderstand the critical nature of the country's most pressing problems.

EFFECT ON LOS ANGELES CITY SCHOOLS

For instance, in the city of Los Angeles, the funds provided in H.R. 13111 are vital for the continuance of the overall educational program and for critically needed improvements in disadvantaged area schools.

Sustaining the President's veto would curtail a program which is promising but, even in its present form, falls far short of meeting the needs of students from lower-income families, many of them of minority descent.

In assessing the significance of this legislation on Los Angeles, I would like to point out that over 120,000 educationally disadvantaged young people are presently attending our Los Angeles public schools. This is equivalent to the total public school enrollment of a school system the size of the city of San Francisco.

Because available resources are already far from adequate to enable the Los Angeles school district to meet the educational needs of these students, I sincerely hope we can override this ill-advised Presidential veto, and the children of Los Angeles can look forward to receiving the urgently needed financial assistance provided for in this appropriation.

Loss of this Federal revenue would mean the loss of nearly $15 million in desperately needed income to the Los Angeles city schools—at a time when our district has already been forced to cut educational programs and services in excess of $26 million in order to keep within anticipated revenue.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to include a summary of the specific effect of sustaining the veto on the various programs in Los Angeles covered by H.R. 13111:

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT, TITLE I

The loss of $8,000,000 of potiential income for the current fiscal year would eliminate the possibility of expanding compensatory education programs to approximately 23 additional schools servicing approximately 23,000 additional pupils. The current program (operating at 90% of last year's funding level) had to be reduced from approximately 116 schools to 55 schools this year to comply with new State guidelines. The bill, as passed by both houses, would allow the District to expand programs into Venice, San Fernando-Pacoima, and the Harbor area.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT, TITLE II

The result would be a loss of approximately $500,000 for the purchase of library materials and books, plus $57,000 for a bilingual bicultural center funded out of Phase II of Title II. This will reduce even further the numbers of library books and supplemental books desperately needed to bolster the reading program in Los Angeles.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT, TITLE VII

The district is currently counting on funds authorized in Title VII, ESEA, to conduct a bilingual education program. Plans have proceeded but the lack of an appropriation bill has prevented implementation of the bilingual education program in Los Angeles.

PUBLIC LAW 874

Elimination of approximately $4,000,000 of anticipated income for the current fiscal year. The elimination of this amount will wipe out the cash flow reserves and may require the district to request loans to meet payrolls.

NDEA TITLE III-A

Matching funds for the purchase of equipment and materials. This would eliminate programs in fifteen schools affecting approximately 10,000 pupils with a loss of approximately $170,000 in revenue.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

Loss of $100,000 to $200,000 for the current fiscal year. This will result in a program loss affecting between 1,000 to 2,000 young people and adults.

A further detrimental effect of the delay in passing the appropriation bill is the inability of the district to plan programs for the next fiscal year in a time frame consistent with the budget calendar. This becomes even more critical since the Los Angeles schools are in a financial crisis with the almost certain reduction of another $40 million in programs and services during fiscal 1970–71.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate my firm support for H.R. 13111, the Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1970, as I have previously demonstrated on three separate occasions by casting my vote for increased funding for public education and health care.

Education should be our country's first domestic priority—we can no longer postpone meeting our proven needs in this field.

I agree that every effort must be made to halt inflation, but not at the expense of the young and the ill. With corporate profits, personal income, employment, and industrial production at all-time highs, American education is one area we cannot afford to shortchange.

For all the reasons I have cited, Mr. Speaker, I will vote to override the President's veto of H.R. 13111.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, last July I voted for passage of H.R. 13111.

I had previously voted against the Joelson amendment to H.R. 13111 which had added almost $900 million to the measure.

At that time, in a news release issued by my office, I said:

I voted for this bill, H.R. 13111, because a no vote would be against *any* money for the many worthy projects contained in this measure. A vote against any appropriation for these two departments (Labor and HEW) was one I was unwilling to cast.

I regretted, however, that I was required to vote for a bill to which approximately $1 billion had been added over and above the request made by the President.

The increases made in this bill by amendments on the Floor, however desirable their objectives, in my judgment were not responsible. This is particularly true when our inflationary and budgetary problems are considered.

It is difficult to understand how, under the

present inflationary conditions, a Member can add $1 billion to an appropriation bill of this character. This holds true especially if he has recently cast a vote as many Members did, against raising the taxes to pay for this added government spending.

It is entirely incredible that we can do this sort of thing and still maintain the $192 billion budgetary limit which the House just recently passed, along with the Senate.

It is continued irresponsible action of this kind which, repeated sufficiently often, will destroy our American form of government, as similar actions have destroyed so many republics in the past.

Following the action of the House the Senate added additional moneys, so that the $20 billion HEW bill, as finally presented, is approximately $1.3 billion in excess of the President's budget request. This budget request was, in itself, the largest HEW budget request in history. At the same time the cost-of-living index has increased another 3 percent since we voted last July.

It cannot be truthfully said that we are miserly toward education. Overall, in various programs, the Federal Government is currently spending more than $10 billion on education, veto of H.R. 13111, or no.

Some $400 million of the increase voted by the Congress was for so-called impacted aid, which benefits the 10th District of Indiana not at all—although we help to pay for it—and which is distributed on so inequitable a formula that $5.8 million was paid out in 1968 to the Nation's richest county—with a population of 500,000—while only $3.2 million went to the Nation's 100 poorest counties, with a combined population of over 3 million persons.

In addition the funds provided in H.R. 13111 would now have to be spent, with attendant waste, within the last few months of the current fiscal year.

Moreover, nearly nine-tenths of the congressionally voted increase is for mandatory programs, for which particular programs the money appropriated must be used, with no flexibility allowed to the executive. This general problem is further aggravated by a Senate amendment requiring specific earmarking and allocations for funds allotted for the OEO.

The extra benefits claimed for this bill would not aid the 25 million people on social security, the 9 million on public assistance, or the many millions of ordinary Americans trying to make ends meet and to pay their taxes, but its inflationary character, against which the President warned, and against which I warned last July, would indeed be felt by all of these people.

Much pressure has been brought to bear in an effort to override the veto of the President; but I agree—and I believe that a majority of Americans agree—with my constituent, a good American back home in the country, who telephoned me late at night before the veto vote and said:

We just wanted you to know that we listened to the President last night—and we think that he is right.

I think so too.

A reasonable compromise bill, providing an adequate appropriation for HEW will undoubtedly be worked out and passed, and I believe that I serve the long-range interests of all of the people I represent in voting to sustain the veto of H.R. 13111.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include at this point in the RECORD a statement by the Republican policy committee:

HOUSE REPUBLICAN POLICY STATEMENT ON SUPPORT OF VETO OF LABOR-HEW APPROPRIATIONS BILL

The House Republican Policy Committee supports President Nixon's veto of the Labor-HEW appropriations bill.

The bill provides new obligational authority for FY 1970 in the amount of $19.7 billion, and appropriates $1.26 billion more than was requested by the President. Such an increase, at this period in history, is clearly inflationary.

The President is making every effort to control an inflation which has reached an annual rate of more than six percent. The necessary tools to control the ever-rising cost of living must be provided by the Congress. It cannot be expected that rising costs be curbed when the Congress votes large, unbudgeted sums which make such control impossible.

Unless inflation is halted, all government programs, including those for education, will suffer. Even more importantly, if inflation continues to run rampant, it will be to the detriment of all Americans, especially those on the lowest rung of the economic ladder. We cannot in good conscience add to the cost-of-living crisis of the old, the sick, the disabled and others on low or fixed incomes.

A major portion of the $1.26 billion increase provides mandatory grants requiring the Administration to allocate funds regardless of real need or of its inflationary effect; a significant portion of the $1.26 billion increase provides lower priority items which can be postponed without lessening the quality of American education.

As President Nixon stated in his veto message, the HEW FY 1970 appropriations represents "the wrong amount for the wrong programs at the wrong time". Much of the add-on merely increases spending for existing educational programs without providing sorely needed reforms to improve the quality of those programs and to use most beneficially and equitably each dollar appropriated.

In supporting the President's veto we wish to emphasize that neither he nor we oppose the expenditure of adequate funds to meet today's bona fide educational needs. Within the framework of a balanced budget the President proposed record-high expenditures for education in FY 1970, 13% above those of last year. We support these increases.

We do not believe, however, that the addition of a $1.26 billion spending program, late in this fiscal year and late in this academic year, at the expense of a balanced budget, can bring true benefit to education. Persistent inflation can and has proved education's worst enemy. And, despite the measures taken by this Administration to curb inflation, the cost of living has risen three percent since the HEW appropriations bill was first considered by the House of Representatives last July. Thus the economic picture is entirely different than it was when this bill was initially voted upon.

In the past decade the free spenders in the Executive Department, with the agreement of Congress, created federal deficits of $57 billion. The increased cost of living which such deficits have brought to all Americans, is all too well known.

Inflation is largely psychological. People who make management decisions still are thinking in terms of further inflation, because they are not yet convinced that this Congress has the courage to make the hard decisions necessary to stem the inflationary tide. This vote will be a clear signal to them, and to the World—America, through its Congress, either will or will not "bite the bullet". The effect of overriding the President's veto would, therefore, be to encourage inflation, and further increase the cost of living to all Americans.

The House Republican Policy Committee urges support of President Nixon's veto.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I am voting to sustain the President's veto of the Labor-HEW-OEO appropriations bill reluctantly, even though I have many reasons for so voting. My reluctance to do so stems solely from the fact that I am for spending more—not less—of our Federal budget for education and this bill does spend more for education. My objection is the fact that this additional money not only continues an unfair and inequitable program but it adds some 400 million additional taxpayers' dollars to it. I have reference to the so-called impacted aid program. This program takes tax dollars collected throughout these United States—and this includes the taxpayers in school districts now having a difficult time keeping their schools open—and makes a Federal payment to school districts having the good fortune of having a Federal installation within their boundaries in lieu of taxes for the Federal employees living on the same. This seems quite reasonable and justifiable. However, the legislation has been extended to make payments for such Federal employees even though they do not live on the installation but are living in private homes and paying their own school taxes.

As the President indicated, Montgomery County, Md., one of the richest counties in the United States, receives $6 million under this program even though most of the people work for the Federal Government, own their own homes, and are enjoying an average family income today of $20,000.

By contrast, Mr. Speaker, I have only three school districts in my entire congressional district which receive impacted aid. Just recently, CBS–TV ran an account of the battle to keep the Fremont, Ohio, school from closing. This school remains open today—not by reason of any help from the Federal Government—but because the people prepaid their real estate taxes. This school district does not receive 1 cent in impacted aid. These people have a right to ask, "Why do we not get some of this Federal aid to keep our school running?" This is a legitimate question, Mr. Speaker, and I am stating here and now that I am for some new educational legislation which will help these financially distressed school districts in a meaningful way without Federal control. With the President bringing

this unfair impacted aid program to the attention of the American people, I believe the time is here to modify this program and adopt a new educational program which will give some real assistance to our poorer school districts. If we do this, education will have been immensely benefited by this veto.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the debate that has taken place here today. There has been a minimum of partisanship. I think there will be a minimum of partisanship on the vote today. I believe that is in the best interests of the Congress and the American people. There has been a minimum of irresponsible charges and countercharges and that is beneficial to all concerned.

All of us are faced with a deadly serious issue here today—whether we are to place the expenditure of an extra $1.2 billion higher on the priority list than a continuing battle against inflation. In my judgment, if this appropriation bill is approved in this form, we will seriously weaken our efforts to do something affirmatively about the problem of inflation. I cannot help but say with all the emphasis at my command that this vote is being watched most closely as to the substantive battle against inflation as well as the psychological impact in the fight against inflation.

Oh, the gentleman from Kentucky was talking a few minutes ago about the problems of 1968. Does he remember or would he rather forget this $25 billion deficit in 1968? That irresponsible fiscal policy was one of the causes of inflation, and this is why we must do something about it affirmatively today.

Let me say this, also: If we lose the battle against inflation—and we surely have not won it yet—then all Americans will be badly hurt.

Also educators and education will be hurt just as badly. If we do not win the battle against inflation, the cost of building schools will soar and the cost of constructing school facilities will go on and on upward.

Mr. Speaker, if we do not win the battle against inflation, the pay check of the teacher will be worth less and less. And, if we do not win the battle against inflation the education programs for our children will erode and will certainly not improve.

Let me say this, Mr. Speaker, to those who voted for the Joelson amendment. In the interim between last July when that vote was cast and today inflation has not been defeated. Quite frankly I am disappointed we have not done better. On the basis of current prices, I think in good conscience any Member of this body who voted for the Joelson amendment in July 1969 could change today, because the issue is inflation and not an extra $1.2 billion.

Let me add this in conclusion, Mr. Speaker. One of the worst features of this legislation is the mandatory spending provisions included in the bill before us. This is a bad law. It would inevitably force cutbacks in other highly sensitive programs, particularly health. We as a Congress put a ceiling on expenditures in fiscal 1970. If you include this mandatory expenditure provisions forcing the President to spend the money in these limited areas, inevitably, Mr. Speaker, these other highly desirable and sensitive programs will have to suffer. This would be wrong.

I urge that we sustain the veto and I urge that we find a suitable compromise.

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the distinguished minority leader 1 additional minute.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania. I am very grateful.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, let me say that when this veto is sustained—and I firmly believe it will be for good reason—I am confident that those responsible in the Congress and those responsible in the executive branch of the Government will be able to come to a meeting of the minds and will end up with a responsible appropriation bill that will adequately take care of education, and that will adequately fund the health programs that are so badly needed in America.

I repeat, let us sustain the veto and then find a reasonable and responsible compromise.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT), the remainder of the time to close debate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, we are coming to the close of the debate on one of the most important issues that Members of this House will face this year. The question at stake here, of course, is the question of education and health. You cannot write that out in this argument. At stake is the position of the legislative branch of the Government in the federal system and at stake is the individual responsibility of every Member of the House of Representatives.

For my part, Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the Members of this House to assert their own personal independent legislative responsibility and to demonstrate their courage of conviction as elected representatives of the American people and to establish once and for all the fact that the appropriations process is basically the prerogative of the Congress of the United States.

We are called upon now to exercise confidence in this institution, and in our independent judgment as Members of the most important legislative body in the world. We have asserted ourselves with respect to this measure in no uncertain terms as it made its way through the Congress. We moved this legislation to the point of final enactment in impressive fashion. The Joelson amendment was adopted in this very Chamber by a vote of 293 to 120, much more than a two-thirds vote. The amendment received a majority vote of the Members on both sides of the aisle.

The conference report on the Labor-HEW bill was adopted by a resounding vote of 260 to 110, with a majority of the members of both political parties supporting the proposal. We did this in the exercise of our own judgment as to the priorities which health and education should have in the Federal area. Is there any one of us now who would transfer that responsibility which we exercised not by a simple majority, but in convincing fashion, from this House to the administration downtown?

Mr. Speaker, are we to concede that there is greater wisdom in the administration than there is in the legislative department of the Government?

When we acted to reduce the administration's overall appropriation request by nearly $6 billion we decided—and I think properly so—that the budget transmitted by the executive contained a surplus of fat in some areas, but did not meet the health and education needs of the American people.

So far as I am concerned, the establishment of priorities in Federal appropriations and Federal expenditures is and will remain, regardless of the vote on the pending measure, the prerogative of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, what about our individual responsibilities as Members of this House? Are we going as individuals to surrender the judgment we exercised, when we voted on this measure before, to pressure from the White House or any other source?

When the Congress acted on this bill, it did so in response to the insistence of the American people that education be given more, not less, support. Congress in approving these funds responded to an overwhelming demand of the people.

We adopted the Joelson amendment and restored approximately $1 billion in appropriations for elementary, secondary, and higher education in response to public backing.

Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration has said that these education programs are "deferrable." But, Mr. Speaker, you cannot any more defer education than you can defer nutrition. If a child is starved physically his body will show it. The same is true if the mind is starved.

The President said that he vetoed this measure because he does not approve of the funds for impacted aid for which the Congress has appropriated some $600 million, as against an administration request for $202 million.

Some of the reports from the White House, if they are accurate and I think they are, indicate that Members are being told to vote for this veto, and we'll give you over $400 million for impacted aid in categories A and B.

This is hypocrisy; this is cynical double dealing. Is the administration against impacted aid funds or is it willing to trade for votes on this issue?

Mr. Speaker, the question of where and how much the impacted aid funds will be in the next bill if this veto is sustained will not be determined in the White House. It must be determined in the Congress and initially right here in the House of Representatives.

If the administration vetoed the bill because of impacted funds and is now ready to restore all or part of this money, what is going to result is the elimination of other quality education programs, because the only areas that will then be

deprived are those providing funds for libraries, disadvantaged children, vocational education, community colleges, and national defense education programs for science, mathematics, and modern languages.

If the President meant what he said in his state of the Union message, when he stressed "quality" then why would he agree to a course that would starve all the quality education programs in the bill.

Inflation has been injected into the debate. In the light of the administration's record of economic mismanagement, high interest rates, and accelerated inflation, it is pure political gamemanship to veto this measure under the guise of anti-inflation.

If the administration is serious about fighting inflation, it has tools it is not using.

On numerous occasions, President Nixon has had a number of things to say on various matters pertaining to health and education. Let us compare what the President has said with what he now so violently objects to in the Labor-HEW appropriation bill. We have increased hospital construction, health planning and services, health manpower, and construction of health education and research facilities, all of which meets with the President's displeasure. Yet, last July the President stated that the Nation faced a health crisis and said the problem was one of not enough doctors and hospitals beds.

We upped the appropriation for air pollution control by $13 million. Apparently he does not like this either, yet on January 1 the President called for a "now or never" attack on pollution.

We have acted to increase the appropriation for education for instructional equipment, for Federal assistance in impacted areas, professions development, higher education, and vocational education. These educational increases have stimulated the rhetorical ire of Mr. Nixon and his spokesmen. Candidate Nixon, however, during the 1968 campaign, said:

> When we talk about cutting the expenses of government—either Federal, State or local—the one area we can't shortchange is education.

Mr. Speaker, the President said we could be sure no schools would be closed and no children would be denied education. His advisers are talking to different sources than those we hear from. An Oklahoma superintendent has said that even if category B funds are increased by an amount which is being talked about, it will cost their schools $1 million. There are 558,000 children in special educational programs which the reductions will affect. There are 250,000 young people in vocational training who will be deprived of an opportunity. And there are over 115,000 college students whose loans could be terminated—these are students in school now.

We also have reports of irreparable damage to very significant health research, including some whose acquired knowledge over several years will now be literally lost. Some of the Nation's most eminent scientists called on the White House recently, imploring presidential aides to carry the message to the President that a veto would be very detrimental to cancer and heart research.

Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is, the only issue is the health and education of the American people. When the House is called upon in a few minutes to vote on the President's veto, the question that every Member must decide when the roll is called is, is he for or against a healthier and better educated citizenry. We are faced with a clear-cut moral choice—do we want to save a few nickels and dimes today, or do we wish to invest in a better future for the American people? In making this choice, every Member must answer to his own conscience.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT) has expired.

All time has expired.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 226, nays 191, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]

YEAS—226

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Alexander
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Baring
Barrett
Bevill
Biaggi
Biester
Bingham
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brasco
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Burke, Mass.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Carey
Casey
Celler
Chisholm
Clark
Clay
Cohelan
Conte
Conyers
Cowger
Culver
Daddario
Daniels, N.J.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Downing
Dulski
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Evans, Colo.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fisher
Flood
Foley
Ford, William D.
Foreman
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gaydos
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gude
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Harrington
Harsha
Hathaway
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Hogan
Holifield
Horton
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Ichord
Jacobs
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Tenn.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Kluczynski
Koch
Kyros
Leggett
Lennon
Long, Md.
Lowenstein
McCarthy
McClory
McDade
McFall
McKneally
Macdonald, Mass.
Madden
Mahon
Matsunaga
Meeds
Melcher
Mikva
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Mink
Mollohan
Moorhead
Morgan
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nichols
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Podell
Pollock
Powell
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Purcell
Randall
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Roberts
Rodino
Roe
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stokes
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Symington
Taylor
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waldie
Watts
Weicker
Whalen
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Yates
Yatron
Young
Zablocki
Zwach

NAYS—191

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ayres
Beall, Md.
Belcher
Bell, Calif.
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Blackburn
Bow
Bray
Brinkley
Brock
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burleson, Tex.
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Caffery
Camp
Carter
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chappell
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Collins
Colmer
Conable
Corbett
Coughlin
Cramer
Crane
Cunningham
Daniel, Va.
Davis, Wis.
Dellenback
Denney
Dennis
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dowdy
Duncan
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Findley
Fish
Flowers
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Frey
Gettys
Goldwater
Goodling
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Hammer-schmidt
Hansen, Idaho
Harvey
Hastings
Hosmer
Hunt
Hutchinson
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Keith
King
Kleppe
Kuykendall
Kyl
Landgrebe
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Long, La.
Lujan
Lukens
McCloskey
McClure
McCulloch
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McMillan
MacGregor
Mailliard
Mann
Marsh
Martin
Mathias
May
Mayne
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Minshall
Mize
Mizell
Montgomery
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Myers
Nelsen
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Pelly
Poff
Price, Tex.
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Rarick
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Rhodes
Riegle
Rivers
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Roth
Roudebush
Ruth
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Scott
Sebelius
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Snyder
Springer
Stanton
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stuckey
Taft
Talcott
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Utt
Vander Jagt
Waggonner
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Whalley
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wold
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Zion

NOT VOTING—15

Burke, Fla.
Corman
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Evins, Tenn.
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Hawkins
Hébert
Kirwan
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Monagan
Teague, Calif.
Wolff

So, two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof, the veto of the President was sustained and the bill was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Kirwan and Mr. Hawkins for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Wolff and Mr. Fulton of Tennessee for, with Mr. Burke of Florida against.

Mr. Corman and Mr. Dawson for, with Mr. Frelinghuysen against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Lipscomb.

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Teague of California.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The message and the bill are referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO INCLUDE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in connection with their extension of remarks on the veto message that all Members may be permitted to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (15149) entitled "An act making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the House amendments to the Senate amendments numbered 8 and 31 to the foregoing bill.

## THE FCC AND WIFE

(Mr. TIERNAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, this is the fourth time in less than 4 months that I have spoken on the floor of the House concerning the actions of the Federal Communications Commission in connection with radio station WIFE.

On January 15, the FCC issued a statement of policy which in effect protects the broadcast industry against public pressure and public challenges to licensees who may not have been meeting the standards of the 1934 Communications Act. I feel that it is now time that the FCC and the Congress go on record in support of the public and their right to have a broadcast industry that is properly regulated and vigorously watched.

This past Friday I called for the immediate revocation of the broadcast license of WIFE radio station—Indianapolis, Ind. If any one of my colleagues doubts whether there are ample grounds on which to base such a harsh move, he has but to look at the record. WIFE has admitted to fraudulent billing of $6,000, and to having staged two phony contests at the expense of its listening audience. It has further been learned that the licensee hypoed his ratings and acted in violation of section 315 of the Communications Act by giving free time to one political candidate to the detriment of another.

The FCC saw fit to give WIFE a 6-month renewal of its license despite knowledge of some of these violations and despite the fact that the station committed the violations while on probation for prior offenses. What was their justification? Where was their sense of judgment? Why are they so bent on protecting illegality and corruption?

WIFE is not the only example of a licensee who is failing to uphold the dictates of the Communications Act; it is only the most flagrant and most outrageous one. We have examples of stations that have committed more than 120 violations and yet have been rewarded with renewal of their license. We know of a station that openly defied the FCC and refused to air stories favorable to Negroes or the civil rights cause. This station, too, had its license renewed by the FCC.

On the whole the broadcast industry has performed well and has lived within the letter and the spirit of the law. The overwhelming majority of the stations have done great service to their community and toward the betterment of communications in America. The obvious failure has occurred in the regulatory agency, where the Commissioners have seen fit to renew licenses pro forma since 1934, thus letting some broadcasters become lax in their duties. If we hope to keep a vigorous and uncorrupt industry, we must see that the FCC weeds out those who fail to maintain high standards.

How can we justify denying licenses to those new groups desiring them while we reward those who have tricked the public and flaunted the law? Our regulatory agencies have often been accused of acting to protect those they are supposed to regulate, while forgetting the public. Let us insure that this is not the path the FCC will be allowed to take in the 1970's.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the FCC is failing in its duty to protect the people and to regulate broadcasting in the "public interest, convenience and necessity." We, as elected officials, have a duty to prod the FCC into action to protect the public's rightful interests. If the FCC is incapable of fulfilling this task, then we must revise the 1934 act and establish a better group that will have the power and the desire to be more interested in the public's good than in the industry's good.

It is time for the Congress to begin to reclaim communications in America for the people and to insure that the people's interest will be paramount.

## A NEW COTTON PROGRAM

(Mr. ABERNETHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to inaugurate a new cotton program. My colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY) is joining with me in sponsoring the bill.

Current law affecting cotton, as well as wheat and feed grains, expires on December 31, 1970. Failure to pass and inaugurate a new law, cotton will revert to the old act of 1958 of high price supports and export subsidies. A new program is imperative.

Hearings were conducted by the House Agriculture Committee during the 1969 session for the purpose of obtaining the views of the Department of Agriculture and others on a new type program. The Cotton Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, conducted extensive hearings on cotton.

The one point agreed upon by virtually all producer witnesses was that the problem of cotton has shifted from one of surplus to that of a deficit crop. Stated another way, the big problem with respect to cotton is not a surplus or the prospect of a surplus, but the means by which we can encourage farmers to produce enough to meet demand and maintain a strong cotton economy.

Even though the domestic consumption of cotton and exports are down, we did not produce enough cotton last year to meet domestic and export need. Therefore, the principal objective of my bill is to establish the kind of cotton program which, hopefully, will assure an adequate supply and maintain farm income insofar as possible. Each change my bill proposes to make in the program is aimed at achieving these objectives.

In recognition of the shift from a surplus to a deficit status, my bill will allow farmers substantially more freedom to plant. This will not be done by completely eliminating marketing quotas but within the framework of a flexible marketing quota system.

## GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF THE JAYCEES

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last week was National Jaycee Week and I want to take this opportunity to join my colleagues in congratulating the U.S. Jaycees, who celebrate the golden anniversary of their founding this year.

As someone who represents a district containing a number of fine Jaycee chapters, I am well aware of the contributions made to the community by the Jaycees; and as a former member of the Jaycees, I am proud of the work this fine organization has done over the past 50 years.

Jaycees in my upstate New York district not only sponsor but work on such projects as cleaning up the parks, running sports events for the children of the community, holding fundraising affairs for charity, and taking handicapped children on outings. The Jaycee organization, which now includes over 300,000 members across the country, has been dedicated to leadership training, youth welfare, and community service since its

founding in 1920 by Henry Giesenbier. They have also taken the lead in Auburn in paying deserved tribute and honor to our returning—and all too often forgotten—Vietnam veterans.

In this era of the "copout" and youthful destruction and with antieverything ideas sprouting in every age group, it is refreshing indeed to see such an organization of young men engaged in such constructive activity and it is only appropriate that we pause to give them the recognition they so richly deserve.

I believe I can speak for all of those communities in my district that are fortunate enough to have a Jaycee chapter when I express my deepest appreciation to all Jaycees for 50 years of selfless community service.

## STRICTER FEDERAL CONTROLS ON PORNOGRAPHY ESSENTIAL

(Mr. DULSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is mounting concern about the spread of pornographic material through the mails and otherwise.

I would like to alert the Members that our Subcommittee on Postal Operations, headed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. NIX), has completed extensive hearings and is preparing to recommend legislation shortly on banning the sending of obscene material through the mails to a home where a minor resides.

We hope to have this matter ready for House action very soon.

We are appreciative of the fine cooperation we are receiving from Members on both sides of the aisle—indeed, by Members on both sides of Capitol Hill—through their testimony and their interest in this frustrating problem.

In this connection, I am very much impressed by the report made the other day by Raymond P. Gauer, of Los Angeles, national director of the Citizens for Decent Literature, as the result of a factfinding survey he made in Stockholm and Copenhagen.

There are some who have the notion that to provide complete freedom from moral strictures will simplify a problem. They say this in connection with pornography. They say it in connection with certain drugs.

It would pay these people to take an objective look at what has happened in Denmark where the controls over pornographic material have been abolished. Mr. Gauer gives a capsule view in his report to his organization.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gauer's summary speaks for itself and I make it a part of my remarks at this point:

PRESS RELEASE BY RAYMOND P. GAUER, NATIONAL DIRECTOR OF CITIZENS FOR DECENT LITERATURE, INC.

Raymond P. Gauer, former Chairman of the Los Angeles County Commission on Obscenity and Pornography and current National Director of the Citizens for Decent Literature, has just returned from a factfinding survey of Stockholm, Copenhagen and London at the request of Charles H. Keating, Jr., the appointee of President Nixon to the Federal Commission studying the obscenity problem in America.

In tape-recorded interviews with police officials, government officials and church leaders, Mr. Gauer documented the following facts:

1. The production and sale of hardcore pornography in Denmark has mushroomed into a major industry since the abolishment of obscenity law seven months ago. Competition in the field is very great and there is a tremendous over-supply (not a lack of demand as reported widely in the American press).

This over supply is being "legally" exported by Denmark to other nations throughout the world—and illegally imported by those nations. Thus Denmark is contributing to criminal activity throughout the world and there is already evidence of Mafia involvement in this industry.

Crown Prince Henrik of Denmark recently said "From a moral or aesthetic point of view I don't approve. But if you see it from a business point of view it is surely good business."

NEW SHOPS EVERYWHERE

2. "Porno" or "Sex Shops" have sprung up all over Copenhagen and feature high quality color picture magazines depicting every imaginable form of perverted sexual activity including homosexuality, bestiality, sadism and masochism.

Live sex shows are sponsored by many of the sex shops in back rooms and are advertised prominently and explicitly in the "Ekstra Blade"—Copenhagen's largest circulation newspaper. This newspaper contains photos and articles throughout that go far beyond even the "underground" press in this country.

3. In an interview with Herr Clor Christiansen, Chief Deputy of Police in Copenhagen, Gauer confirmed that the 31% reported decrease in sex crimes since abolishment of obscenity laws is due to the *fact* that what was previously considered a sex crime is no longer so considered.

For example the sale of pornography was considered a sex crime in the past. It is also a fact that "statutory rape" is no longer considered a sex crime if the girl—regardless of her age—is a willing partner in the act. Violent sex crimes of forcible rape and assault have not decreased since the abolishment of obscenity law.

Another "fact" distorted by the press in this country and elsewhere is that prostitution is illegal in Denmark because the "Danes frown on women accepting money for such activity."

The true fact is that the streets of Copenhagen are alive with street-walkers who can "operate" legally as long as they carry a certificate stating that they are employed at a "legitimate" job for at least five hours per day and are thus not dependent on prostitution for a living.

POPULAR DISCUSSION TOPIC

4. Pornography is the topic of discussion among all groups in Copenhagen and it is common to see visiting businessmen displaying purchased items which they are bringing back to clients in their country. Live sex-shows are "arranged" for visiting businessmen through contacts with the many pornographers in that city.

5. While Denmark is 98% Lutheran—church attendance is at an all-time low. Nationally 3% of Danes attend church—and in Copenhagen—1%.

The auxiliary Bishop of Copenhagen—Rev. P. Werner Hansen—rector of the Cathedral—reported to Gauer that the ten Bishops of Denmark meet once a year and issue a formal report that has no more effect than if "ten shoemakers" had met. Traditional Judeo-Christian morality plays little or no part in Danish life.

6. Dr. Folmer Wisti, Director of the "Danish Institute" which sponsors seminars and study groups to promote the image of Denmark internationally is appalled at the fact that Denmark has received more international notoriety over pornography than it has over the many tremendous accomplishments of that nation in the past thirty years. He is fearful that the reputation of Denmark internationally will be destroyed by the pornographers who will do anything for commercial gain.

SWEDEN WORSE THAN DENMARK

Sweden in many ways is worse than Denmark in that citizens and visitors are confronted with displays of the worst possible hard-core pornography in the windows of sex shops that operate throughout the city.

Even in the historical "old city" section of Stockholm—where the place and other government buildings dating back 800 years are located, visitors—young and old—are assaulted by pornographic displays in shops adjacent to the beautiful and quaint shops displaying the products of Swedish industry.

In London where a working party of the Arts Council recently recommended a five year moratorium on obscenity law enforcement, Gauer interviewed British Home Office officials who pointed out that very little credence is being giving to the Arts Council recommendation by British officials.

Britain is also concerned by the tremendous influx of illegally imported pornography from Denmark and the Home Office is aware of the distortions contained in the Danish sex-crime reports.

Gauer reported that an international conference on "Community and Morality" will be sponsored by the Danish Institute in the fall of this year to hopefully offset the bad publicity Denmark received over the "Sex Fair" held last October.

Gauer said that it is "poetic justice" to conduct such a seminar in Copenhagen—which is the home of Hans Christian Anderson.

If Hans Christian Anderson were alive today, he would write a new version of "The Emperor's New Clothes"—and would point out that there *is* something rotten in Denmark and that the Danish people and officials know it but seem afraid to speak out because they are making too much money or for fear that their neighbors will consider them prudish, reactionary or too religious.

From this international conference—which Gauer will help organize—will hopefully come forward the "little boy" who will point out the *fact* that "the Emperor has no clothes on"!

## YOUNG WORLD DEVELOPMENT—THE YOUTH ARM OF THE AMERICAN FREEDOM FROM HUNGER FOUNDATION

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL), is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. SCHWENGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, recently I was invited to speak before a national conference sponsored by the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation, Inc., at the YMCA in Chicago. This was a thrilling, exciting and revealing experience. It was extremely interesting because I was talking to an audience of young people—young people from 33 States who are concerned about the problems within their communities, within their States, the Nation, and, indeed, in

the world. They were there voluntarily to find out ways and means that they could help in their small, individual and collective ways, to come to grips with this problem, this plagueing problem, and agonizing problem, of hunger in America.

In this, Mr. Speaker, I think they caught the vision and the idea of a great American whom many of us knew personally who was President, who was young also, who had a feeling for the right things, whom all men could admire personally, and did. His memory shall never leave us.

You will recall that he said, among other eloquent things:

> Ask not what your country can do for you. Ask rather what you can do for your country.

Another American said in 1916 that Americanism must be more than the conservation of the individual.

In this great fulfillment, this Republican President, President Harding said:

> We must have a citizenship less concerned about what Government can do for them, and more anxious about what they can do for the Nation.

The American Freedom From Hunger Foundation has a well-known and impressive leadership.

Their organization's honorary chairman is Harry S. Truman. The board chairman is Paul S. Willis, president of the American Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc. The president is Robert Nathan, president of Robert Nathan Associates and the executive director is a former Member of the Congress, Leonard G. Wolf, about whom I shall speak more later.

Mr. Speaker, in order to raise money to finance their modest but effective program and their other worthy objectives, they carry on and sponsor projects to raise money.

One that I think you have all heard about, for it has been conducted all across America, is called "walks for development."

Two of these walks were held in my district and they had a tremendous impact on the thinking and they received a marvelous response.

These projects raised money to feed the hungry, to eliminate poverty, and the peculiar kind of pollution that it brings to a community. But more importantly, it seems to me, these programs and this organization does something that is good—it gets people involved, and in this instance young people, and they show concern for the less fortunate among their contemporaries and their colleagues.

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman for his statement and for taking the special order on this occasion to commend the Freedom From Hunger Foundation for its good work, and particularly the long hikes that are being taken.

A year ago my assistant and I joined others who participated in the Washington hike. Some 6 hours and 24 miles later, we were somewhat the worse for wear—but I must say that associating with these young people was one really gratifying experience for both of us that we ever had.

One little boy in particular, I remember, was ill equipped for the march. He was wearing what we back in Indiana call "pointed toe loafers" for dress shoes. But half way through the hike, he was obliged to discard his shoes. He had blistered feet. I asked him if he would not want to drop out of the hike and he said, "No blisters can heal, but malnutrition lasts all during a person's life." He completed the march.

It is a very, very inspiring display by those who participate in it. I hope this year many more Members of Congress will join the march.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I thank the gentleman.

As we all know, Mr. Speaker, the problems that these young people are concerned with are the lives of people in their communities. They eventually become problems of the State and the Nation. In the unique way that has already been referred to, they get contributions from people to pay them to walk all the way from 25 cents a mile to a dollar a mile or more, and some walk for one sponsor and some walk for 100 or more sponsors.

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. SCHERLE. Can the gentleman from Iowa tell me approximately what percentage of the money that is voluntarily contributed goes for administrative costs?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I do not have the figures, but the figures are available. They are public, and I think they will bear scrutiny. I made inquiry on the point, and the administrative cost is handled from foundations and from other sources.

Mr. SCHERLE. Recognizing the fact that this is a voluntary program, many of we here in Congress and throughout the United States have been very, very much aware of the fact that so much of the money that is collected, and much to be appropriated, has gone in the past for administrative costs and very little of the money actually goes down to help the poor people. I do not think there is anything more disgraceful in this country than to extend the hand of hope to these people, and usually give it to them empty.

I am also concerned with what the salary of Mr. Wolf would be at this time. If my colleague could provide these figures for the RECORD in this special order, I am sure we would all appreciate it.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I will have time to do that. Let me assure the gentleman that if I thought there was any misuse of talent or money by these people, I would not be standing in the well here today.

Mr. Speaker, I now have the answers to the questions raised by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE) with respect to the finances of the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation, and will include them in the RECORD at this point.

The books of the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation are maintained by Finance Management Services of Washington, D.C. The foundation's books are audited, and the gentleman will be interested in this, by the firm of Meriwether, Miller, Wilson & Sitrick of Des Moines, Iowa. I am advised that copies of the annual audit report will be made available to any person or organization with a genuine interest in the financial operations of the foundation.

The records of the foundation show that it has received a total of $853,964.42 from the "Walks for Development" during the calendar year 1969. Of this amount $758,227.27 actually has been disbursed to projects, or transferred to trust accounts specifically dedicated to specific projects. Ninety-five thousand seven hundred thirty seven dollars and fifteen cents, has been transferred to the national education project of the foundation. This project of the foundation carries on a worldwide effort to make people aware of the problem of hunger. Actually, only approximately 7½ to 8 percent of this figure, the $95,737.15, goes to costs which could be truly categorized as administrative.

The grand total of expenses for the foundation for the calendar year 1969 was $155,299.93. Of this amount $68,-851.47 went for salaries of the 15 staff members employed during the year 1969. As to the question of Mr. Wolf's salary, while I am not quite certain of the motivation for the question, Mr. Wolf's gross salary for 1969 was $28,222.82. Now, the gentleman from Iowa will quickly realize that amount is considerly less than the amount received by an incumbent Member of Congress, and in fact represents a sizable cut in the salary received by Mr. Wolf in his former position with the U.S. Government.

I trust these figures will allow the gentleman from Iowa to have some peace of mind, at least with respect to the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation, and the "Walks for Development."

Mr. SCHERLE. That is not my position. I am sure the gentleman is sincere in his remarks. However, so many of these programs do not play the part for which they were originally designed. It is a fallacy in some cases to where the poor people never derive the benefits for which the plan observed on the drawing board was intended, and some—I, for one—have been very cautious and skeptical about these programs, particularly those depending upon voluntary contributions and the larger part of the funds are not designed for those who actually need them.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Some day, since the gentleman has brought this subject up, I intend to make a statement on voluntary programs which I hope will clarify the matter.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to heartily endorse the sentiments expressed by Congressman SCHWENGEL.

Several young citizens from my own congressional district have called the walk for development program—as sponsored by the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation—to my attention through personal visits to my district and Washington offices, and of course, through letters. To say that I have been impressed by their enthusiasm and initiative would be an understatement.

Carolyn A. MacDougall, Morris William Roderstein, and Wilma Leinonen, constituents within my district, have recently outlined in correspondence to me the walk for development program conducted in Quincy, Mass. A portion of Miss Leinonen's letter follows:

Last June 8, 1969, there was such a walk in Quincy. Father Pat Hughes of the Paulist Fathers and Dick Summer, D. J. from WMEX led 2,000 real people from Quincy's Stadium for a 30 mile stroll through the streets. Ten hours later, 725 weary walkers could claim the satisfaction of walking 30 miles, and of raising over $26,000.

The money is now being used to fund an agricultural training center, in Liberia and to fund a nutritions program for low-income families in Brewer's Corner, W. Quincy. The money was divided in 3 parts complying with AFFHF standards; 42.5% for a foreign project, 42.5% for a domestic project and 15% for the Foundation to provide staff and equipment to institute projects like YWD and to start new walks.

The following news article further outlines this successful venture:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald Traveler, June 5, 1969]

FOOT POWER A HEADY QUALITY IN QUINCY

(By Robert L. Hassett)

Michael Levine and Michael Winerip came into the office and said everyone in Quincy should forget the beach and television Sunday and go for a 30-mile walk.

Michael Levine was wearing a white button which had a green footprint and said "Foot Power."

There are a couple of hundred signs decorating corridors and stairwells in the schools in Quincy and they say that everyone who goes walking Sunday will be helping to kick hunger out of the country.

Michael Levine and Michael Winerip, both 17 and juniors at North Quincy High School, began talking about the Quincy Walk for Development.

This is a 29.6-mile hike through the streets of the city which is going to begin, rain or shine, at 8:30 a.m. Sunday at the Quincy Veterans Memorial Stadium.

It is hoped that a couple of thousand persons will begin trudging and raising money to donate to anti-hunger programs at home and abroad.

Sponsors of the participants have agreed to pledge a certain amount of money for every mile walked, and checkers at a dozen points along the route will do the bookkeeping on cards carried by the hikers.

"We want to make people aware that hunger does exist and we want to do something to help in our limited way," said Michael Levine and Michael Winerip.

"You ask a sponsor what he thinks of hunger. He'll probably say, 'It's bad.' Then you challenge him, ask him what he'll do about it, how much he will pledge."

Teachers, parents, businessmen and members of church groups have been asked to become sponsors. Some church groups have pledged a dollar a mile. The average pledge is between five and ten cents, but a dozen persons can sponsor the same walker.

The anti-hunger walk in Quincy was organized by the Rev. Patrick Hughes and John J. Murphy, guidance counselor at North Quincy High School, with the help of the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation, Inc.

Murphy said that Fr. Hughes, a member of the Paulist Fathers who was transferred recently from Washington to Boston, contacted him in April and suggested that a walk to help the impoverished of the nation and world be organized in Quincy.

"Fr. Hughes grew up in Quincy," said Murphy, "and he was hoping that this would be the first walk of its kind in this area. But last Saturday 600 pupils from the Framingham schools walked from there to Boston Common, about 20 miles, and I understand they raised between $25,000 and $30,000.

"There have been similar walks in Buffalo, N.Y., Fargo, N.D., Texas, and several in Canada."

Murphy said that a committee of pupils, headed by William West, a senior at North Quincy High School, began visiting school assemblies and other gatherings trying to enlist support for the project.

"Ten thousand pledge cards have been distributed," said Murphy, "and we hope to have at least a couple of thousand participating in the walk, so it is hard to estimate how much money may be raised."

When the walk is over and the pledges have been made good, the money will be deposited in a special account at the South Shore National Bank.

"Fifteen per cent will go to the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation for expenses incurred in helping us organize this," said Murphy. "The rest of the money will be divided between donations to an agricultural training center in Liberia and to local anti-poverty projects."

One thousand "Foot Power" buttons were purchased for about eight cents each and distributed for a donation of 15 cents a button. The profits will also be deposited in the special account.

The Quincy Walk for Development has been endorsed by President Nixon, Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, Sen. Edward W. Brooke and Mayor James R. McIntyre of Quincy.

Members of the Quincy City Council, who were solicited early as sponsors, have also pledged to walk.

John Pierce, a social studies teacher at North Quincy High School, says he is going to jog the 29.6 miles and has asked other faculty members to be his sponsors.

Pupils have been urging teachers to spend Sunday either helping to keep the records straight at the dozen checkpoints or by walking past them.

"Most of the boys and girls on the committee are seniors who ordinarily would be busy with graduation plans or looking for jobs," said Murphy, "but they've kept working on this to make it a success. William West and Christopher Cavanagh, the treasurer, even skipped the senior class outing at Lake Pearl in Wrentham on Tuesday. They've all been very unselfish."

Brochures in circulation to promote the Quincy Walk for Development contain some good advice for the walkers, such as:

"Stop at all checkpoints as far as you walk and make sure you get your card stamped. Also stop at these checkpoints to rest and to eat, but don't eat too much or too fast because you'll get cramps."

"Walk slowly, this is not a race. If you drop out, look for a designated 'walk' vehicle to take you back to the stadium."

The brochure's after-the-walk advice: "Go home and recuperate."

Two highly articulate gentlemen recently visited me in Washington to personally call my attention to the Walk for Development Program, Mr. William West and Mr. Jeff Issacson, both of Quincy, Mass. Others active in the Quincy Walk were Susan Drew, Isabel Damon, Jane Kamps, Robert Grady, Steve Fishman, Judith Hughes, Scott Little, Susan O'Connor, Kathie Duggan, March Freedman, Frances Blanchard, Laurie Haapanen, Christopher Nourse, Maria Staiti, and Fred DuFresne.

Webster's Dictionary defines the word "lobby" as "to conduct activities aimed at influencing public officials and exp. members of a legislative body on legislation and other public decisions to promote—as a project—or secure the passage of—as legislation—by influencing public officials." I commend these youthful demonstrations as lobbying of the highest order. These youths are lobbying for legislation to alleviate worldwide hunger and malnutrition. Their position is backed by action—not just idealistic rhetoric—but action that proves they are serious in working for their goals. Congratulations are in order; however, our answer to the appeal made to us by those involved in the Walk for Development Program would best be answered through legislating programs for the elimination of hunger within our own Nation and abroad.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts very much.

Mr. Speaker, the conference in Chicago to which I referred earlier was called to consider the depths of the problems of our young people and to consider how best to deal with those problems, especially the problem of hunger in America. It was very evident to me, Mr. Speaker, that these young people, while they disagreed with me on some of my observations and conclusions, were well read and were honorably motivated and were dedicated to those ideas and ideals that will hasten the day when there will be a greater realization of the spirit of the Declaration of Independence and especially that part which deals with the equality of opportunity and with the terms of the Constitution—beginning with three thrilling words, "We the people." They were interested and are interested in we, the people, all the people of this country.

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

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

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlemen from Iowa, the members of the young world development group have highlighted the hunger and malnutrition that is all too prevalent in the United States.

It is a national disgrace that bold emergency action has not been taken by our Government to help 10 million people whose health is being permanently impaired by malnutrition. They are found on our Indian reservations, in Appalachia, in the Mississippi Delta, in our urban ghettos and in other pockets of poverty in this land of plenty.

These conditions are so shocking that 3 years ago the late Senator Robert Kennedy described the misery due to hunger in the United States as being worse than what he had witnessed in parts of South America. I find it tragic that in this land of plenty children cry themselves to sleep at night for want of food.

A poor child is caught in a never ending cycle of misery due to malnutrition.

From the moment he is conceived in his mother's womb he sufferes from the lack of proper nutrition. This unfortunate situation is a result of his mother's faulty eating habits. Poor nutrition for the mother condemns the child to a life of mental and physical retardation. He may become prey to crippling diseases such as rickets, anemia, and blindness. If an infant is malnourished until his fourth birthday his body and mind may be so irreparably damaged that further efforts to restore full mental or physical ability are condemned to futility.

When these children go to school they are not able to meet the school's standards. If they are not already mentally damaged they may fail to learn because they lack the necessary energy which learning requires.

What follows then in the never ending cycle of misery reveals that poverty begets poverty. We find children dropping out of school too early. In our modern society which places increasing emphasis on education those with a poor education lose out. Due to their lack of education these individuals can only compete for menial employment. Even then they may have difficulty keeping these jobs because their inadequate diets and poor health hinder their ability to perform. Many are faced with a life of continued poverty and welfare dependence. By tolerating hunger for the young, society condemns these individuals to unproductive lives. To these unfortunates the American dream remains just that—a dream.

This tragic cycle must be broken. If we insure that infants, children, and pregnant women receive adequate nutrition we can interrupt the cycle and become the masters rather than the slaves of our future. Our inexcusably rising mortality rate would drop. Our children would benefit both physically and mentally. Educational accomplishment and achievement would improve. In turn the children of poverty would earn more. The Nation could reclaim not only millions of wasted lives but billions of dollars that we lose because the underfed cannot make their full productive contribution to society.

Aristotle once said that the good of men must be the end of the science of politics. But recent governmental programs have failed to break the links in this tragic cycle.

Many of the 22 foods available under the agriculture department's commodity distribution programs never reach needy families. The Federal food stamp and commodity distribution programs are aimed at the disposal of surplus farm products rather than the nutritional needs of the poor. The Federal food stamp program has failed because—

Many counties do not want to make the local contribution required for food stamp programs and do not have them.

Many of the poor cannot afford to buy the stamps.

Many of the poor cannot afford the time or the money needed to travel to the centers where food stamps are sold.

Families must buy stamps regularly if they are to participate. Many of the poor cannot do this.

In many areas families no longer qualify for food stamps although well below the poverty line.

Fortunately, the plight of the underfed has been recognized. The late Senator Kennedy put the spotlight on hunger in Mississippi and in New York State and Senator HOLLINGS, of South Carolina, sounded the alarm last year. As a result the Federal budget has been increased. The funds to fight hunger have been increased to $1.5 billion.

But this is not enough. The Federal Government must recognize the urgency that malnutrition demands. How many authors, doctors, carpenters, steelworkers, and lawyers will our society lose because our Government failed to respond in time.

Even a budget of $1.5 billion for food is inadequate. It is only half of what is needed. If we can spend billions on military cost over-runs then we can surely afford $3 billion to eliminate hunger, and this investment will in turn reduce our medical and welfare costs.

The White House sponsored a conference in December to discuss malnutrition and further develop an anti-hunger program.

What is needed is an all out war against hunger. The plight of the underfed deserves the highest priority. No child should be subjected to the physical pain and damage which hunger causes. This is a right which we can guarantee as a part of the promise of America.

This is not an unrealistic goal, in the 1940's we were in the midst of a great war which involved all of our resources and yet we mobilized a successful drive to see that no one was malnourished. This contrasts starkly with our greatly increased agricultural productivity and limited Federal food program. It is not a question of whether we have the resources to do the job, for we do. It is rather a matter of applying the will and compassion which is necessary to eliminate hunger in America.

I have cosponsored a bill with Representative THOMAS S. FOLEY, Democrat of Washington, and Representative EDITH GREEN, Democrat of Oregon, and others that proposes the coupling of the food stamp program with the Commodity Credit Corporation allowing the Commodity Credit Corporation to use up to $19.5 billion of its borrowing power to reach all the foreseeable needs of the present hunger program. The bill calls for the distribution of free food stamps to families that have no disposable incomes.

I further propose that we take the following actions:

First. Use emergency funds to fully meet the needs of the hungry this year.

Second. Mobilize Federal, State, and local agencies—government and private—to insure that all the underfed are reached.

Third. Educate the poor about nutrition.

I am convinced that an imaginative, energetic and determined effort can eliminate hunger in America.

There is no excuse for one meal a day of grits and molasses, beans and tortillas, or bread and gravy. There is no excuse for a free and reduced-price lunch program that can only feed a few of the deserving children in a class. There is no excuse for an underfunded lunch program that requires that lunches be rotated through a class during the week. There is no excuse for a food stamp program that provides less than a minimum diet. There is no excuse for charging people with no income for food stamps. And there is no excuse for the existence of diseases caused by malnutrition. Only by making these necessary and monumental efforts can we honor the biblical commitment: "They shall hunger no more."

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for his kind and appropriate remarks. That will help us to understand better the total problem, I am sure.

Mr. Speaker, in my brief presentation to these young people I first commended them for their coming together at considerable sacrifice to this type of a meeting. I know many of them came at some sacrifice. Then I suggested to them at the outset that, whatever might be their feelings toward America in any category or on the broad front, they should have faith in the American system.

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I was tremendously impressed by the enthusiasm, the organization ability and the sensitivity of the young people in my congressional district who made the march and raised substantial amounts of money. When young people can use that positive means to express themselves and their strong feelings, to activate progress, it is not a disruption, as so often it appears when students march. This gained tremendous respect for them in the communities where they conducted this.

It is very exciting to see America's young people so concerned about the problems of population, pollution, and poverty. The people participating in the Young World Developers Conference in Chicago are contributing to the solutions of these problems by drawing attention to them, discussing them, and making recommendations for their solution. From such interest and enthusiasm, I am confident that these age-old problems will soon be solved.

The "walks for development" conducted throughout the country were examples of the constructive solutions carried out by these young people. They exerted real effort to make some money to contribute to programs for the alleviation of hunger and poverty at home and abroad. I am very proud of the "walks" taken in my congressional district and would like to pay tribute to the organizers of some of them. At Albert Lea, Minn., the "walk for development" was coordinated by Brian Veiman. The slogan on this walk was "Hunger Hurts." Jon Bergland was the student coordinator of the Winona, Minn., "walk for development" and John A. Anderson was the adviser. In Rochester, Minn., the youth coordinator was Wayne J. Fieck. While I could not participate in any of these walks, I was happy to wish them well in this venture. I am happy to join today in this effort to bring public attention to the inspiring work being done by this group.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. I want to join in commending the gentleman for the statement he is making this afternoon.

I believe the work being done by the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation and the work being done by the Young World Development Organization represent a new hope—a new vision—for the young people of America.

Last year I took part in the walk in Washington, D.C., along with some members of my family, aimed at raising money to help to meet the problems of hunger and development both at home and abroad.

Just a week or so ago I had the opportunity to participate in a conference at the University of Minnesota in which young people were again expressing their convictions about the moral commitment needed on the part of Americans to participate in development and the need to make this a high priority among our many concerns.

I know the views of the gentleman from Iowa about the importance of turning our priorities away from excessive expenditures for the military and devoting more of our resources to human development both here at home and abroad.

If in the months and years to come we can renew the commitment of this Nation through its young people to developmental aid and to the building of constructive relationships with the peoples of other nations through our efforts to assist in their development, this could become one of the finest periods in our history.

There is a great stirring in our Nation. Young people have been caught up in some of the most far-reaching controversies ever experienced by our nation. The horrors of Vietnam, the agonies of starvation at home and abroad, growing racial tension, and the threat to continued life from pollution of our environment have become their central concern. They wonder and worry about seeming indifference on the part of their governmental institutions. Cynicism has too easily displaced commitment.

The decision of young people to involve themselves directly in the problems of hunger and world development provides new hope. We need for this generation as well as for all the world to stake out new visions of tomorrow—of a world more concerned about sufficiency of nutrition than the sufficiency of armaments, of a world in which the largest share of our resources is channeled into human development rather than into preparations for war. Peace is development.

We should give all the encouragement we can to the work of these young people. We should work with them—walk with them—and talk with them whenever we can join in their magnificent undertaking.

I thank the gentleman very much for yielding to me.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his very worthwhile contribution today.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in 1967 the United States produced 132,219,000 short tons of corn, more than 45 percent of the total world production.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, as I said, I suggested to these young people gathered there that they continue to have faith in the American system.

I pointed out to them that even with all of the shortcomings that are so apparent to them and to us these days that the American system is still defensible; it is still the best system for any people in the long run, for it has done more in more ways to bring the Biblical promise of a long and good life to a nation and to all its people than any other system. I quickly added, for I sensed their feelings that there were things wrong with the system, that we needed to reconcile the system, we needed to improve the system and review its traditions to determine whether or not they are appropriate for our time. We have to review the precedents and find ways and means to make it easier to attain the objectives that were envisioned by our forefathers.

I agreed with them as I later found out that we need to set proper priorities and to come to grips with the many problems of our times which plague many areas. These are problems which really keep us from the kind of greatness we can achieve. We can add to America, and this, too, will enrich our heritage.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I suggested something that they already sense, as was my observation to them; namely, that there are right and wrong ways to do right things; there are right and wrong times and places to do right things, and the genius of success, as history has so often revealed to us, is to find the right way to do the right thing at the right time.

Then I also pointed out to them, as they knew and as they expressed in various ways, that our system and our way of life was based on a moral foundation. I pointed out to them, which is obvious—and I think most agreed with me—that the power of conscience that tells us not to do something because it is wrong or to do something because it is right is far more powerful than any constitution we can ever adopt or any laws we can ever pass. I told them, which is the fact, that I supported every strengthening of laws to improve society, particularly civil rights laws, and that many Members of Congress also did.

I also suggested to them that while we were strengthening and changing and improving laws, we needed programs to strengthen character, to upgrade minds, to improve the spirit. This is particularly pertinent because these people, in my view, were living this thing.

Then I shared with them some of their concerns about foreign policy and our involvements at the present time. I shared with them a concern I had gathered from the colleges I visited across America. I believe I have been on over 300 college campuses in recent years, and the same thing comes through there from the student bodies I associated with there; that is, the vast majority of the young people—and it is a tragedy that this is not better understood—know what is right and wrong. The vast majority of the students in college know why they are in college, and they are making the best of the situation there.

They recognize, though, as they ponder the future that they are given a commitment by us of our time to make a sacrifice, perhaps, unnecessary because of some mistakes that we have made and are now making.

One pointed out to me that in Vietnam if we left there tomorrow the major cost of Vietnam would still be before us. I did not think about it until I had this checked out by a reliable source and found that the youngster was right. The future cost of Vietnam in death benefits, hospital care of soldiers who have been wounded over there, disability benefits, and benefits to families will come to something like $250 billion. That is more than we have already spent over there.

Mr. Speaker, these things are plaguing the minds of these young people. I suggested that we needed at every level to rethink this whole question of foreign policy and maybe recognize what I think is the truth and that is the trouble with our foreign policy—we have no foreign policy.

Well, I talked about some of the other things and then it was opened up to a question and answer period to which I responded as best I could. In this experience I sensed a frustration about these many problems that are plaguing America and which are preying upon the minds of our young people. I felt the frustrations that were involved in specific projects such as the project of removing hunger from America. There could not be a more honorable project than that to undertake. But they felt frustration because they could not participate fully.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague from Iowa yield to me at this point?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes.

Mr. SCHERLE. I think from the beginning of time, or since this country developed its independence we have had problems; we have had trials, we have had tribulations. This will not be overcome even with idealistic ideologies. These problems will go on even after you and I are gone and long after these youngsters about whom we are speaking are gone. There will always be frustrations and problems.

Now, these young people, are they so frustrated because things have been handed to them, are they so frustrated because some of them have never learned how to work, are they so frustrated because they do not have the responsibility of their age? I have often said it is too bad that our young people could not be 21 before they were 18.

I think it is wonderful that these young people participate in the problems of our Nation today because tomorrow they will be theirs.

Do they have alternatives? Do they have substitutes? Or would some of the recommendations they made resolve all of these problems? Do they really believe that the time will come where no one

will be faced with any problem insofar as any civilization exists?

I always hear about the poor kids that are involved and their frustrations. I have had to face up to some of these problems every day of the week—sometimes 7 days a week. The trouble is that these youngsters have to learn to grow up. They have to grow up themselves. We cannot run around spoon feeding them all the time. We cannot run after them and wipe their nose all the time. I think they are going to have to face up to reality.

I do not know what we can do, or who has provided a better place for these kids to learn to live with these problems, nor has anyone tried any harder than we have.

I have three youngsters of my own, and I see this developing. By the same token, they are not afraid to take the bull by the horns, they are not afraid to go out and work, they are not afraid to do things, they are not spending their time idly sitting by and wondering what is going to happen to society; they are doing something about it. I believe a little more effort, rather than thought, perhaps might go a long ways toward solving their frustrations.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the statement of the gentleman from Iowa, I do not quite know what the gentleman is aiming at. Maybe it has not come through what I am trying to do. I stand here before this body because some people were interested in me. I suppose by certain measurements today, and even at the time that I was growing up, I could have been considered handicapped. I come from a German family. I am the son of immigrant parents who did not believe that I needed any education beyond grade school, and I would not have gone, I am sure, to high school, even, if it had not been for a schoolteacher, Helen Sculler, was her name, who in my eighth year when I was to take the county examination to see whether I could be graduated from eighth grade, walked home with me one day and talked to my parents about the importance of my going on to high school. She knew the attitude of my parents toward high school.

Well, to make a long story short, she convinced them, and I got them to let me go to high school and finally ended up working my way through high school. Then when I was graduated from high school, a high school teacher took an interest in me, and suggested I go to college.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. If the gentleman will permit me to continue for just a moment, then I will yield.

I could speak about this with emotion, because I would not have gone to college if it had not been for Mrs. Dennett.

I now yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, the thing that concerns me—and I thank my distinguished colleague from Iowa for yielding to me again—there are many more opportunities existing today than have ever existed in the entire history of our country, our great United States. We talk about handicaps. I feel that we had greater handicaps when we were young than the young people are faced with today. I believe the problem is indecision. I think this can be overcome also with a little thought and effort. I do not believe there are many men and women of our age who have not had the very handicaps that we had. I, too, come from a German family, a German immigrant family. I have as many relatives behind the Iron Curtain in Hungary and East Germany as I do in the United States.

I realize what the value of our country means to me as a first-generation American, and it is difficult for me to sympathize with young people of today.

My parents never took welfare. They were both immigrants, and there was a stigma attached to welfare. Nobody wanted it. But, today, if you can get it and beat them out of it, why, it is to your advantage.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to sympathize when we have the great opportunities that we do in this country, and it is impossible to try and compare those with the opportunities we had when we were younger, because they did not exist.

I am grateful for the opportunities that my two young sons have to grow up in society today. They do not have to work as hard as we did years ago, but there again it did not hurt us, and I do not believe it would hurt them today either.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, let me say this in further response: I believe that the gentleman is not being critical of the students and people who are trying to do something. I believe the gentleman is talking about somebody who is not involved in this. That is my viewpoint, and I certainly hope that is true, for I am here today because I am convinced that this is an honorable organization, and that it is headed by good people.

Mr. SCHERLE. If the gentleman will yield further, I hope my colleague has not misunderstood what I said here this afternoon. I criticize no organization, I criticize nothing of that nature that has in a sense done good. But again I say it is difficult for me to sympathize with always wondering what we are going to do about the young people, what we are going to do for them. Perhaps it should be what are they going to do for themselves, not what are we going to provide for them.

The thing that concerns me is that I think perhaps we have turned them loose a little bit too soon, and that we should discipline them at home before they get to that point. If we did, I think maybe we would be a little better off, and a little further ahead.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Well, I repeat—sympathize with the handicapped wherever they are.

I suppose that the child who does not have good parents, or for whatever reason, is handicapped, in a measure—not necessarily—and to the extent that we can give him encouragement and help to this self-determination to help other people, we ought to do it. That is my purpose here today.

Oh, I know of people in my community who are not taking advantage of all the opportunities they have in this great land. But here is an organization that is doing something—at least they are trying—and I salute them and wish them well.

Mr. Speaker, I have much more to say, but before I do, I want to put in the RECORD and read for this body the conclusion of this—or some of the conclusion at least—of this meeting in Chicago that I attended.

I think I should say that during the discussion period, there were some rather critical things said about our system and some of our leaders and people that bothered me.

Obviously, someone had not acquainted them—or they had not read about the institution of the Congress, for instance, that was severely and I felt, unjustly criticized and said so.

But you know the best answer to that probably came from the group themselves. Somebody within that group answered much better that challenge than I could. This is a part of their record. This too was an experience, and an interesting experience for me.

There is a statement of purpose by the Young World Development Group—

Listen to this. They said:

> The creation of a world free from hunger, environmental abuse and overpopulation must be fought and won.

They were translating in their words what many adults are thinking.

They continue:

> Young World Development recognizes that these conditions inhibit all mankind from realizing its greatest human potential. It is up to the people to take the initiative to redirect and stimulate personal and governmental involvement towards the solution of the problem.
>
> We are committed to involving everyone in the recognition of the severity of these conditions and the urgency of dealing with them. The late President Kennedy once said, "We have the ability, we have the means, and we have the capacity to eliminate hunger from the face of the earth. We need only the will." The accomplishment of this task is possible through dynamic participation, both collective and individual, education, motivation of the will and redirecting community resources.

At this juncture I should say, they were not just thinking of tax money—they were thinking of money that they could get from whatever source, honorably and through their own efforts and organization, then distributed in such a way as to come to grips with the real critical problems.

They continue:

> A fundamental requirement is the changing of priorities to insure survival.

How often do we hear that?

> The failure to meet this requirement can mean the eventual annihilation of mankind.
>
> The time for feeling "deep concern" about hunger, environmental abuse, and overpopulation is past. Expressing passion for our fellow man by verbal commitment is now hypocritical. We can only be true to ourselves and the world when we are true to our purpose by taking action. And it is this we believe to be the true expression of love, the joy of freeing man to seek fulfillment of his human potential.

There are many ways to do that.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I would like to insert letters I have received as a result of my speech at the Second National Young World Development Conference. Let me reiterate my commendation of this constructive and meaningful organization. The young people involved in the conference demonstrated the kind of concern for our Nation that is healthy and which will make them creative and productive members of our society.

AMERICAN FREEDOM FROM HUNGER FOUNDATION, INC.,
*Washington, D.C., December 28, 1969.*

Hon. FRED SCHWENGEL,
*U.S. House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHWENGEL: The delegates of the Second National Young World Development Conference thank you for sharing your views with us and listening so attentively to our ideas and questions. We appreciate your involvement in the problems that concern us. Your voting record has encouraged us to believe that social change can come through our Congress.

We, the 175 delegates from 33 states, write this letter in response to your generous offer to read our statement of concern to the 92nd session of Congress. It is as follows:

Young World Development is concerned with hunger and the causes that relate directly to it: population, pollution, and poverty. We feel that there is a state of emergency existing in our country and that the Congress must deal with it immediately to enable future generations to exist on this planet.

We believe that some steps have been taken towards the solutions of the problems of hunger, but that they are tragically insufficient. Hunger still exists across the entire country and much must be done to minimize its causes. Hunger, which has been a rather hidden and untalked about issue in America, has now come to the surface and jolted the public into seeing the need for effective action. We, as concerned youth, are beginning to do something about it. However, it is sometimes hard to work on progressive solutions when a number of states will not even officially recognize that there is poverty in their state. Whether they recognize it or not, the emergency exists, and in some cases, most blatantly in those states where it is denied.

We commend the congressmen who have been fighting hunger and poverty and those who are now seeing the extent of the tragedy and are trying to re-evaluate the priorities of this great nation. We have faith in the American people and the lawmakers of our land and cannot believe that they will sit by and let this continue to happen when they have the power and means to end it.

Our challenge to Congress is this: Young World Development will work with and support those Congressmen who are aware and fighting for effective action: we will also do everything in our power to make those who deny the fact of hunger in their state see the growing crisis created by their blindness.

---

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS,
*Amherst, Mass., January 5, 1970.*

Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL,
*U.S. House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I wanted to write you ever since you spoke at the Young World Development Conference. You may recall a bearded young man from Boston, unfairly criticized you for some of your remarks. Since I am that bearded young man and since I now realize that instead of criticizing you I should have been encouraging you to continue your work in Congress. If I had sat down and realized that you are really on our side, I would never have said what I did.

I have written my local congressman, Congressman James Burke and I have urged him to support your efforts when you address the Congress later this month. Keep up your * * *.

——— ———.

---

OREGON CITY, OREG., *December 31, 1969.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHWENGEL: Thank you very much for having the time, patience, and dedication to listen to a group of angry youth at the Young World Development Conference. I have great respect for men of your type, and men like you save my faith in the American system.

You asked for suggestions. My main concern is hunger. I don't have all of the answers to even that problem, but here are a few:

(1) Greatly escalate the war fought by VISTA and the Peace Corps.

(2) Organize a National Operation Bread basket.

(3) Remove the income tax exemption for every child after the second born to any one family from now on.

(4) Call in UNICEF (but only if Congress makes it clear that it has no desire to feed the starving children in the world's richest nation).

Congress alone has the financial resources to free America from hunger. I hope and pray that more men in Congress develop a morally responsible attitude like yours, Congressman Schwengel.

Yours truly,

LYNN KAHLE.

---

GREAT FALLS, MONT.,
*January 5, 1970.*

CONGRESSMAN SCHWENGEL: I was at the Young World Development Conference in Chicago where you were kind enough to speak. I was the only member from Montana. I want to thank you for speaking to us and for offering to make our views known in Washington. Even though we questioned you, I hope you have no hard feelings because we truly appreciate your coming. I sent the enclosed letter to our two representatives asking them to support you and our foundation. I hope it will help.

Thank you.

KAREN MCBROUN.

---

CONCORDIA COLLEGE,
*Milwaukee, Wis., January 5, 1970.*

Congressman SCHWENGEL,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHWENGEL: I attended the Second National Young World Development Conference in Chicago and heard you speak. During the question period we gave you a rough time. Later in the conference it was often wished that we had shown more support of what you are trying to do instead of being so extremely critical.

I enjoyed your comment, "You are reflecting an understandable impatience." That statement, I believe, reflects your understanding of the youth who were gathered in Chicago that day.

I am also very happy that you brought your religious faith into your speech. That is the motivation which I wish everyone would have for their humanitarian activities.

I have one question. While working with the Milwaukee (Wisconsin) Hunger Hike, we asked several Congressmen to give us written support of our activities. In reply, we received from some of these men just a list of what they had done. They made no mention of whether they approved or not. Why do Congressmen so often tell people to look at their records?

Thank you for all you have done and are doing.

Sincerely,

GLENN TESCHENDORF.

---

AMERICAN FREEDOM FROM HUNGER FOUNDATION

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*Washington, May 16, 1969.*

I congratulate you and all who work with the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation to eliminate hunger and malnutrition in this country and abroad.

The urgent problems of feeding the world's growing population must have high priority on our national agenda. The Federal program we recently announced to expand our governmental efforts against hunger and malnutrition gives recognition to this fact. But the sustained support of private groups such as your own is indispensable if we are to reach our goals.

Your reputation fills us with encouragement, and with the hope that by working together we may succeed in satisfying the most basic human need.

RICHARD NIXON.

---

The American Freedom from Hunger Foundation was established in 1961 at the suggestion of the late President John F. Kennedy, as the national committee to support, voluntarily, the worldwide Freedom from Hunger Campaign of the United Nations.

It is a nonprofit, nonsectarian organization financed through the contributions of individuals, corporations and nonprofit foundations, and through a fixed portion of the proceeds from its Walk for Development program.

The purpose of the Foundation is to enhance public awareness and understanding of the existence and causes of hunger and malnutrition, both domestic and worldwide, and to suggest ways that the American people can become personally involved in combating these problems. The scope of the Foundation's activities, due to the importance of its objectives, is growing rapidly. Presently most of its efforts are concentrated in five areas.

1. Public Information. Requests for information and educational materials dealing with hunger are serviced, either through direct mailing from the Foundation or by referring the request to an appropriate source of assistance. An extensive bibliography, including references on hunger, urban decay, population, third world development and world trade is periodically updated and made available to the public.

2. Research. The Foundation serves as a channel of support for a wide variety of special projects such as educational film making, high school curriculum development, and fertilizer resource surveys.

3. Walk for Development. The Walk program, sparked by enthusiastic youth across the country, has provided an opportunity for thousands of Americans to become actively involved in the war on hunger. Walks are generally 30 miles in length and involve several thousand participants. Some have had over 10,000 Walkers. Each Walker gets sponsors to pledge an amount of money for each mile that he (the Walker) completes. Money raised is used to support domestic and overseas self-help projects which have been selected by the local organizing committee prior to the Walk, and to support the Foundation's national public information program.

4. Young World Development. YWD is the vehicle that promotes follow-up activities once the Walk for Development has taken place. Many young people, stimulated by their participation in the Walk, are anxious to further educate themselves to the problems of the world and seek meaningful ways to involve themselves in community activities. Contact among the various Young World Development groups is maintained through the *YWD Newsletter* published monthly by the Foundation. Further research by the students into hunger, population control,

ecological problems, and changing high school curriculums to include hunger-related topics is encouraged.

5. Project Support. The American Freedom from Hunger Foundation supports a wide variety of self-help projects to alleviate the causes of hunger and malnutrition both at home and abroad. It is the Foundation's policy not to give handouts of food and material—but rather, to strike at the root causes of the hunger problem by supporting social and economic self-help projects that are of long-term social value.

Overseas projects are administered by organizations such as CARE, FAO, Peace Corps, Partners of the Alliance, World University Service, Church World Service, Lutheran World Relief, and Catholic Relief Service. Projects include:

Rural youth agricultural training/Dahomey;

Demonstration home gardens/Madagascar;

Laboratory equipment to produce swine & poultry vaccines/South Korea;

Irrigation pumps for rural co-ops/Ecuador;

Rural school construction/Guatemala;

Rehabilitation centers/Biafra;

Community canneries/Turkey;

Mobile nutrition health unit/Peru;

Farm youth training and veterinary education materials/India;

Farm mechanization study fellowships/Colombia.

Domestic projects are carried out in local communities by a large number of social action and self-help organizations. Among the projects are:

Indian nutrition research and education/North Dakota;

Inner city day care center/Hollywood, Florida;

Medical equipment/Rural South Carolina;

Migrant workers training program/Iowa and Minnesota;

Indian crafts program/Great Falls, Montana;

Day care centers/Eugene & Klamath Falls, Oregon;

Medical clinics/Texas, Arizona, S. Carolina;

Low-cost housing project/Suburban Chicago;

Development reading project/Minneapolis, Minnesota;

Economic development program/Mississippi;

Inner city nutrition training center/San Diego, California.

Today the American Freedom from Hunger Foundation, aware of the importance of the task it has been assigned to fulfill, is actively seeking additional ways to involve the private sector in promoting further awareness of hunger and its related social problems.

OFFICERS, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND TRUSTEES 1969

*Officers*

*Honorary Chairman of the Board:* The Hon. Harry S. Truman

*Chairman of the Board:* Mr. Paul S. Willis, president emeritus, Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc.

*President:* Mr. Robert R. Nathan, president, Robert R. Nathan Associates

*Executive Director:* Leonard G. Wolf

*First Vice President:* Mr. P. Kenneth Shoemaker, senior vice president, H. J. Heinz Company

*Vice President:* Mr. Richard W. Reuter, vice president, Kraft Foods, Inc.

*Vice President:* Mrs. Arthur L. Zepf

*Treasurer:* Mr. Douglas R. Smith, president, National Savings and Trust Company

*Secretary:* Mr. Leslie Nichols, international specialist, National 4-H Clubs Foundation

*Historian:* Mr. Arthur C. Ringland

*Counselor-at-Law:* Richard Schifter, Esq.

*Executive Committee*

Officers listed above, plus—

Mr. R. Stewart Boyd, Good Housekeeping Magazine

Dr. Russell Coleman, president, The Sulphur Institute

Mr. Bernard A. Confer, executive secretary, Lutheran World Relief, Inc.

Dr. Howard Cottam, North American representative and director of FAO Liaison Office for North America

Mr. Aled P. Davies, vice president, American Meat Inst.

Mr. Harry Edell

Mrs. Orville L. Freeman

Mr. Frank Goffio, executive director, CARE, Inc.

Mrs. Dorothy Jacobson, Population Crisis Committee

Dr. Flemmie P. Kittrell, Head, Department of Home Economics, Howard University

Mr. Robert M. Koch, president, National Limestone Institute

Mr. James MacCracken, executive director, Church World Service.

The Rev. Henry A. McCanna, executive director, Department of the Church in Town and Country, National Council of Churches.

Mr. William Murphy, Washington representative, Eli Lilly and Company.

Mr. Hershel Newsom, Tariff Commission.

Mr. James J. O'Connor, executive director, The Academy of Food Marketing, St. Joseph's College.

Mr. Edward J. Piszek, president, Mrs. Paul's.

Mr. Walter P. Reuther, president, UAW.

Mr. John Walker Scott, master, National Grange.

The Most Reverend Edward E. Swanstrom, executive director, Catholic Relief Services.

Mr. John F. Wood, editor, York County Coast Star.

*Other trustees*

Mr. Clarence G. Adamy, Mr. Braulio Alonzo, Mr. Dwayne O. Andreas, Rev. David Brown, Mr. Thomas C. Butler, Mr. William Byler, Mr. Carlos Campbell, Mr. Wallace J. Campbell, Mr. Seymour S. Cohen, Dr. Robert Coles.

Mr. Tony T. Dechant, Mr. John P. Duncan, the Hon. Charles Goodell, Mr. Fowler Hamilton, Mrs. Vance Hartke, Miss Marsha Hunt, the Hon. Marvin Jones, Mr. Frederick Jonker, Mr. Burton M. Joseph, Miss Philomena Kerwin, Mr. Howard L. Lauhoff.

Mr. Charles Mackall, Mr. Leon O. Marion, Mr. Joseph M. McGarry, the Hon. George McGovern, Mr. Robert D. McMillen, the Hon. George Meany, Dr. Raymond W. Miller, Rt. Rev. Monsignor, Edward W. O'Rourke, Mr. James G. Patton.

Dr. John Perryman, Dr. Nevin S. Scrimshaw, Mr. Lionel Steinberg, Mr. Harvey T. Stephens, Mr. Sterling Tucker, Mr. Charles Tyroler II, Mr. Harold Vogel, Mr. Thomas M. Ware, Mr. Edwin M. Wheeler, Mr. Franklin Williams, Mr. Donald B. Yarbrough.

The world is a beautiful place to be born into if you don't mind some people dying all the time, or maybe only starving some of the time, which isn't half so bad if it isn't you.—LAWRENCE FERLINGHETTI.

Next to the pursuit of peace the really greatest challenge to the human family is the race between food supply and population increase. The race is being lost. Every member of the World Community now bears a direct responsibility to help bring our most basic human account into balance.—LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

If there is a history of our time, the era will be noted not for its horrifying crimes or the astonishing inventions but because it is the first generation since the dawn of history in which mankind dared to believe it is practical to make the benefits of civilization available to the whole human race.—ARNOLD TOYNBEE.

We have the ability, we have the means, and we have the capacity to eliminate hunger from the face of the earth. We need only the will.—JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Nothing is impossible.—POPE JOHN XXIII.

[From NAM Reports, Nov. 17, 1969]

BUSINESS EXECUTIVES LEND HELPING HAND: CHILDREN WALK TO FEED THE HUNGRY

(By Leonard C. Wolf)

At 4:30 p.m. on May 16, a personal letter arrived in our Washington office from President Nixon. The message began:

"I congratulate you and all who work with the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation to eliminate hunger and malnutrition in this country and abroad.

"The urgent problems of feeding the world's growing population must have high priority on our national agenda . . . the sustained support of private groups such as yours is indispensable if we are to reach our goals."

A few days before in San Diego, Calif., the Evening Tribune had the following banner headline:

YOUTH'S BLISTERS GIVE NEEDY A LIFT—17,000 HERE MARCH ON HUNGER

A few weeks later in a neighborhood center in a San Diego slum, an 18-year-old student handed me a check for $85,000, the results of their Walk for Development. The money will finance hunger-fighting projects on four continents. Not one is a food handout; all are self-help. All attack the root causes of hunger: malnutrition and poverty.

The first Walk for Development took place in September 1968 in the twin cities of Fargo, N.D., and Moorhead, Minn. More than 3,500 walked in this 33-mile demonstration of "foot-power" raising nearly $24,000 to help launch an agricultural training program in Dahomey, West Africa, and nutrition education projects among North Dakota Indian tribes. Sponsors, each pledging a fixed amount per mile walked by "their" volunteer, included downtown merchants, civic associations, service organizations, grade school children, and high school and college classes.

In the heart of America's "bread basket" near the cornfields at Ames, Iowa, youths from 33 nations, rejecting age-old rivalries and ethnic feuds, walked side-by-side, footsore but lighthearted, to raise funds for a 4-H Club nutrition and home economics center in the Inner City of Washington, D.C., and a 4-H Center in Jamaica. These youngsters had convened from every continent for a conference sponsored by the 4-H Foundation's International Farm Youth Exchange Program; they remained to walk together in common cause under the banner of the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation.

On Oct. 5, student leaders of Madison, Wis., where bayonets quelled campus disorders a few months ago, and youthful organizations in Kiel, Germany, Baltic operations base for U-boat "wolf-packs" in both World Wars, simultaneously led Walks for Development in their communities to raise funds for a rural youth training center in Chad, in central Africa. Madison students coordinated planning with their German "opposite numbers."

"Although the foundation offers some basic guidelines for conducting a walk, the teens themselves handle the detailed planning, organizing and problem solving," Good Housekeeping noted in a September article.

"I couldn't stop until I finished," a 13-year-old girl from Fargo, N.D., said. "I felt I was carrying a starving baby in my arms, and if I quit the baby would die."

Reporters for Good Housekeeping found that "there is enough challenge and off-beat adventure in the sponsored-walk concept to attract vast hoards of teenagers. Solicitation of neighbors, businessmen and relatives as sponsors, publicity, and the sight of the peaceful marchers helps draw the attention of uninformed or apathetic adults to the pressing problems of hunger.

"Because the proceeds go almost wholly to projects attacking the root causes of hunger and poverty, the young walkers make a

positive social contribution to the troubled world in which they often feel only helpless."

Established in 1961 at the suggestion of the late President John F. Kennedy, the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation is a non-profit, non-sectarian organization financed through the contributions of individuals, corporations, and nonprofit foundations, and through a fixed portion of the proceeds from its Walk for Development program.

Prominent business executives, as well as leaders in many other sectors of North America society, such as CARE, Catholic Relief, Church World Service, Lutheran World Relief, strongly support the mission of the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation. Its president is Robert R. Nathan, who heads Robert R. Nathan Associates. Chairman of the Board is Paul S. Willis, president-emeritus of the Grocery Manufacturers of America. Vice presidents include P. Kenneth Shoemaker, senior vice president of H. J. Heinz Co., and Richard W. Reuter, a vice president of Kraft Foods, who formerly served as Executive Director of CARE and White House Food For Peace Director. Douglas R. Smith, president of the National Savings and Trust Co., of Washington, D.C., is treasurer. Others on the Executive Committee include Aled P. Davies, vice president of the American Meat Institute, Dr. Russell Coleman, president of the Sulphur Institute; William Murphy, Washington representative of Eli Lilly Co., and Edward J. Piszek, president of Mrs. Paul's.

The foundation, whose trustees include several executives of NAM member companies, centers its activity on the Walk for Development program. Every project proposal, domestic or foreign, must meet the following criteria:

All funds donated through the walk must reach the recipients at the local level.

The project must attack causes of hunger and malnutrition.

The project must be of a self-help nature.

All individuals, groups and organizations responsible for the administration of the project and funds must be reliable and effective persons.

A well-defined procedure for follow-up reports is required, so both the foundation and the donors will know exactly how the funds were spent.

The Walk for Development movement is acquiring national momentum. Walks in 16 states have generated contributions of well over $800,000 during the past 12 months. Upwards of 120,000 persons have taken part in the walks to date, sponsored by 1,130,000 contributors.

Young World Development Committees have selected and funded a multitude of self-help domestic projects in pockets of poverty, hunger and malnutrition. These include nutrition education, crafts training, production and marketing cooperatives, and integrated community development among American Indian people in North Dakota, Montana, Wisconsin and Minnesota; community action programs, food cooperatives, nutrition training and consumer education in "inner cities" (Maryland, Florida, Colorado and California); migrant action programs (Iowa and Minnesota); low-cost housing in Chicago satellite areas; rural medical clinics (South Carolina, Texas, and Arizona); training of Mississippi field workers; day care centers and aid for dependent children (California, Colorado, Massachusetts, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Oregon and Washington, D.C.)

Local civic agencies, church groups and non-governmental anti-poverty organizations originate many of these activities. They are a personal link between people who need and people who care.

Walks for Development has supported such priorities as construction and equipment of agricultural training centers and schools (Brazil, Botswana, Chad, Dahomey, Ecuador, Ghana, Guatemala, India, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Peru, Thailand, Togo); a revolving loan fund for 4-H projects and a rural credit program in Peru; community canneries in Turkey; a farm mechanics center in Colombia; animal disease control laboratory in South Korea; irrigation equipment in Ecuador, and demonstration home gardens in the Malagasy Republic.

The local people contribute voluntary labor and services, materials and other resources, thus becoming productive participants in the development process. Emphasis is on building more efficient institutions.

Fifteen percent of the funds raised by the walks help the foundation to carry out its mandate of creating greater awareness among the American people of the problems and consequences of hunger crises at home and abroad . . . and stimulating effective action.

High school and college student leaders have prepared a Walk for Development Handbook, which is available from the foundation on request. Other materials prepared for the foundation's war on hunger include a 38-page bibliography on hunger, malnutrition, population problems, urban decay, third world development, and world trade, as well as special reports and studies, various educational films, display kits, posters, and a monthly newsletter.

High schools are assisted in curriculum development relating to hunger problems. The foundation periodically schedules Young World Development Workshops for student leaders.

Seventy-five more walks are being organized, or are already underway across the nation. Some towns are finding that the Walks for Development become catalysts for a wide range of community betterment activities.

The philosophy of many student organizers was summarized by Tom McDermott, a freshman at Elmhurst College, in Villa Park, Ill.: "We wanted to show other students that it's possible to help improve society without being disruptive and destructive. And we wanted to wake up the adult community to the problem of hunger and to communicate that kids can be responsible when given a chance to do something meaningful."

Not one act of violence, not one act of confrontation, and not one injury to walkers or helpers from any cause has occurred in the total effort, other than blisters, bruises and strained muscles.

As I wrote in a recent letter to President Nixon: "When the walk program began, it was looked upon as a 'youth activity'—we now recognize it as far more. It has become, in the hands of dynamic youth leadership, a catalyst for community concern and involvement at all ages, and all economic and social levels."

The walks have far-reaching consequences beyond drawing public attention to the problems of world hunger, involving students in international affairs, and mobilizing human and material resources to bring about constructive change. High school and college students throughout the country learn through experience to relate effectively to adult authorities and the power structure, to mobilize support from diverse groups and organizations; they are rapidly acquiring political sophistication. Result: a growing confidence and awareness of the leverage they can exercise and the power they can wield, but within the established order of society.

Consider that the student organizers must successfully negotiate permits from city authorities; organize rallies; coordinate manpower deployment with police officials; form action committees; raise funds to cover organizing costs; locate sponsors; arrange press conferences and issue news releases; operate communications networks; plan logistics of food supplies and standby medical services; register participants; handle funds and furnish tax receipts; and assume responsibility for follow-up activities.

They assimilate basic principles of training in leadership, analysis of social and economic problems, civic responsibility, and group dynamics.

They perceive that they have a stake in their society and in the community of mankind—and that they are needed. Interaction with those of other races, classes, age groups, creeds and political persuasions results in greater tolerance and respect for the rights of others, diminishes racial tensions. Energies and frustrations are directed to constructive, creative change—rather than bitter outbursts leading to broken heads and confrontations with bayonets and truncheons. What better training for future leaders of the educational establishment, the great corporate structure, the professions, the churches and service organizations, national and international government agencies?

What are the dimensions of the world's hunger crises?

Forbes Magazine notes that "of the three billion men, women and children in the world, about one-third crawl into bed hungry every night, many to die of starvation or starvation-accentuated diseases before the dawn, while another third is badly malnourished. By 1985 there will be well over another billion mouths to feed, four-fifths of them precisely those nations where food is already a problem, the underdeveloped nations."

One child in three now living will carry for life the irreversible effects of food deficiencies in the form of mental or physical retardation—or both.

Feeding the hungry, rescuing the starving, means multiplying human productivity. A major result of a "bread upon the waters" policy toward the developing nations will be the rapid expansion of world markets for U.S. products of almost all types. The war on hunger is sound economics!

World business and political leaders have suggested formation of a World Resources Corporation, with a divisional World Food Corporation. The plan would involve both government authorities from participating nations and worldwide "agri-business"—manufacturers of agricultural chemicals, fertilizers, farm equipment, distribution systems, storage facilities, food processing, packaging and marketing.

The general public, on a common stock basis, could generate the magnitude of capital required. The collateral would be the known but as yet unexploited resources of the participating countries and the agricultural know-how available in the more technologically advanced countries. The program would draw support from the private foundations which have already made important contributions to agriculture in the diet-deficient countries, and from agricultural colleges, universities, and research institutions.

The program would require the dedicated talents of tens of thousands of young people, as well as experts in many fields, from many countries. Establishment of a world resources inventory would provide a sound basis for selection of feasible targets for development.

And the role of youth?

The youth of America is seething with discontent. Their leaders are clamoring for bold assaults on the status quo, forceful measures to resolve social ills. They crave adventurous new frontiers. They articulate their need to realize their ideals and high aspirations, transforming their dreams into deeds, shaping a better world.

Explosive pressures are mounting. As the late John F. Kennedy often repeated "If we make peaceful revolution impossible, we make violent revolution inevitable."

Can we hope to see many more newspaper photos of mobs of excited youth on the move—building, not demolishing, in their Walks for Development? It depends on all of us.

How shall we answer their poet (Lawrence

Ferlinghetti) who says: "The world is a beautiful place to be born into if you don't mind some people dying all the time, or maybe only starving some of the time, which isn't half so bad if it isn't you."

---

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
*January 27, 1970.*

LEONARD G. WOLF,
*Executive Director, American Freedom From Hunger Foundation, Inc., Washington, D.C.:*

You will please convey my warmest congratulations to the young people who have accepted the challenge of the American Freedom from Hunger Foundation, Inc., and have participated in your Walks for Development. It is very gratifying to know that so many young Americans are deeply concerned about the problems of hunger and malnutrition which afflict so many millions of human beings at home and abroad.

CLAUDE PEPPER,
*Member of Congress.*

Mr. Speaker, Bert Tollefson, Jr., Assistant Administrator for Legislative and Public Affairs of the Agency for International Development, recently commended the young men and women of America who are involving themselves in improving the quality of life for disadvantaged people both at home and abroad. Mr. Tollefson and I both addressed the Second Young World Development Seminar conducted by the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation in Chicago on December 27. Mr. Tollefson praised in particular the young people who gave a portion of their holidays to attend the seminar and consider ways in which they might help solve problems of health, hunger, education, and economic improvement in the two-thirds of the world which remains relatively poor and underdeveloped.

Mr. Tollefson recalled that in a holiday message to agency employees at home and abroad, AID Administrator John Hannah had pointed out that "peace on earth and good will toward men" were goals for which world development personnel were privileged to work 12 months a year.

Mr. Tollefson added:

All Americans participate through foreign aid programs in sharing America's resources and skills with those less fortunate and this appropriate form of giving is the true spirit of Christmas.

Looking to the future, the Assistant Administrator reminded delegates to the seminar that in a few years they would be taking over responsibility for dealing with these problems through their associations with government, private industry and the academic community.

Mr. Tollefson said:

During this holiday season it is important for all Americans to reflect on the difficulties of maintaining peace and stability in a world where one-third of humanity annually produces goods worth over $2,400 per person, while the figure for the other two-thirds is less than $200.

This nation, through its foreign assistance programs of loans, grants and technical assistance, is helping the poorer nations to feed themselves, improve their health standards, enlarge their skills and expand educational opportunities. We are doing this because it is the right and moral thing to do, but at the same time we were helping ourselves by providing investment opportunties and jobs for American business and laying the foundations for a future expansion of our trade with the developing countries.

Mr. Tollefson complimented the young people on their foresight in devoting attention to problems of world development at a time when communication technology is rapidly producing a "village world in which all men will necessarily be their brothers' keepers."

His speech follows:

As young people from 33 states, you are obviously interested in what kind of world we are living in. Your presence here is proof of your interest in what the United States is accomplishing through its foreign aid program. In adopting the Foreign Assistance Act, the Congress has declared that "it is not only expressive of our sense of freedom, justice, and compassion but also important to our national security that the United States, through private as well as public efforts, assist the people of less developed countries in their efforts to acquire the knowledge and resources essential for development and to build the economic, political, and social institutions which will meet their aspirations for a better life, with freedom, and in peace".

DOING WHAT IS RIGHT TO DO

Why should the United States care at all about the people of Latin America, Africa and Asia? Does it matter to the United States what happens to Morocco or Indonesia? President Nixon gave the answer in these words:

"Certainly our efforts to help nations feed millions of their poor helps avert violence and upheaval that would be dangerous to peace.

"Certainly our military assistance to allies helps maintain a world in which we ourselves are more secure.

"Certainly our economic aid to developing nations helps develop our own potential markets overseas.

"And certainly our technical assistance puts down roots of respect and friendship for the United States in the court of world opinion.

"These are all sound, practical reasons for our foreign aid programs.

"But they do not do justice to our fundamental character and purpose. There is a moral quality in this nation that will not permit us to close our eyes to the want in this world, or to remain indifferent when the freedom and security of others are in danger. . . . We have shown the world that a great nation must also be a good nation. We are doing what is right to do".

This year President Nixon has asked the Congress for $2.2 billion for economic assistance, the lowest request in ten years. This appropriation would support these regional programs: Latin America, $605 million; Near East and South Asia, $625 million; Africa, $168 million; East Asia, $234 million; Vietnam, $440 million.

The President has said these sums are necessary to meet essential requirements now, and to maintain a base for future action. Meantime, the President is establishing a task force of private citizens to make a comprehensive review of the entire range of U.S. aid activities and to study the role which foreign assistance plays in the development process, and the relationship between development and overall U.S. foreign policy.

MISUNDERSTANDING

The United States has conducted a foreign aid program since the end of World War II—a span that covers five Presidents, 12 Congresses and more than 20 years. Yet many Americans still have no clear or accurate picture of what foreign aid is, how it works or why we provide it.

1. The biggest single misconception about the program is that we bundle up money and send it abroad. We don't. Foreign aid consists of American equipment, raw materials, expert services and food—all provided for specific development projects which we ourselves review and approve.

Foreign aid is not a "giveaway." In the early days much of our help was given in the form of outright grants, but today most of our aid is in the form of interest bearing, dollar repayable loans.

Ninety-nine percent of A.I.D. funds for purchase of products are spent directly in the United States. Some 4,000 American firms in 50 states received $1.1 billion in A.I.D. funds for products supplied as part of the foreign aid program in fiscal 1968.

Among other items, A.I.D. financed the export of $152 million in fertilizer, $114 million in chemicals, $84 million in iron and steel products, $315 million worth of machinery and $86 million worth of motor vehicles, engines and parts. The impact of these purchases is felt in every state.

A.I.D. funds also go to pay the salaries of American experts, both those who work directly for the government and employees of American labor unions, business firms, cooperatives and universities that carry out technical assistance on contract with the Agency.

2. Among the other misconceptions about foreign aid is that it costs vast sums of money. Actually A.I.D. represents a little more than a penny out of each federal budget dollar, and the United States gets nearly all of that back through purchases of U.S. commodiites and interest on loans.

3. The U.S. ranks behind seven other nations in terms of its official foreign aid as a proportion of gross national product. In 1968 the U.S., with a per capita gross national product of $4,360, provided $3.6 billion in official aid. Other aid-giving nations, whose per capita GNP averages out to only $1,890, provided $3.3 billion.

4. The nations which receive the bulk of U.S. development aid today invest more than five dollars of their own for every dollar's worth of help they receive from A.I.D.

5. Our assistance is concentrated in those countries which can make the best use of it. Ninety percent of all country assistance goes to just 15 countries (Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Korea, Laos, Nigeria, Pakistan, Thailand, Turkey, Vietnam).

Eighty-six percent of all country Development Loans will go to eight countries (Brazil, Chile, Colombia, India, Indonesia, Korea, Pakistan, Turkey).

Supporting assistance is even more concentrated. Three countries (Vietnam, Laos and Thailand) will receive 93 percent of country aid to maintain economic or political stability.

SUCCESSES

The long-range goal of foreign aid is to help underdeveloped nations reach the point of self-sustaining economic growth.

In recent years, several developing nations have reached the "take-off" point and no longer require A.I.D. loans or grants. Others have reached self-sufficiency in the critically important area of food production and still others are within sight of that goal. Examples:

*Taiwan*

Between 1951 and 1965, Taiwan:

Raised literacy from 57 percent to 81 percent in ten years;

Eliminated malaria, which once afflicted millions and killed 12,000 a year;

Carried out a land reform program which has resulted in 80 percent of the farmers owning their own land;

Doubled the real income of the people.

Taiwan, though by no means yet a rich country, is a graduate of the A.I.D. rolls and standing on its own feet.

*Iran*

The United States was able also, in 1967 to terminate A.I.D. assistance to Iran.

Iranian oil helped speed progress toward self-support, but the key was the use to which Iran put her oil revenues: three-quarters of those revenues—four times the total of U.S. economic aid—went back into development. During the period 1962–1967: industrial output jumped 85 percent and exports almost doubled . . . the rice, sugar and tea crops increased more than 50 percent through increased fertilizer use, irrigation and land reclamation . . . the gross national product rose 50 percent . . . the incidence of malaria dropped from 90 percent of the population to five percent . . . a nationwide land reform program was carried on.

*Israel*

Between 1951 and 1966 official U.S. loans and grants to Israel totaled almost $500 million. During this period Israel's gross national product rose from $1.1 billion to $3.9 billion, an average growth rate of 8.7 percent a year. In the past 10 years Israel has almost tripled its industrial production, almost doubled its farm production and more than doubled its electrical output and export trade. In 1967 the United States was able to terminate all A.I.D. assistance to Israel.

*Korea*

Korea is an example of a country rapidly nearing the "take-off" point of economic progress. The Republic's *industrial output* increased an estimated 28 percent during 1968 over the previous year. *Overall growth*, as measured by the gross national product, has averaged almost 11 percent annually in real terms over the past four years. *Exports* have jumped from $119 million in 1964 to $460 million in 1968—a yearly increase of 40 percent.

The Republic has mobilized domestic capital for development by increased taxation and private savings programs; *government revenue* has increased from seven percent of the gross national product in 1964 to 13.7 percent in 1968.

FOOD AND POPULATION

Food and population are two top priority problems. We are moving with alarming speed toward having too many mouths to feed. Producing more food is one half of the battle.

In a message to the Congress in July, President Nixon pointed out that at present rates of population growth, the earth will contain over seven billion human beings by the end of this century, and that these increases are highest in the developing countries. In these areas, he pointed out, "we often find rates of natural increase higher than any which have been experienced in all of human history. With their birth rates remaining high and with death rates dropping sharply, many countries of Latin America, Asia, and Africa now grow ten times as fast as they did a century ago." We already see tragic results of this in malnutrition, under-employment, under-education, and a variety of adverse elements which go to make up a miserable standard of living. Family planning is now, and must continue to be, a key factor in plans to advance human progress.

Food aid from nations like the United States, which grow more food than they consume, can bridge the food gap to some extent. Markets for American farmers will continue to expand as population grows and world development occurs with resultant purchasing power. But donated food aid is the least desirable and least dependable answer to the problem anyway.

The right answer is to help these countries grow more food themselves. This we do. We encourage and help them expand their food production in every way we know how. We help finance exports of US-made chemical fertilizer to the developing nations. We offer incentives to American companies to construct fertilizer plants in the developing countries. We promote and support policies that will get fertilizer distributed to farmers at prices and on credit terms they can afford. We help and encourage the developing countries to maintain prices that give farmers incentives to grow more food, and to produce goods which farmers can buy with their higher income.

We also help the developing countries acquire and use the new miracle seeds. They are doubling and tripling yields of wheat and rice in India, Pakistan, Turkey and the Philippines. In 1967, these new seeds were planted on 3 million Asian acres. Last year the total was 20 million, and by the end of this year it could go up to 25 or 30 million acres.

People can have plenty of food and still starve if the food lacks vital nutritional qualities. In many developing nations protein is the vital missing ingredient. That is why A.I.D. is sponsoring research to improve the protein content of wheat, rice and corn, and why A.I.D. encourages tapping the resources of the oceans—which can supply four times the amount of seafood being harvested now.

Many developing countries, given interim but sustained outside assistance, can achieve food self-sufficiency. In 1968, the developing nations of the free world produced 335 million tons of grain, an increase of about 26 percent over the 1960 harvest.

EDUCATION

Economic progress in the developing nations can only inch along when three out of five grown people can't read or write. Education is one key to development. That is why A.I.D. is helping education in the developing countries—with seventeen million textbooks distributed through A.I.D. programs last year and almost 23 million students enrolled in A.I.D. assisted schools.

ENTERPRISE

This year's aid legislation would set up a separate Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) to get more U.S. private capital and business know-how more deeply and effectively involved in the development process. OPIC would take over and build on AID's present developing country investment incentives—helping to identify, promote, insure, guaranty and finance private projects which contribute to the economic and social development of two-thirds of the world's people living in less-developed countries.

The basic idea of OPIC—which has been widely endorsed by business and other private groups, government officials and Congressional panels—is to bring U.S. business management into a new partnership with responsible U.S. foreign economic policy officials. Working closely with the Department of State and the Agency for International Development, the new Corporation will more fully engage the resources of private outside capital and will stimulate private initiatives within the developing countries.

Can we afford to assist international development at a time when the United States is confronted by pressing problems of *domestic* development? The answer is clear. We have already learned at home the price a society pays for ignoring the problems of the disadvantaged—for telling the poor and hungry that they must wait. At home we can no longer segregate ourselves from the problems of the poor. In today's world, the advanced countries can no longer isolate themselves from the problems of the developing countries. Beyond this, the American people are already spending for the domestic welfare about thirty times as much each year as we spend for improving the well-being of all the rest of the world put together.

What is the connection between foreign aid and foreign policy? Some people persist in the notion that foreign aid is somehow supposed to buy friends for the United States. The fact is that it couldn't, even if we wanted it to. Aid will not win votes for the U.S. in the U.N. Aid cannot even be counted on to earn us the gratitude of the people and governments it helps.

But votes and gratitude are not the point. We are looking for progress. We are helping the poor two-thirds of the world because it is right. Hunger is wrong. Ignorance, disease and hopelessness are wrong.

And we are helping because the best interests of the United States are involved. Immediately after World War II it was very much in our interest to help re-construct the war-ravaged economies of Western Europe. In the 1950s we were concerned with security—particularly the security of the countries rimming the Sino-Soviet bloc from Turkey to Korea. Most of our aid in those years went to help build a shield against direct Communist pressure.

The emphasis in the 1960s has been on development, and once again, our national interest is involved. In the Age of Apollo, we live in a tight little world. The developing nations are our new neighbors. They are going to change whether we like it or not, and it is in the interest of the United States to support constructive change. If the Indias and the Pakistans have only hunger and ignorance and disease to look forward to, the odds on their holding together as nations will grow very long indeed. So will the chances for international stability and peace. Hungry people are angry people. "Development," Pope Paul has said, "is the new name for peace." The development progress of countries in Asia, Latin America and Africa has direct bearing on the long-term security interests of the United States. This is a fact of international life today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and also unanimous consent that the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA) be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEPPER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to join with my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL), in discussing the laudable efforts of the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation and its Young World Development effort.

I believe that when future historians look back on the decade of the 1960's, they will reflect that one of the most significant features of those 10 years was the growing awareness and increasing involvement of America's young people in the problems of their country and the world. Certainly the 1968 presidential campaign was conclusive proof of both the commitment and the potency of a younger generation painfully aware of the problems which their country faced and strongly committed to finding solutions. It is in this perspective that the Young World Development effort takes on added significance.

The Freedom From Hunger Foundation and the Young World Development project seek to focus attention on the blight that is hunger. In addition, during its recent conference in my home city of Chicago, YWD members discussed the closely related problems of population control and pollution control. As YWD's director, Jack Healy, noted—

The personal determination needed to stem these human problems must be deep; I read this determination on the faces present. . . . We have just begun to fight.

Perhaps most relevant to this body, delegates composed a letter to one of our colleagues, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL), expressing their view of what Congress' role in the fight against hunger, overpopulation and pollution should be:

Our challenge to Congress is this: Young World Development will work with and support those Congressmen who are aware and fighting for effective action; we will also do everything in our power to make those who deny the fact of hunger in their states see the growing crisis created by their blindness.

The challenge of responding to hunger in America and throughout the world, perhaps more than any other single issue, is the one which Congress must meet if it is to maintain its relevance and respectability in the eyes of this Nation's young people—the citizens and voters of tomorrow. Because the moral imperative is so clear, this is not an issue which we can any longer evade; we must respond whether it is in the form of a food stamp bill, assistance to Biafran refugees, or economic—as opposed to military—assistance to underdeveloped nations. I urge my colleagues to respond to these challenges with compassion, with a sense of urgency, and with the money and material necessary to help solve the problem of hunger in hunger in America and the world.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to associate myself with the remarks of my fellow Iowan and colleague, Mr. SCHWENGEL.

Eastern Iowans are particularly proud of the Young World Development Program, both because of the early active involvement of the young people of our area, and because of the leadership which has been provided by the executive director of the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation, Leonard G. Wolf, a former Representative of the Second Congressional District of Iowa.

During the time that I have been in Congress, I have had the repeated opportunity to visit all of the 82 public and parochial high schools in the Second District. I am very much aware of and impressed by the deep concern these students have about the critical human and social problems this country and the world face today.

Their own personal involvement in researching local projects which need assistance, in developing plans for their walks and the distribution of funds, in participating in the marches and in regional and national conferences with other cocerned youth, have given these young people an opportunity to publicly demonstrate their concern and to translate it into positive action.

Aurora, Iowa—a town with a population of less than 250 in my district—is the smallest community in the country to take the initiative in organizing such a march. More than 130 young people, some of them only 10 years old, participated in the walk there last June, which earned $6,800 to aid a migrant action program in Mason City, Iowa, and a United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization project in Madagascar.

Several of the young people involved in the walk have gone on to help coordinate walks in other Iowa communities.

Cedar Rapids—the largest city in my district with a population of well over 100,000—was the site of an equally impressive march in September, which brought $7,800 to assist a local credit union project for low-income families and an Andean Foundation rural development project in Peru.

Other walks are being planned in the district for later this spring. In addition, our area was the site of one of the first regional workshops on the Young World Development Program, a seminar which brought young people from five Midwestern States to a youth camp in Strawberry Point.

The activities of these highly motivated young men and women have drawn the attention of their parents, the press, and their communities. This public awareness of the problems of hunger and poverty, which they have stimulated by their own involvement, may be every bit as important in the final resolution of these problems as the actual money which they raise.

I join my colleagues in the House in commending their efforts and expressing our admiration.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join with my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL) in calling attention to these Young World Developers. Their organization, I understand, grew directly from the American Freedom from Hunger Foundation's Walks for Development, a program which was pioneered in Fargo, N. Dak., and Moorhead, Minn., back in September 1968. More than 3,000 young people participated in the "walk," netting more than $25,000. Certainly, this kind of program involving young people in combating the problems of hunger and malnutrition at home and abroad, is worthy of our attention and plaudits.

I wish to place in the RECORD at this point, an article from the War on Hunger publication which tells how the young people in Fargo and Moorhead made their outstanding contribution for an agricultural training program for rural youth in Dahomey in West Africa and to provide nutrition and health education training for residents of the four Indian reservations in North Dakota:

WALK FOR DEVELOPMENT

A demonstration of "foot power" to help relieve hunger at home and abroad netted more than $25,000 for the American Freedom from Hunger Foundation in a unique campaign held in the twin cities of Fargo, N.D., and Moorhead, Minn., in late September.

The "Walk for Development", aimed at raising money for both an agricultural training program for rural youth in Dahomey in West Africa, and providing nutrition and health education training for four Indian reservations in North Dakota, drew more than 3,000 participants, 650 of whom walked the entire 33 miles through the streets of Fargo and Moorhead on Sept. 28.

Pledge cards were made out by donors in the Fargo-Moorhead area to pay each walker so much per mile. Sponsors ranged from grade school children to downtown merchants, civic associations and service organizations. Teachers persuaded their classes to sponsor walkers at the rate of a few pennies per student in grade school for every mile walked by each participant. High schools and colleges pledged larger amounts, and multiple pledges were encouraged. One Fargo high school girl who went the distance appeared to have the highest record of pledges, with a total income of $16.50 per mile.

NICE DAY FOR A WALK

It was a bright, brisk day for walking. Restaurants, drive-ins and drugstores in the twin city area reported an extra heavy "walk-in" trade, and the statisticians on hand estimated that 7,800 plastic bandages were dispensed, chiefly to soothe blisters.

Words of encouragement came to the walkers as they set out. Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey sent a telegram expressing his pride in the young people for their "growing sense of purpose and . . . unselfishness to those less fortunate. You have a commitment to a worthy cause. America must lead in bringing forth a new prosperity to the developing world. My thoughts will be with you as you walk your 33 miles. I know your steps are the beginning of a long journey—a journey which will end hunger and disease throughout the world."

Dr. H. Brooks James, AID's Assistant Administrator for War on Hunger, told the youthful participants in the walk they had "enlisted in a new army, together with your sisters and brothers and friends to fight against man's oldest enemies—famine and pestilence, malnutrition and disease. You can be sure your cause is just.

"You do not face the same dangers and uncertainties as the pioneers who settled these lands. But your commitment is not less, for it is a total commitment of self. You are here because you care. You are here because this is your frontier. I congratulate you. I salute you and wish you every success as you go out and tell the world what America is all about."

FIRST IN THE UNITED STATES

The Fargo-Moorhead walk was the first held in the United States by the Freedom from Hunger Foundation, patterned after similar activities in Canada. Executive Director Leonard Wolf, a former AID official and Congressman, said the Foundation plans to spread the "Walk for Development" project throughout the United States, with as many as 100 walks scheduled to begin next summer.

Wolf was among the walkers in the Fargo-Moorhead hike, earning $5 a mile pledged by Robert Nathan, head of the Freedom from Hunger Foundation. The one-time Congressman lasted 24 miles. Robert Moses, the Foundation's director of youth activities and a native of Fargo, walked the complete 33-mile route. Two Catholic nuns completed 19 miles.

Bill Schlossman, Jr., a senior at Fargo South High School and a coordinating director of the walk, said he was tired of hearing young people being downgraded. "We are walking *for* something instead of *against* something," he said. Jackie Voss, a senior at Fargo North High School, chimed in: "This is a walk, not a march or a protest or a demonstration. It is hard for us in Fargo-Moorhead to comprehend the problem of hunger, and we hope the walk will help us become aware of it."

Schlossman, along with two other walk participants, Fargo high school seniors Tom Dawson, and Dale Buford, later presented a check for $10,000 to Addeke H. Boerma, chief of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, at UN headquarters in New York on Oct. 22, to be turned over to Dahomey to help launch an agricultural

training program. Another $10,000, earned by the Fargo-Moorhead hikers, will be used for a nutrition program among North Dakota Indian tribes, and the remainder will help finance Freedom from Hunger information campaigns.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, in their quest for excitement and challenge, the young people in America, particularly the teenagers, have developed many different ways to express themselves. Some of the methods they have used have been destructive and senseless. Others have been constructive and highly valuable to society.

In the past 12 months alone, teenagers and college students in no fewer than 16 States have raised well over $800,000 to help hungry people in this country and overseas. More than 120,000 students have marched in the streets—not in protest but in support of programs designed to help poor and undereducated people make a living for themselves.

I rise to point out the tremendous effort made by the youngsters who have participated in "Walks for Development" all over this country. Sponsored by the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation, the "walks" are designed to allow these youths to actively participate in a movement that seeks to help others end their own hunger by improving their ability to produce food.

I am proud to point out that the first "walk" of this kind was held in the twin cities of Fargo, N. Dak., and Moorhead, Minn., in September of 1968. At that time, 3,500 people walked 33 miles to raise $24,000. The money went to Dahomey, West Africa, for a nutrition clinic and North Dakota for a program among American Indians.

Since that day, almost $1 million has been raised in similar marches everywhere. They have involved 150,000 students. More than a million people have offered to sponsor a marcher.

The system works this way: A sponsor is secured who will promise to pay a certain amount of money to the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation for every mile walked. The money is then given to agencies selected in advance by the students themselves.

More than just serving as a constructive way for young people, those who have developed a new awareness of the needs of their fellow men, to use their energy and their talent constructively, the "Walks for Development" have given leaders wide experience in handling crowds, dealing with municipal governments for permits and regulations, arranging for press relations and publicity, and leadership. Students have been the ones who research the many agencies claiming to fight poverty in this country and claiming to work for development in poor nations around the world to determine who will be the beneficiary of their marches. The funds are evenly split between domestic and foreign agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the young people who have so eagerly accepted the challenge of the poor and hungry people in America and abroad. I am doubly proud of the organization, the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation, for capturing the imagination of these restless teenagers. But I am most proud to say that it began in a community which I serve, in Fargo-Moorhead.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my praise for the outstanding efforts of the Young World Developers to combat the problems of hunger and malnutrition at home and abroad. The actions of these young people through their walks for development demonstrate their concern for the serious problems our Nation and the world must confront. The idealism and energy of these youths have served as a catalyst in their communities, where young and old cooperate to tackle the social ills of society.

In my own district last year, 1,500 of these fine young men and women held a walk for development in Palm Springs, Calif. This was the fifth walk in America and raised almost $11,000 for the benefit of a Palm Springs English as a second language program and a day-care center for low-income families in Thermal, Calif. We are proud of these youths.

At a time when many people are critical of the youth of this country, the public spirit and social concern of these young people bode well for the future of our great Nation.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, anybody who has lived long enough to get elected to Congress is—and should be—suspicious of organizations such as Young World Development and the American Freedom from Hunger Foundation. Every one of us has seen organizations such as these, started and fostered by do-gooders and idealists, shine brightly for a time; then we have seen the members lose interest, and lose a little of their idealism, too.

These two associated endeavors may have that kind of a history. Who can say, one way or the other?

While they are active, however, they are attracting the energies of a lot of fine young people in the 14th District of Illinois, which I represent. If this is a short-lived effort, the world will be a little better place for its having come along.

If, on the other hand, it continues to attract the interest and the impossible dreams of these youngsters, it may well make a big contribution to the feeding of the hungry.

We in Government have been less than 100 percent successful in ending poverty. I suggest that we should give every encouragement to those who want to use their own energies and their own initiatives in helping to alleviate the misery of their less fortunate contemporaries.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is a singular privilege for me to participate with the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL) today in commending the Young World Development program, and supporting these constructive-minded young people in their mobilization to abolish hunger and malnutrition in America.

In this regard, my privilege is very special because it was a fine young people's group from Eureka, Calif., in my own congressional district, which recently provided a new kind of leadership in this youth mobilization for a better America. They are, of course, a part of the Young World Development program that we are commending here today.

Last January 12, my good friend and colleague from Illinois, Mr. FINDLEY, made a statement that was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, entitled "Food Enterprises for Poor People." It was a very interesting and challenging piece which described and complimented the role played by the Food Business Center in the recent White House Conference on Food and Nutrition.

It is not, however, generally known—even Representative FINDLEY did not know at the time—that this fine piece of work by the Food Business Center in behalf of better foods and nutrition for poor people was supported financially by the Eureka, Calif., "Young People's Walk for Development Group."

But there is an even deeper significance to this whole chain of events, to which I wish to call your attention.

It is the fact that the young people of my district were joined by two major food companies in their food conference project, in which they invested $3,000 of their own money. They raised that money through one of these "Walks for Development." They invested half of it in an overseas project to feed hungry people abroad, and the balance went into this very worthwhile White House Food Conference project that earned the praise of so many people.

The food companies involved—and we should applaud them also—are the Archer Daniels Midland Co. and General Foods Corp., both of whom have been demonstrating a practical and meaningful concern for improving foods and nutrition among the disadvantaged and deprived people of America; particularly among minority groups.

These companies were, in part, inspired by the commitment of the young people from Eureka, in the food conference project, and they responded by their own assistance in it. To me, this is an outstanding example of an effective partnership that makes a lot of sense as we look for new approaches, new ideas, and new resources in improving foods and nutrition in America, especially for poor people.

Young people and progressive-minded food companies working together, are—I submit—a fascinating potential that we should encourage in all possible ways as we try to solve the hunger problem and other controversial and complex problems facing our Nation today.

In my judgment, it is absolutely incredible that a nation with an annual agricultural surplus should, at the same time, be faced with problems of hunger and malnutrition. Not only is it incredible, but it is also totally unacceptable and I heartily applaud those of this young generation who have dedicated themselves to helping resolve this paradox.

Such organizations as the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation, and the new Food Business Center to help bring in the private food companies, have a vital role, I feel, in helping these

voluntary programs and projects to be successful.

In this instance, the AFFHF is challenging the young people of America to accept responsibility, and to undertake their own individual projects. The foundation offers a way for young people and youth groups to raise money to finance their chosen projects—at home or abroad—in the hunger and food fields.

It was the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation that challenged the young people of my district, and they raised $6,900 in one "Walk for Development" which supported these two valuable projects I have mentioned. This spring, I am told, there will be some 200 of these "Walks for Development," conducted as part of the Young World Development program we are commending today. This will involve over 500,000 young Americans in thoroughly constructive activities that will give them an investment and a personal stake in a better future and a better America.

On May 5, the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation will hold its third annual dinner, recognizing "Freedom From Hunger Month," which will be in progress at that time. The theme of that dinner will be: "Freedom From Hunger at Home and Abroad."

It is my hope that many of us may find ways to actively support this whole program and effort. Quite frankly, I would like to see our private food companies and other private organizations participate by enabling these young people to attend and be honored at that dinner. It would be an excellent way to show our appreciation to young Americans who have demonstrated the realism and provided the leadership in this Young World Development program.

Let us also bear in mind that the second World Food Conference will be held at The Hague in June. We in America, under President Nixon's leadership in the food and nutrition fields, have earned new credentials, I feel, for making a valuable contribution to that conference.

Without the dedication and commitment of these fine young people of the Young World Development program, our credentials, and our contribution, would be less.

In closing, I wish to honor and commend the young people of Eureka, Calif., for their fine participation, and I herewith pledge my continuing support for this most constructive and worthwhile undertaking.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my name to the growing list of friends and supporters of the Young World Development.

After participating in a YWD walk in Buffalo, N.Y. and witnessing the dedication and enthusiasm of YWD members, I am unable to thank this group of young people enough. In its program to involve the American people in the crusade against hunger at home and abroad, the Young World Development deserves the encouragement of Congress, the Nation and, indeed, the world. I applaud your efforts and pray that they will serve as inspiration and guidance to all of us.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to participate in Congressman SCHWENGEL's program today in recognition of the work of the Young World Development program and the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation. Aside from my personal interest, the citizens of Dane County, Wis., which I represent, have done particularly outstanding work in connection with this foundation, which is, incidentally, directed by my good friend, Len Wolf, a native of Dane County and a former Member of Congress from Iowa.

The Young World Development statement of purpose resolved that, "The time for feeling 'deep concern' about hunger, environmental abuse and overpopulation is past. We can only be true to ourselves and the world, by taking action." The work of the youth of Madison as pioneer participants in the Young World Development program exemplifies the spirit of the resolution I have quoted. They have sponsored two "Walks for Development," the first in November of 1968 and the second in October of 1969, making Madison the first city in the country to have done so. In those two walks, they have raised nearly $100,000 for the projects they have chosen to support, the largest amount raised in this manner by any city with the exception of Buffalo, N.Y.

These figures, however, do not truly convey the nature of what these young people and their sponsors—who pledge contributions based on the number of miles walked by the participant—have accomplished for themselves, their community, and the projects they have chosen to support.

One of the outstanding features of the Young World Development program is that the participants themselves choose, on the basis of a number of criteria, the projects they will support by their "Walk." For their first walk, the young people of Madison showed their awareness of problems in Wisconsin itself by raising money for a wild rice production and marketing cooperative being developed by the Great Lakes Inter-tribal Council in northern Wisconsin. At the present time, 95 percent of the wild rice produced in Wisconsin is marketed by white people, and this project is an assertion by the Indians themselves of their historic right to control both the production and the marketing of their product.

For their international project, the youth contributed an equal sum of money for the purchase of an irrigation pump which now pumps a 16-inch stream of water 24 hours a day to irrigate formerly dry areas of Ecuador.

During their second walk, Madison raised nearly $70,000, and 42½ percent of that amount is being used in a Madison measure-for-measure project for the purchase of land and farm machinery for a cooperative farm in Sunflower and Bolivar Counties, in the delta area of Mississippi. Those in charge of the cooperative hope to be able to produce articles for resale, and thereby create job opportunities in this area in which unemployment among the black community averages 75 percent, and, during the wintertime, 60 percent among all adult males. For their international project, Madison youth walked in tandem with the youth of Kiel, Germany, for a World Food and Agricultural Organization program to purchase mechanization and refrigeration equipment for the development of the fishing industry on Lake Chad in the country of Chad, Africa.

The quantitative achievements I have outlined are matched in importance, however, by the changing of attitudes, and by the growing awareness in the Madison community of the real nature and extent of the problems of hunger, poverty, and world development. By working through the news media and through the high school curriculum, interest in the program has not only been maintained, but it has grown tremendously. The fact that the second walk raised nearly $70,000, or 2⅓ times as much money as the first, is striking evidence of the community's concern.

The current coordinator of the Madison program is Bob Peterson, a Madison native and a student at the University of Wisconsin. He tells me that currently they are participating in Senator NELSON's teach-in program on environmental problems, population growth, and hunger. In addition, he and his colleagues are involved in organizing a statewide "Walk for Development" to be held this coming May 17 in participating communities all over the State.

I feel that the Young World Development program is an outstanding one, and I am justifiably proud of the extent to which the people of Madison have demonstrated the validity of the idea behind it: That each person has a responsibility to educate himself on the nature of the problem of hunger and to act constructively to attack the causes of the conditions that exist.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today; namely, eliminating hunger from America.

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

There was no objection.

## THE SONIC BOOM AND AIRCRAFT NOISE RECOVERY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEPPER). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, for millions of Americans living in the path of jet aircraft and victimized by impaired hearing and property damage, there is no legal recourse—the courts will not touch jet noise. That is why I am today introducing a bill to protect the public against expected damage from sonic boom or other aircraft noise.

Lawsuits amounting to billions of dollars have been pending against the major airports for a decade, deterring other plaintiffs; and the new Federal jet noise regulation does not offer real re-

lief from the relentless roar of turbojet engines. The bill I am introducing, the Sonic Boom and Aircraft Noise Recovery Act, provides for recovering damages for personal injury or property loss by establishing a fund so an injured party can bring suit where present laws do not provide grounds for recovery for such damage or injury.

The bill not only provides for public compensation against injury or damage, but serves as an incentive for manufacturers and airlines to reduce noise pollution and the hazards of sonic boom. Civil and commercial airlines would pay their share of the costs of damages occasioned by their operation of supersonic aircraft in such a way that a damaged party could recover his losses without costly and burdensome legal procedures. The damage fund would be operated by the Secretary of Transportation, who would set up rules establishing the basis of recovery as well as contributions to the fund.

With the increase in the number of airports equipped to accept jet aircraft; with the increase in the number of aircraft landing and taking off from those airports which already have jet service; and with the increase in noise predicted to be a byproduct of the future and larger airplanes now on the drawing-boards, the public will demand a greater control of jet noise pollution.

As they have in the past, many will seek just compensation for the alleged damage done themselves or their property as a result of noise created by sonic boom or low-flying aircraft.

Hundreds of suits against aircraft noise are pending throughout the country. For example, last summer Inglewood, Calif., residents living near Los Angeles International Airport filed suit for $1.4 billion in damages, claiming that jet noise created "nerve and economic disturbances of a permanent nature."

Over the past 25 years the average increase in the noise level has been 1 decibel per year. When you consider that a level of 85 decibels is all that is necessary to cause ear damage, it will not be very many years before the noise level in this country becomes lethal.

The age of mass transportation came upon us so fast that many of the subsequent problems which developed might well have been avoidable if we could have had the benefit of advance planning.

But now we have the opportunity to learn from the lessons of the past, and the most creative way to do this is to act before the fact by setting up a means whereby the public will be protected from the problems of sonic boom and aircraft noise damage.

My bill will set up a fund whereby an injured party can bring suit where present laws do not provide grounds for recovery for such damage or injury.

At present there are few grounds on which a person can successfully recover damages resulting from aircraft noise. The use of the injunction is of no avail because the closing down of a major airport would wreak havoc throughout the world. The development of local ordinances against noise has been stricken down by the Supreme Court on the grounds that Congress has preempted the rights of States in this area and therefore Congress is the only body which has authority in this area.

The Federal Tort Claims Act is only useful if the aircraft is owned and operated by the Federal Government.

The need for such a law, then, is that there are few grounds on which people can successfully recover damages from aircraft noise. Most courts would not touch these cases. The concept of strict liability is no longer acceptable because flying is no longer legally considered an "ultra-hazardous" activity. And the law of eminent domain is only partially successful—some States have accepted the idea that flying over a person's land is a "taking" of that land but others say it must be a physical taking. That leaves the grounds of negligence, which is very difficult to prove since you must show a clear causal connection between the noise and the damage.

The bill calls for the creation of a damage fund to be administered by the Secretary of Transportation and provides a system of payment of damages causes to either property or individuals by excessive aircraft noise. It further gives the Secretary of Transportation the authority to hold hearings and determine the amounts due each of the claimants.

A large portion of the money for this fund will come from payments made into it by the civil airlines. The bill also provides an incentive to each airline operator in the form of possible lower premium payments into the fund if his airline insists on aircraft that have been designed and engineered so as to reduce the possibility of noise.

Broad general powers are given to the Secretary of Transportation in establishing rates for both civil and public aircraft. Payments into the fund, in the case of public aircraft, will be accomplished through appropriations, which the act authorizes.

The act further provides that the Secretary of Transportation shall pay the claimant the amount to which he would have been entitled under the law of the place where the damages were caused, had they been caused by negligence. Both personal and property damages are covered.

The act also provides the claimant a variety of remedial procedures. He may proceed under State law and pursue whatever remedies are available, or he may make his claim against the fund. If he chooses to proceed against the fund, he must assign all rights he may have against any person or corporation who may have a legal liability to pay for the damages, caused; however, any excess, recovered by the Secretary, over the amount paid by the fund and costs, shall be paid to the claimant.

With a half million takeoffs and landings yearly at Kennedy Airport in New York, O'Hare in Chicago and Los Angeles International Airport, local residents are being hammered by the shrill whine of jet noise. But our present jet noise problem is a mere shadow of the difficulties we can expect when supersonic aircrafts start smashing through the sound barrier as they sweep from coast to coast.

During the 90th Congress I cosponsored the 1968 Aircraft Noise Abatement Act, which instructed the FAA to issue regulations for the abatement of aircraft noise. It has now been 18 months since the act went into effect. Little has been done to implement it.

Last November, the FAA issued a new regulation which established noise standards for new subsonic aircraft. There are a great number of things lacking in the new regulations:

It does not apply to planes already flying; nor does it apply to the new 747 jumbo jets until sometime in the future.

Additionally, once new planes are inspected and certificated as meeting the noise level requirements, they are not again subject to reinspection. Some engineers have expressed the concern that the new antisound devices to be used on aircraft may wear out and not be replaced.

There also is a great deal of question as to whether the 108 EPNdB—effective perceived noise decibels—level established by the regulation is low enough. It may not be acceptable to those living near our airports.

In addition, no regulation has been issued about ground activities of jets. Taxiing and the revving up of engines during repairs are a major source of irritation and complaints. And the FAA has not even touched the noise problem for the SST.

I am also greatly concerned with the noise level which is measured in decibels. Many jets now emit noise at level of 150 decibels which can cause permanent damage. Indeed, doctors say anything over 85 decibels can be harmful, yet the new regulation for the Boeing 747 is 108 decibels.

The jet noise problem will be alleviated for sometime to come. Until present aircraft are replaced with new, quieter models, quite probably there will be an increase in the noise level. Development of the quiet engine is still more than 5 years away. Even then it will cut noise levels at landing and takeoff by only 10 percent unless there is a major technological breakthrough. The result will be a corresponding increase in the number of lawsuits and claims made by the affected parties.

This act provides a means of recovery for these parties, provides added incentive for the airlines to reduce excessive sound emission, and is a necessary companion to the now ineffective application of the 1968 Aircraft Noise Abatement Act.

---

## WELL DESERVED TRIBUTE TO MR. C. RUGGLES SMITH

(Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I address the House and extend my remarks to include a very fine tribute to Mr. C. Ruggles Smith, so long associated with

our great Brandeis University in my district.

This eloquent tribute was rendered by a very able, distinguished friend and gifted writer, Mr. Emanuel Goldberg, in his "State of Affairs" column of the Jewish Times, and he has most appropriately and feelingly referred to Mr. Smith's memorable contributions to this great university in my district, of which I am so proud.

I am pleased indeed to associate myself with the comments and views so well expressed by Mr. Goldberg concerning the long, faithful, and efficient service of Mr. Smith to Brandeis. This fine gentleman was associated with Brandeis for years, even before the advent of that great educational leader and former illustrious president, Dr. Sachar, and I am very happy indeed that Mr. Goldberg has so fittingly recognized the wonderful service of Mr. Smith to Brandeis in the celebrated publication, the Jewish Times.

I extend to Mr. Smith and his family, my heartiest congratulations upon his outstanding work for Brandeis, and wish for him and his dear ones all choicest blessings of continued good health, success, prosperity and peace for many years to come.

To Mr. Goldberg, I express my compliments and appreciation for his fine, thoughtful remarks lauding Mr. Smith which follow:

[From the Jewish Times, Jan. 22, 1970]

C. RUGGLES SMITH CLOSES THE DOOR

(By Emanuel Goldberg)

The other day, a friend at Brandeis told me that C. Ruggles Smith had retired, slipping out unobtrusively one day before the anticipated final one on December 31st.

Not even a conventional office farewell could be sprung on the Special Assistant for Legal Counsel, who was at the campus in Waltham before Dr. Sachar arrived—the son of the founder of Middlesex University, the last President himself of that controversial institution, and the fortuitous human link between the dream of a Brandeis and its actual fulfillment.

For it was Ruggles Smith in 1947 who contacted a New York group headed by Rabbi Israel Goldstein and, later, Albert Einstein, who were interested in establishing a Jewish-sponsored, non-sectarian university somewhere in this nation, and offered the 90 acre campus and plant of Middlesex, which was about to close its doors.

Somewhere in the archives of the University is the famous missive of Mr. Smith which set in motion the series of negotiations which culminated in the birth of Brandeis. In fact, if my memory is correct, the first public mention of an institution of higher learning called Brandeis came in Ruggles Smith's own penned "class-note" for his Harvard alumni publication.

Not many people know it but, over the years, Mr. Smith maintained relationship between Brandeis and Middlesex alumni, the later mostly physicians of Jewish persuasion who, a couple of decades back, were widely denied access to Grade A medical schools because of religious quotas or outright intolerance. Ruggles was in the forefront of those who defied the A.M.A., the local medical societies, the hospitals and other segments of the Medical Establishment of his day, and Middlesex admitted any competent and qualified student. Some very fine physicians in this nation, who overcame educational handicaps and later inadequate hospital affiliations, still practice only because Middlesex existed. A close friend of mine, now one of New England's leading cardiologists and researchers, had an "insurance policy" admission to Middlesex in his pocket on the day that classes opened at one of the famous schools in Boston. He didn't know that he was "in" the latter institution until the very last moment—and, to this day, suspects that it was his Jewish faith that mounted the terrible suspense and agony.

Another fact that is not generally known involves the Charter which Brandeis University inherited from Middlesex University (Brandeis could actually have retained the Middlesex name if it wished). One section contained the clause: "No officer or instructor in said university shall ever be required by the trustees to profess any particular religious opinions as a test of office, and no student shall be refused admission to or denied any of the privileges, honors, or degrees of said college on account of the religious opinions he may entertain."

Even if Brandeis had not become the liberal institution it is today, it would have been bound by this clause in the Middlesex charter—which, in turn, was entered before the Commonwealth of Massachusetts had enacted its own Fair Education Practices Act.

There'll always be a "party" in the hearts of Ruggles Smith's multitude of friends. A graduate of Harvard, Harvard Law School, and, oddly enough, the Pulitzer School of Journalism at Columbia University, he is a very young 65, who, despite impeccable credentials, always knocked the stodgy establishment long before the present radical young generation was born. He still loves rich desserts, can shock even sophisticated Brandeis scholars with his candour, and maintains articulate contempt for the young unwashed intolerants and the old, overkempt phonies.

He and his gracious wife have sold their home in Wellesley and settled in Sandwich where, according to his long faithful secretary, Mrs. Naomi Cherny, a flourishing law practice is unexpectedly evolving. Good lawyers are as rare as good plumbers beyond the Bourne Bridge in the Cape Cod winters.

Anyway, we wish him and his family many more years of happiness and productivity. The Jewish community, and higher education generally, owes this Christian gentleman a great debt.

---

## TEXAS FOOD-AID COURT ORDER SHOULD STAND

(Mr. FINDLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include tables.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture should withdraw its opposition to a court order requiring that Federal food-aid programs for poor families be established immediately in 88 Texas counties.

I suggested this action in a letter mailed yesterday to Agriculture Secretary Clifford Hardin.

On December 30, 1969, the District Court for the Northern District of Texas in Dallas added its weight to the growing concern of those who would, to use President Nixon's phrase, "put an end to hunger in America for all time."

The court ordered that the commodity distribution program should "immediately" be put into effect, "in the shortest time feasible and at Federal expense" in 88 Texas counties which have no Federal food-aid program. The court further stated:

As an outside limit, the Federal defendants in every Texas area that has no Food Stamp Program, must put into effect the Commodity Distribution Program within sixty (60) days from January 5, 1970.

The Department of Agriculture has requested the Justice Department to ask the court for a stay in executing its order. The justification given has been the laudable desire by the Department of Agriculture to place Federal food-aid programs in cooperating counties willing to administer and finance the programs locally. This emphasis on the preservation of federalism is important, but in this case I suggest it be set aside in the interest of the hungry and malnourished people in the 88 counties.

My suggestion has urgency because this Friday, January 30, a hearing has been scheduled in Texas on the motion to postpone the court order.

In my view, local officials in Texas, like others elsewhere, have richly deserved pressures aimed at persuading them at long last to recognize minimal basic necessities for people in their jurisdictions by implementing Federal food-aid programs for poor families.

Even before the Federal court order, the Department had adequate justification to bring every possible pressure against these county governments. I am gratified by reports showing that during the past year the Department had actively been encouraging the missing counties to participate. It is to Secretary Hardin's credit that in fiscal 1969, for the first time in over a decade, every penny of the section 32 funds available for implementing surplus distribution programs has been spent by the Department of Agriculture, and none was returned to the Treasury. As recently as 1968, well over $200 million available for this food-aid program went unspent by Washington.

After a year's renewed effort, however, 88 Texas counties still have neither the food stamp nor the surplus distribution program. From this I would conclude that the cooperative spirit of the new federalism so admirably displayed by President Nixon and by the Agriculture Department has been frustrated and bankrupted by local county officials, not by officials in Washington.

Accordingly, I strongly urge that the Department withdraw opposition to the court order. In making this recommendation, I am aware that this will enable the county governments to escape the cost of administration. Conceivably, causing the court to withdraw the order might mean that one or more of these counties will voluntarily initiate food-aid programs and thus pay the cost of administration.

This probability must be evaluated in light of the long-standing, callous indifference of these officials to local poverty. They have resisted all pressures up to now, and are unlikely to acquire a social sensitivity in the next few months. Meanwhile, hunger and malnutrition continue. A few months may be but a speck of time for Government budget makers, but it can seem like an eternity for those without enough food on the table.

I make this suggestion for another reason, too.

Some aspects of the farm programs are in wide disrepute in the public mind and on Capitol Hill. Resentment against programs which permit large payments to individual farmers has grown over the years. This resentment is intensified by disclosure of payments totaling millions of dollars in the very counties which refuse to feed the hungry through participation in a Federal food-aid program. Congressmen, urban and rural alike, find it difficult to justify large payments to wealthy farmers for not growing food while many of their constituents go hungry.

Included in this statement is a list of the 88 Texas counties which still refuse to institute a food-aid program, together with data on the level of local poverty, as well as payments to farmers which exceeded $5,000. These statistics show convincingly the need for a realinement of priorities and justify the concern and resentment of Congressmen dissatisfied with farm programs inherited from previous administrations. They show in the 88 counties 187,907 hard-core poor, also 6,562 farmers, each of whom got over $5,000 in farm payments in 1969.

When I placed similar information in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in May of 1969—now almost 1 year ago—98 Texas counties were without any type of food-aid program, yet wealthy farmers in those counties were receiving huge farm payments. Lynn County, Tex., had the dubious distinction of having no program to feed 2,282 hard-core poor—about 25 percent of the county's population—while at the same time another 25 percent of the population constituted families which received $8,903,000 in Federal farm payments.

The next morning after I revealed these facts, the Dallas Morning News headlined the story "Texas Food-Aid Situation Decried." Today, I am very glad to report Lynn County has a Federal food-aid program. Thanks to the publicity and the persistent efforts of USDA since last May, Lynn County and nine other Texas counties have initiated food-aid programs.

Some progress has been made, but not enough. There are still too many "Lynn Counties" in Texas. In the case of Hartley County, which still has no food-aid program, if annual payments to individual farmers in excess of $5,000 were divided equally among the hard-core poor, each man, woman, and child would receive over $18,000. In two other counties, Armstrong and Sherman, each poor individual would receive over $14,000.

It has been 35 years since Congress first enacted a program to help feed the hungry in this country. It has been almost a year since the specific counties without food-aid programs received widespread publicity. Despite the passage of a third-century, and despite all the publicity, many counties obstinately refuse to help feed their poor, hungry, and malnourished citizens. Federal policies which permit hunger to exist alongside big Federal payments to keep wealthy farmers from growing food are bound to create resentment.

Therefore, I urge the Department to reconsider its position requesting a stay of execution of the court order, so that the Department can move immediately to begin implementing Federal food-aid programs in each Texas county which presently does not have one. I applaud Secretary Hardin for his goal to lodge at the local level primary responsibility for financing and control of the food-aid program, but involved here are die-hard political combines which obviously are sensitive neither to embarrassing publicity nor to the hunger of their needy constituents. The hungry should not have to wait for the resolution of differences between local, State, and Federal officials. They have waited long enough, as the commodity distribution program has been universally available since 1935.

Here is data on each of the 88 Texas counties:

88 TEXAS COUNTIES WITHOUT FEDERAL FOOD-AID PROGRAMS

| County | Population [1] | Hard-core poor [2] | 1969 farm subsidy payments which exceeded $5,000 | 1969 number of payees |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Andrews | 13,450 | 456 | $217,061 | 19 |
| Aransas | 7,006 | 1,148 | 35,241 | 3 |
| Archer | 6,110 | 509 | 107,643 | 13 |
| Armstrong | 1,966 | 80 | 1,137,279 | 122 |
| Bailey | 9,090 | 1,630 | 6,147,319 | 437 |
| Bandera | 3,892 | 768 | 0 | 0 |
| Baylor | 5,893 | 891 | 469,129 | 54 |
| Bell | 94,097 | 11,732 | 458,381 | 63 |
| Blanco | 3,657 | 795 | 0 | 0 |
| Borden | 1,076 | 108 | 564,905 | 58 |
| Bosque | 10,809 | 1,682 | 53,982 | 8 |
| Bowie | 59,971 | 11,724 | 763,836 | 33 |
| Briscoe | 3,577 | 777 | 2,764,718 | 219 |
| Castro | 8,923 | 2,457 | 9,226,764 | 590 |
| Chambers | (3) | (3) | 0 | 0 |
| Clay | 8,351 | 746 | 253,903 | 32 |
| Coleman | 12,458 | 2,087 | 204,218 | 32 |
| Collin | 41,247 | 6,353 | 1,200,446 | 139 |
| Collingsworth | 6,276 | 1,465 | 1,626,896 | 174 |
| Colorado | 18,463 | 4,307 | 168,458 | 16 |
| Concho | 3,672 | 811 | 253,337 | 30 |
| Coryell | 23,961 | 2,269 | 156,501 | 18 |
| Crane | 4,699 | 243 | 0 | 0 |
| Crockett | 4,209 | 527 | 5,560 | 1 |
| Deaf Smith | 13,187 | 2,718 | 8,574,532 | 526 |
| Denton | 47,432 | 3,699 | 344,345 | 39 |
| Donley | 4,449 | 584 | 753,240 | 87 |
| Ector | 90,995 | 6,929 | 24,451 | 2 |
| Edwards | 2,317 | 445 | 0 | 0 |
| Ellis | 43,395 | (3) | 2,040,625 | 208 |
| Erath | 16,236 | 2,021 | 6,146 | 1 |
| Fort Bend | 40,527 | 10,300 | 1,321,253 | 107 |
| Garza | 6,611 | 955 | 1,014,363 | 105 |
| Gillespie | 10,048 | 1,045 | 0 | 0 |
| Glasscock | 1,118 | 132 | 793,783 | 62 |
| Gray | 31,535 | 1,759 | 650,999 | 76 |
| Gregg | 69,436 | 10,051 | 0 | 0 |
| Hall | 7,322 | 1,675 | 2,731,283 | 265 |
| Hansford | 6,208 | 421 | 3,100,266 | 254 |
| Harrison | 45,594 | 11,785 | 0 | 0 |
| Hartley | 2,171 | 92 | 1,695,712 | 113 |
| Hood | 5,443 | 758 | 0 | 0 |
| Hopkins | 18,594 | 3,672 | 31,969 | 5 |
| Jack | 7,418 | 657 | 17,265 | 3 |
| Johnson | 34,720 | 2,865 | $376,288 | 39 |
| Kaufman | 29,931 | 5,837 | 772,315 | 64 |
| Kendall | 5,889 | 642 | 0 | 0 |
| Kenedy | (3) | (3) | 0 | 0 |
| Kerr | 16,800 | 1,709 | 0 | 0 |
| Lamar | 34,234 | 7,883 | 1,058,005 | 101 |
| Lampasas | 9,418 | 1,796 | 5,314 | 1 |
| Llano | 5,240 | 675 | 14,318 | 1 |
| Loving | (3) | (3) | 0 | 0 |
| McCulloch | 8,815 | 1,603 | 98,541 | 14 |
| McMullen | (3) | (3) | 5,513 | 1 |
| Mason | 3,780 | 943 | 6,475 | 1 |
| Menard | 2,964 | 847 | 0 | 0 |
| Mills | 4,467 | 835 | 14,786 | 2 |
| Navarro | 34,423 | 7,741 | 1,940,498 | 179 |
| Ochiltree | 9,380 | 375 | 1,572,658 | 173 |
| Oldham | 1,928 | 121 | 989,022 | 78 |
| Palo Pinto | 20,516 | 2,424 | 19,761 | 3 |
| Parmer | 9,583 | 1,376 | 10,592,987 | 734 |
| Presidio | (3) | (3) | 165,995 | 12 |
| Randall | 33,913 | 1,198 | 3,261,467 | 263 |
| Reagan | 3,782 | 415 | 105,324 | 12 |
| Reeves | 17,644 | 3,924 | 4,681,051 | 149 |
| Refugio | 10,975 | 3,154 | 497,751 | 59 |
| Roberts | 1,075 | 87 | 207,246 | 20 |
| Rockwall | 5,878 | 1,618 | 336,595 | 31 |
| Runnels | 15,016 | 3,027 | 948,836 | 128 |
| Rusk | 36,421 | 8,224 | 77,647 | 5 |
| San Saba | 6,381 | 1,535 | 23,687 | 4 |
| Shackelford | 3,990 | 307 | 78,690 | 8 |
| Sherman | 2,605 | 189 | 2,654,022 | 227 |
| Somervell | 2,577 | 508 | 7,370 | 1 |
| Stephens | 8,885 | 702 | 11,936 | 1 |
| Sterling | 1,177 | 196 | 5,099 | 1 |
| Sutton | 3,738 | 732 | 0 | 0 |
| Throckmorton | 2,767 | 149 | 204,295 | 24 |
| Uvalde | 16,814 | 4,860 | 104,599 | 10 |
| Van Zandt | 19,091 | 3,597 | 101,919 | 12 |
| Wheeler | 7,947 | 904 | 887,099 | 103 |
| Winkler | (3) | (3) | 0 | 0 |
| Wise | (3) | (3) | 0 | 0 |
| Wood | (3) | (3) | 0 | 0 |
| Yoakum | 8,032 | 691 | 2,081,019 | 164 |
| Young | 17,254 | 955 | 181,894 | 23 |

[1] Population data from 1960 census.

[2] Hard-core poor defined by the Office of Economic Opportunity as the number of persons having an income at or below $2,200 for a family of 4, per year, derived from 1960 census.

[3] Not available.

## MORATORIUM ON GRAZING FEE INCREASES—THE PUBLIC SHOULD BE HEARD

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the two faces of the Department of the Interior are plain to see. On the one hand, the Secretary states during a national television interview that "polluters should pay." Chalk up five conservation points for the Secretary and the public interest. On the other hand, the same Secretary declares a "moratorium" on public land grazing fee increases. Chalk up 10 points for the Secretary and private interests. Net score: 10 points for private interests; zero points for the public interest. The arithmetic is no stranger than the Secretary's decision matched against his conservationist-oriented public statements.

Talk about a "concern" for the Nation's environment costs nothing; declarations, plans, programs, and other bureaucratic mumbo-jumbo about protecting the environment are cheap. However, action such as the grazing fee moratorium decision is immediately chargeable against the public's account.

Mr. Speaker, our colleagues have been bombarded in the past few weeks by apologists for all those private interests who have applauded the Secretary's anti-public decision regarding our public lands. It is time the public's voice was heard. To begin the balancing of the "grazing fee controversy" I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues just a few of the comments I have received, spontaneously, from the public. The items below really speak for themselves but let me point out that they come from the very "backyard" of the private interests who have so loudly acclaimed the Secretary's moratorium.

This first is a copy of a letter from the Arizona Conservation Council addressed to Members of the other body along with a "position paper" regarding public land law review:

ARIZONA CONSERVATION COUNCIL,
*Scottsdale, Ariz., January 20, 1970.*

To the Honorable Senators ALLOTT, JORDAN, HANSEN, HATFIELD, BELLMON, and DOMINICK.

GENTLEMEN: We have learned that you were among seven Senators commending Secretary Hickel for his recent action in delaying the scheduled increase in price of grazing fees on lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management. The Arizona Conservation Council wishes you to know that it regards Secretary Hickel's action as a surrender to pressures by certain vasted interest groups and definitely not in the best interests of the American public.

In view of the extreme importance of the public domain lands to the American people, Congressional action in response to recommendations of the Public Land Law Review Commission, when submitted, will likely extend over a considerable period of time. Hence, Secretary Hickel's delay is not the minor or short-term delay it has been alleged to be.

Please note that in the enclosed copy of its adopted resolution regarding actions of the Public Land Law Review Commission, the Arizona Conservation Council supports the principle of charging fair market values fees for the private use of public lands. These lands are the property of all the poeple and are not the private domain of the permittees. The public is entitled to a fair return on its investment. Current grazing fees do not produce such a return.

Sincerely,
ARIZONA CONSERVATION COUNCIL,
PAUL W. VAN CLEVE,
*Chairman.*

---

POSITION STATEMENT OF ARIZONA CONSERVATION COUNCIL REGARDING PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW

GENERAL

1. The Federal public lands are immensely valuable for their timber, forage, minerals, wildlife, water, and for scenic and recreation purposes, and as open space itself.

2. The wilderness concept is an important part of enlightened land use planning. The last vestiges of America's natural environment should be preserved so that succeeding generations will have access to a variety of natural areas for scientific, esthetic and recreational purposes. Therefore, the principle that the best use of some land is to leave it entirely natural should be reaffirmed, and the classification of land in the National Wilderness Preservation System should be expedited.

3. For the bulk of the public domain, the principle of multiple use should be continued and strengthened. Areas which have unusual scenic, scientific, historic, cultural, recreational or public values should be classified to serve the best interests of all the people.

4. History furnishes abundant evidence proving that private management of public lands would not be in the interest of the Nation as a whole. We are only now beginning to overcome the effects of overgrazing, strip mining, stream pollution, soil erosion, watershed destruction, water depletion, and wasteful timber management on private lands. Prior to enactment of the Taylor Grazing Act, public land use practices had reduced big-game numbers to an all time low. Good management, improved habitat and greater protection have effectively increased the wildlife resource.

5. Public lands in the West are the habitat for ¾ of the major big-game animals and most of the coldwater species of fish. They provide more than 112,000,000 visitor-days of outdoor recreation annually, and the volume of recreation use is increasing yearly. These are *productive* and *beneficial* uses, and represent tremendous values to the Nation's people, albeit that they are intangible values.

DISPOSAL OF FEDERAL PUBLIC LANDS

1. Any general disposal of Federal public lands would inevitably mean: (a) public subsidy of individuals and private interest groups, (b) early disposal of lands having the highest value due either to presence of immediately usable resources or to high potential for resource discovery, and (c) retention of the lowest value lands by the Federal Government accompanied by reduced capability for sound, productive management.

2. The great bulk of the Federal public lands should be retained in Federal ownership and under Federal management.

3. There exist certain Federal public lands which can be disposed of to the States or to private interests without harming the bulk of the public lands or their sound, productive management.

4. People and governments at state and local levels should be consulted regarding what should be done with public lands.

5. The Federal Government should develop criteria for evaluation of all resource values to provide a sound base for determining what land should be retained or disposed of. The cardinal consideration in selection of lands to be disposed of should be the effect of this disposal on the value and management of public lands to be retained.

6. Lands having high scenic and recreation value, or value for other essential public purposes, should continue to be made available for acquisition by States, political subdivisions and quasi-public organizations in accordance with the Recreation and Public Purposes Act.

7. Where lands are disposed of to private interests, mineral rights should be retained by the Federal Government, and the minerals should be utilized on a lease basis from the Federal Government.

USE AND MANAGEMENT OF FEDERAL PUBLIC LANDS

1. In general, Federal public lands should be managed according to the principles of multiple use and sustained yield. Management practices should be strengthened by better procedures to assure consideration of all values and benefits, intangible as well as tangibe.

2. No use of Federal public lands should be permitted which is likely to produce air pollution, water pollution, thermal pollution, soil erosion, overgrazing, watershed destruction, water depletion, or desecration of scenery. To this end, exhaustive studies should be made to determine, (a) the kind of controls and assurances which are required to determine when and how such effects are likely to result, and (b) how such controls can be effectively enforced.

3. The principle of charging fair market value fees for the private use of public lands should be reaffirmed and supported by law. All private use of public land should be by lease based on productive value, with competitive bidding for leases. No change in "security of tenure" is warranted.

4. Mineral, oil and similar exploration on public land should be rigidly controlled to prevent destruction of other resource values.

MINING LAW

1. Give-away mining laws should be repealed. Patenting of mining claims should be eliminated and replaced by enactment of appropriate leasing laws governing mining on public land.

2. Land should not be leased for mining until appropriate restoration plans have been prepared and approved in advance. Lease terms should control and minimize the inevitable damage to the land and to other tangible and intangible values.

3. All existing mining claims should be evaluated by the Federal Government, invalid claims should be voided, and the program for voiding such claims should be expedited.

4. The National Wildlife Refuge System and the National Wilderness Preservation system should be closed to mining.

Adopted August 7, 1969.

PAUL W. VAN CLEVE,
*Chairman.*

Mr. Liven A. Peterson, Jr., of Boise, Idaho, wrote to me on January 13 concerning the grazing fee increase, wherein he stated:

Most Western states are still dominated politically by the exploiters of our land, and they follow the pattern of activity which has been established since "the West was

won." These people find it difficult to accept the fact that a new day is dawning.

And later, Mr. Peterson adds:

I see no reason why the grazing fees should not be increased in proportion to other costs, particularly to the cost of beef at the supermarket.

This Idaho resident then enclosed two editorials from local newspapers which reflect more public concern for our public lands than some of the recent statements by public servants of the same area.

In summary form the editorials point to a paradox surrounding public land policy formulation. The State of Idaho is trustee for 34 million acres of land held for the 270 million citizens of the United States; however, the instrument of the State, the Idaho Public Land Law Review Commission, is not representative of the wishes of the citizens of Idaho according to the Idaho Statesman. The editorial points out,

At the heart of the commission's philosophy is the idea that the public lands belong to the miner, the timber industry and the grazer but not to the people.

The situation in Idaho is not unique; rather, it is illustrative of the problem facing all Americans when it comes to public land policy. Because of the fact of geography and a blind, uncompromising tradition which overrepresents one area of the country irrespective of the public interest involved, we have created a system which encourages continuation of private interests over public interest. We have, in short, created a regulatory and policymaking monstrosity where the fox guards the chicken coop. The public lands should be guarded as if they were the domain of all the people rather than as if they were in the private fiefdom of a specific industry, geographic region, or political entity.

All is not lost. With continued publication of hard-hitting editorials such as those reproduced below, it is hoped that citizens of all States will respond to the threat to our public lands and demand that the total spectrum of interest and concern be represented before decisions are made affecting our public lands. The public lands in Arizona, Utah, Idaho, or in any State are no less a national treasure than the Everglades, Yellowstone, the Redwoods, or any other truly national responsibility.

Two editorials follow:

[From the Idaho Post-Register, Dec. 11, 1969]

BUT WHO SPEAKS FOR IDAHO'S PUBLIC?

East Idahoans found out Tuesday night that Idaho's Public Land Law Review Commission, unfortunately, is not public. It essentially represents the traditional land users—the grazers, the miners, the lumbermen, the water users, or all of the private users—and no one else but these.

As this newspaper pointed out when the commission was formed, any impartial examination of the makeup of the commission mirrors the entrenched commitment of not only the commission but the Governor who appointed them, against recognition of the growing public stake in the public use of public land. That principal public stake is in recreation use.

It is essentially an attitude that after all of the private user interests have been met, the public can have the leftovers. This view, strangely enough, calls wilderness or any non-intensive use a "look-up", but fails to explain why intensive mining is not a "lock-out" in those areas of high recreational interest.

But before commission members hurry to pin a label on this newspaper, let us hasten to underscore our conviction that the public lands should be grazed, should be mined and should be lumbered—in proper priority ratio by agencies balancing the greatest public interest. To achieve this greatest public interest, we contend, the public land laws need changing—particularly for mining, which now enjoys the only exclusive "lock-out" franchise of any of the users on public lands.

The commissioner's thoughts on public land, save for preliminary recommendations which local conservationists obtained upon request, have not been announced. If the Commission has preliminary recommendations on other public land law changes, however preliminary they may be, the public is entitled to its thinking. The commission may have rightly taken the position that it should not make up its mind, until all of the testimony on its hearing circuit is in—but the preliminary recreation proposals suggest that the commission has also projected its thinking on the entire gamut of proposals for changing the public land laws.

The commission had an understandably defensive stance in its hearing Tuesday night. Dennis Olsen, Idaho Falls attorney who is a member of the commission, at times inveighed against the conservationist line of questioning, attempting to brush all conservationism with the anti-progress label when he should have been listening and responding specifically to questions. Not all conservationists are anti-progress. They only desire recognition of the public stake. They also ask searching questions about progress itself—questions like, "Does the environment of the Wallace and Kellogg vicinities represent progress or long ignored responsibility?"

We don't agree with all conservationists. A very small percentage do not even agree to the validity of private grazing on public lands. This newspaper not only sees the validity of private grazing on public lands but its vital public value. We see the priority of this wilderness and not that, the need for lumbering in this stretch of forest but not next to that lake, mining at this stretch of forest (under a new set of responsibility and new set of government decision-making) but not in that pre-eminently wilderness area like the White Cloud lake region. The process of deliberation on land resources is not the "either, or" rationale that the state land law review commission suggested in its answers and its interruption of questions in Idaho Falls Tuesday night. Nor can they apply such over-simplification to the conservationist.

Mr. Olsen himself is symbolic of the Commission's overriding philosophic bent. He is supposed to represent conservation on the commission. Mr. Olsen decidedly does not represent conservation in the context of that word's meaning among the conservationists of this state. His connections in the past have been with mining interests and any conversation with him on the basic conservationist issues of the state reflect immediately either his lack of knowledge of issues or a philosophic bent for the private user. Conservation, as we know it, is not represented on the commission. And it was intended to be that way.

Walter Little, legislator from New Plymouth, and chairman of the commission, is the legislator who led the fight against a three-year moratorium against Cougar hunting in the Big Creek area of the Middle Fork of the Snake the past session. If Mr. Little was successful in his fight, a study of national import on the cougar, presented recently in National Geographic Magazine, would have been denied. Mr. Little, also head of the Idaho Woolgrowers Assn., feels the cougar is of sole concern to the woolgrowers of the state—even if it only involves a three-year moratorium against cougar hunting in one small area of the state.

Such is the makeup of virtually all of the commission.

It reflects anew that when it comes to land resources in Idaho, state government continues to ignore the public stake on our national and state forests and rangelands. We harken instinctively to the presumptions of the Associated Industries of Idaho, but we are not in tune with the emeging public stake in public lands. The Idaho Public Land Law Review Commission is another rigid demonstration of the commitment to perpetuate this philosophy in Boise.

It is a question whether the commission should be composed of completely independent and non-connected leaders of good judgment or whether it should represent all of the users, public and private. But if the latter, certainly, it should have been balanced with truly public members. Idaho's private land resource use should be forwarded and coordinated, without question. But in Idaho who speaks for the public?

---

[From the Idaho Statesman, Dec. 14, 1969]

RECREATIONIST IS A DIRTY WORD

If you are among the Idahoans who use the public lands occasionally for recreation you are a "recreationist." In the eyes of the Idaho Commission on Federal Land Laws you are a second class citizen, a menace and a nuisance.

This commission was created by the 1969 Legislature and its members were appointed by Gov. Don Samuelson. In theory it represents the people of the state of Idaho. In practice, it is a pawn of economic interests which are hostile to recreation use of the lands.

Probably a majority of Idahoans enjoy outdoor recreation on public lands. Fishing, hunting, hiking, picnicking, exploring, rock hounding, boating, camping are part of the Idaho way of life.

But as far as the commission is concerned, recreationist is a dirty word. It wants the federal laws governing the public lands to represent the same attitude.

Here are some of the statements from a summary of the commission's position on outdoor recreation:

"Establish a national policy to retain in federal ownership as outdoor recreation areas only those lands which constitute federal unique national wonders; and existing federal areas where multiple use of the land makes detachment of the outdoor recreation an impractical function."

"Allocation of land to exclusive recreational use should be limited to those areas that meet the following conditions: (1) A large effective demand has been demonstrated. (2) The land has unique or unusually good recreation capabiilty. (3) There are no feasible alternatives for recreation."

"No tract of land should be designated for a single use unless it does not lend itself to other uses. If, after an area has been allocated to any exclusive use, other valuable uses of the land should be reconsidered in light of these other possible uses."

"We are not opposed to wilderness areas as such but recommend that existing wilderness withdrawals should be periodically scrutinized and should be retained as wilderness only as continued retention meets the

criteria for wilderness withdrawal as of the time of each periodic review. Regulations and statute pertaining to wilderness withdrawals should not prevent examination by modern scientific methods to ascertain other uses of the lands designated as wilderness areas provided disturbance of the surface should be permitted when a need is demonstrated and disturbance is at a minimum."

"Entrance and user fees should be assessed where specialized or developed facilities are utilized by the user and the user receives a direct benefit."

The commission says that only recreation areas which constitute "unique national wonders" should remain in federal ownership. This would disqualify many of the existing federal recreation areas. The Sawtooth Recreation Area is magnificent but it is not necessarily a "unique national wonder."

Before land could be allocated to exclusive recreation use a "large effective demand" must be demonstrated and there must be no "feasible alternatives." What is a "feasible alternative?" Is a barroom a feasible recreation alternative to a fishing stream? Is a mountain lake in California a "feasible alternative" to a mountain lake in Idaho?

The commission wants to distribute wilderness acreage nationally in relation to population. Idaho, with a small population, would end up with very little wilderness. The commission wants to reduce existing wilderness areas.

In saying that "no tract of land should be designated for a single use (it apparently means recreation) unless it does not lend itself to other uses" the commission is saying that only lands which aren't good for anything else should be designated for recreation.

Quite simply, in the commission's view, recreation use comes last. No consideration is given to the fact that a large and growing number of Idaho people and out-of-state visitors use the lands for outdoor recreation. No consideration is given to the trend for increased recreation use.

The commission is properly concerned about mining, timber and grazing. But its concert for these uses contrasts sharply with its negative attitude toward recreation.

The commission butchered a statement submitted by the Idaho Fish and Game Department concerning the hunting and fishing value of public lands. Among the statements suggested by the department which the commission deleted was this one: "Public lands having significant value in the production of wildlife or in providing public fishing and hunting should be retained in public ownership."

Conservation witnesses who appeared at a hearing in Idaho Falls last Tuesday were shabbily treated. The commission member who is supposed to represent conservation, attorney Dennis Olsen of Idaho Falls, made his hostility clear.

This commission was organized in May. When it drafted a statement on mining laws it acted after hearing only one witness—a spokesman for the mining industry. Only in the last several weeks has it begun to conduct public hearings. It plans to submit its recommendations to the Federal Land Law Review Commission in only a little more than two weeks, December 31.

Governor Samuelson stacked the commission with anti-recreation sentiment when he appointed its membership. Its decision to even conduct public hearings was an afterthought.

It is absurd to pretend that this commission represents the sentiment of the people of Idaho on land questions concerning recreation use and conservation.

Its statement on mining opposes any federal law to provide for reclamation of land that is mined. It says state and local regulation is preferable "when it is demonstrated that regulation by governmental authority is necessary."

The need has been amply demonstrated in Idaho. But if regulation were left to the discretion of Idaho's present governor there would be no regulation.

At the heart of the commission's philosophy is the idea that the public lands belong to the miner, the timber industry and the grazer but not to the people. The public, the "recreationist" is an undesirable intruder on the land.

This is obviously not the attitude of a majority of the people of the state of Idaho. This commission has misused the dollars which the public is paying for its operation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to close this edition of "the public speaks" with an excellent editorial from the February 1970, issue of Field and Stream. Mr. Michael Frome, the courageous editor of the magazine and a crusading, all-fronts conservationist, details the implications of Secretary Hickel's decision to reverse the long-fought-for policy of establishing reasonable fees for the use of our public lands. Mr. Frome's article will probably become the rallying cry for the Nation's conservationists. The article follows:

[From Field & Stream, February 1970]

THE PRESIDENT'S ENVIRONMENTAL CRUSADE AND THE PUBLIC LANDS

(By Michael Frome)

The editors of Field & Stream hail and praise the President for declaring his intention to press improvement in the environment as a major goal of his administration. We urge that he and his associates in the White House read—or reread—"A Conservation Program for the Nixon Years," which appeared in the March 1969 issue, and subsequent materials in this space over the past few months, designed to define the national issues and to help chart a constructive course.

In facing the environmental challenge, the President must have men of proven background, experience, and consecration in key roles. The time for politics as usual is over.

The same holds true for the Senate Interior Committee. It can no longer consider the Department of the Interior as a fiefdom of patronage for the political power structure of the West.

Mistakes, misplacement of personnel, are costly. Decisions must be based on meeting the long-range needs of all the people, not on catering to the demands of special economic interests for their own short-range benefits.

This is especially the case in dealing with the public lands of the West. These millions of acres have long been neglected and abused, through Republican and Democrat administrations alike, for the simple reason that decisions were made on the basis of serving mining, grazing, and other special interests. Now at last the people recognize the immense potential of these lands for hunting, fishing, camping, wilderness, a thousand and one forms of recreation, as well as for watershed protection, soil conservation, and production of renewable resources on a sustained yield.

An enlightened, progressive policy of protection and management of the public lands is essential. The Nixon Administration cannot mean business in the environmental arena without it.

Nevertheless, the danger flags are flying. Recent decisions and policy declarations at the U.S. Interior Department do not bode well for the public lands.

This became evident in late November when Secretary Hickel announced a moratorium on grazing fee increases pending the final report of the Public Land Law Review Commission. The announcement marked a shocking setback for sound land management, a frightening sign of the future. It was not even sound administration, considering the Agriculture Department, which also provides grazing through the national forests, was not consulted and thus left in the lurch.

The grazing fee issue is simple. Fees paid by stockmen using lands administered by the BLM have been notoriously low, reflecting the long domination by livestock interests over the public lands, consistently characterized by single use and overuse. Increases were advocated by the Eisenhower Administration and continually ever since. Finally, former Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall made a long overdue decision to affirm the public interest. That decision provided for an annual increase over a ten-year period. The first increase went into effect in early 1969; the remaining nine were to be automatic.

I should note that Maurice Stans, the present Secretary of Commerce, who became well versed in grazing fees while serving as Director of the Budget under President Eisenhower, urged proceeding with all dispatch in instituting the increases. The Interior Secretary would have done well to follow the council of his colleague in the Nixon Cabinet.

Secretary Hickel's moratorium decision was announced in Congress by Senator Gordon Allott, of Colorado, the ranking Republican member of the Interior Committee. He proceeded to perpetuate sheer mythology upon his colleagues by referring to the "400-percent increase" proposed by the former Secretary and alleging it would have "severe impact" upon Western stockmen. Conveniently, he overlooked mentioning that only 2 percent of the nation's livestock use the public lands, which means that a relative handful of ranchers are clinging to a discriminatory cost advantage, that the Secretary's moratorium foists a competitive setback on the greater preponderance of stock growers who must rely on private lands for forage.

Senator Allott called on others of the Western power bloc for support. Senator Clifford Hansen, of Wyoming, who is a rancher himself benefitting from the use of public lands, felt constrained to offer a correction that "the grazing fee would not be raised very much." He alleged, however, that "it could be enough to put out of business a number of operators who are now marginal." This, too, was part of the mythology: the "marginal operators," more than 25 percent of BLM permittees, would not be affected by the graduated scale until 1974. The big boys, about 11 percent of the permittees, are slated to pay 75 percent of the bill.

In behalf of the big boys, the industrial stockmen and bankers, others spoke up, hailing cancellation of the fee increase—Senators Len Jordan, of Idaho; Peter Dominick, of Colorado; Mark Hatfield, of Oregon, and Henry Bellmon, of Oklahoma. All these are Republicans, but they willingly shared credit with three Democrats: Frank Church, of Idaho; Alan Bible, of Nevada; and Gale McGee, of Wyoming. "The implication of the Secretary's action will be felt throughout the West," commented Senator Hatfield. He may be proven right, for both Senators Jordan and McGee are up for reelection in 1970.

One of the foremost conservationists in Congress, Representative John Saylor of Pennsylvania, reached the heart of the matter in a telegram dispatched to Secretary Hickel. In his own forthright language, he charged a surrender to profit and political pressures. Then he declared: "You have given up your prerogative to carry out the duties of your office to hide behind a 'projected' report of the Public Land Law Review Commission to be made during 1970. These public lands are not the private domain of the grazers but belong to all the American people. Your decision is unworthy of the Interior Department's responsibility to the people."

The grazing fee decision is not the only bad sign. There is also the Arizona case. Three years ago, under terms of the Classification and Multiple Use Act of 1964, the Bureau of Land Management conducted hearings on proposals to retain in public ownership for multiple-use management approximately 34,000 rugged acres, well suited for wildlife and recreation,' in the Music and Hualapai Mountains near Kingman. A long list of prominent organizations, individuals, and the county commissioners testified in behalf of retention and classification. The State Game and Fish Department supported the same position.

But Governor Jack Williams, a carryover of the old Western power structure appealed the decision. He claimed the lands for the State under Federal selection laws. His motive was scandalous; to furnish leases at lower fees to a clique of favored ranchers and without required BLM range-improvement programs. This was made plainly evident by the Governor's rejection of better, more valuable property near Phoenix and Tucson. The Governor's appeal was rejected by both BLM and the former Secretary of the Interior.

With the advent of the new administration, however, it was another story. Assistant Secretary Harrison Loesch reversed the earlier decision, disregarded the desires of sportsmen, recreationists, and citizen conservationists, and the expertise of the Arizona Game and Fish Department. "Although these lands may have some values for wildlife and recreational purposes," he wrote, "there is no basis for the implicit finding that disposal of such lands to the State of Arizona would impair such values."

The Arizona case stirred a wide ferment. It reached into Congress, where Representative Henry Reuss, chairman of the Subcommittee on Conservation and Natural Resources of the House Government Operations Committee, stepped in to request of Secretary Hickel the complete file and a temporary stop-order before this foul deed was consummated. The response came to him from Assistant Secretary Loesch citing a variety of legal cases without relevance and with disregard of the Department's own regulations. Most frightening, he brushed off multiple use and sustained yield as being purely temporary, as though destined to meet their death following the report of the Public Land Law Review Commission—although the multiple use concept has long been applied to the public lands.

Then there is the Wyoming case: Under the archaic Desert Land Act of 1877, three ranchers and their wives filed applications to acquire as private property 1,920 acres in an area called the Soapholes along the Green River. These tracts, in turn, are tied in with an irrigation and land scheme promoted by a Wyoming state legislator and a member of the Republican National Committee.

In processing these applications, BLM consulted other agencies—Bureau of Reclamation, Soil Conservation Service, and the Wyoming Game and Fish Department. Their reports showed (1) the lands are characterized by poor soil unsuited to irrigation; (2) irrigation of alkali soils would return flows of warm, salty, silt-laden waters to the Green River, causing deterioration of a blue-ribbon trout stream of national significance; and (3) sage and rabbit brush in the Soapholes constitute a significant part of a critical winter range to big-game herds.

On this basis, BLM rejected the applications in October. Mr. Loesch overruled the Bureau. "The record does not define the extent of the impact on the deer herd that would result from allowances of these applications," he wrote. "While there may be a detrimental effect, there is no substantial evidence indicating that the loss is significant." The courageous, up-and-coming Wyoming Outdoor Coordinating Council, Trout Unlimited, and the Wyoming Wildlife Federation believe otherwise and are fighting to save the Soapholes. We shall see whether the will of the people or the power of the special interests will prevail.

The administration has made a variety of appointments to policy-making positions in the U.S. Interior Department. Secretary Hickel has been evaluated by us in past issues. Under Secretary Russell Train and Assistant Secretary (for Parks and Fish and Wildlife) Leslie Glasgow are endowed with excellent backgrounds, wide reputations, and capacity for public service. They would be a credit to any administration.

Assistant Secretary Loesch came on as an unknown quantity.

Curiously, the confirmation hearing conducted by the Senate Interior Committee of his boss, Secretary Walter J. Hickel, of whom much was known, consumed three full days; but the hearing in April dealing with Mr. Loesch, of whom virtually nothing was known, lasted barely an hour.

The position to which Mr. Loesch was nominated, and which he presently holds, carries decision-making authority over the Bureau of Land Management and the 453 million acres it administers, complete with mineral, grazing, forest, wildlife, and recreation resources: the Bureau of Indian Affairs, with the fate and future of 600,000 long-abused native Americans; the Office of Territories, covering the Virgin Islands and far-flung islands of the Pacific; and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, charged with giving inspiration, leadership, and coordination to all levels of government and private interests in meeting the recreation needs of the people.

The record of the hearing is quite plain. Mr. Loesch is a lawyer by profession. He hails from Montrose, a small town in western Colorado. In his practice there he was often engaged in fighting Federal Government in behalf of special interests.

By his own words, he had no prior experience with intricacies of the Washington scene. His experience in public lands was confined to the mining laws of Colorado. He admitted he was "not very knowledgeable" on the subject of land classification, that he had "no competence" about the Trust Territories, that he had had very little involvement in Indian matters, and knew nothing at all of Indian education problems. When one Senator advised that half the acreage under his jurisdiction would be in Alaska, he replied forthwith, "No, I have never been to Alaska."

The members of the Senate Interior Committee apparently had other things on their minds that morning. "It appears to me that you are very well qualified to take over this position." Senator Frank E. Moss, of Utah, advised the Assistant Secretary-designate. "I am satisfied."

While Mr. Loesch may lack knowledge or understanding of wildlife and recreation values, mining is quite another story.

When he addressed the American Mining Congress last fall, he assured the delegates in the hall that he felt "comfortable" in their midst, with a high degree of "empathy" for their purposes. These feelings, he said, he intended to translate into meaningful and significant action in behalf of the mining industry. He defended the ancient mining law—which hardly anybody defends anymore—"because of the financial incentive it gives for location, exploration, and development." He pledged to make it easier to claim and patent public land for private acquisition. In short, the giveaway flags are flying.

While his boss, Secretary Hickel, insisted at the same meeting that the American people are determined to have a liveable environment and that other resources must be protected even while mining proceeds, Mr. Loesch looked at it rather differently. To him environmental protection is something of an irritant. "Indeed," he said, "people travel from afar to see the copper mine at Bingham, Utah—to me it is a thing of beauty."

He then paid tribute to the mining companies for generously improving conditions of the land. His comment that, "After all, since much of the phosphate is found in swampy areas, many reborn acres are far more useful than before mining," will come as a strange knell to citizen groups fighting to save Lake Okeechobee in Florida and the Georgia coastal marshlands.

But enough of this. During the course of a weekend last fall many thousands of good citizens throughout the West responded to President Nixon's call and exercised themselves as volunteers for a better America. They rallied for Johnny Horizon Countryside Cleanup Days, collecting tons of trash littered over the public lands. "My family and I attended the cleanup in Calico County," reports my friend, Jack Cox, from Barstow, California. "We had 1,300 people, including all kinds of recreationists. I don't know how much litter we hauled away, but I do know the area was clean and beautiful once more."

The President should send out some of his policymakers to try this kind of thing themselves. They will discover new opportunities to lead and serve in the environmental crusade. They will get away for a little while from the pressures of the special economic interests, who shout about the glories of free enterprise but forever demand public subsidies and prime cut of the public land. They will see the beauty of the American earth without dollar signs tied to it, and this is always good for the soul.

In poker parlance for the benefit of our Western colleagues, we can say "all the cards have not been dealt in this hand." The Nation's conservationists and the Department of Agriculture have not been heard from so far. With the stakes as high as the preservation of our public lands we will add, "leave the chips on the table!"

---

## A NATIONAL LABORATORY FOR ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE

(Mr. MORSE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today which will, I believe, contribute significantly to strengthening the means by which this Nation

can find effective solutions to its environmental problems. The bill, which provides for the establishment of a National Laboratory for Environmental Science, would implement one of the main recommendations of the recent study by the National Academy of Sciences on effective management on the environment, and would provide one of the major components necessary to meet the Nation's needs for environmental research.

As the National Academy study points out, there is no laboratory within the Federal Government that now carries out systematic research on the environment as a whole. Present efforts are specialized and fragmented, and the overall ecological systems approach has not been adopted by any single Federal agency. There is, therefore, a need for a Federal Laboratory for Environmental Sciences, whose research goal would be the development of knowledge and techniques that will lead to effective management of the environment.

This laboratory would be contractor-operated as other national laboratories are, and funded by the several Federal agencies with environmental responsibilities. Its prime mission would be to carry out research in the environmental sciences and to develop a quick-reaction field function that would call attention to potential threats to the environment.

It would perform research in monitoring, but would not have operational responsibility for a monitoring program. It would also conduct analysis of its research results, but would not be policy oriented. Thus, as an arrangement outside the Government, the Laboratory would have the advantage of flexibility and a minimum of extra-bureaucratic constraints, and it would encourage the relatively free interchange of research staff among universities, private research institutes, the National Laboratory, and other Federal laboratories. Additionally, as an independent laboratory it would have the further advantage of providing the diversity of talent and viewpoints necessary to cope with environmental problems.

According to the National Academy of Sciences report, these characteristics which I have just described have been largely responsible for the success of other national laboratories in different fields, such as Brookhaven, Oak Ridge, and Los Alamos, and privately-operated national type laboratories such as Woods Hole and Scripps. I have kept the successful experiences of these laboratories in mind in proposing this new one to deal with the environmental sciences.

The objectives of the National Laboratory for Environmental Science will be analyzing the interaction of environmental factors, developing the capacity to predict environmental changes, and the capacity to restore, improve, and generally control the environment. For the basic and applied research that will be necessary to achieve these goals, the Laboratory will need a sizable research staff, laboratory facilities, and the use of the vast body of monitoring data acquired through the activities of the Federal Government.

Although this proposal was not predicated on the utilization of the NASA Electronics Research Center in Cambridge, Mass., I think that this site might well be a most suitable and appropriate place for the National Laboratory for Environmental Science. It is most relevant, in this regard, that the National Academy of Sciences study itself states that:

> The necessary components for building a National Laboratory, the scientists, supporting staff and facilities, might well come from existing laboratories whose missions have been accomplished, or whose original usefulness has diminished. Biologists, physicists, computer scientists and other specialists could serve in the new laboratory . . . as they did in the . . . old. The growing concern for the environment that we sense among scientists and other professionals, and the need for new kinds of research, might well serve to reinvigorate many professionals who seek new opportunities to assume social roles.

Importantly, the proximity of the large and outstanding academic community in the area would provide a vast talent pool, and greatly facilitate the kind of interchange of research staff and expertise that will go to make a National Laboratory for Environmental Sciences a successful operation.

---

## ADDING FUEL TO THE FIRE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago, in 1950, the victors of World War II indicated concern over the Middle East. The Western democracies—the United States, Britain, and France—joined in the Tripartite Declaration. This was a move designed to prevent Communist penetration and Soviet-instigated aggression. Israel welcomed the Tripartite Declaration.

Now, 20 years later, in 1970, President Nixon has told us in his state of the Union address that we are moving from an era of confrontation to an era of negotiation. A new relationship is sought with Moscow, based upon American disengagement and compromise. We are to be motivated by what Mr. Nixon calls "mutual self-interest" in dealing with Moscow rather than by "naive sentimentality." We are told that we must avoid other Vietnams while extricating ourselves from the original Vietnam. It seems that nations, like Israel, with which we have no treaty commitments will be left to fend for themselves. That may be the price Washington is willing to pay for the President's dream of "a generation of uninterrupted peace".

In 1938, at the time of Munich, we heard another voice speak of "peace for our time." Czechoslovakia was sold out to the Nazis. Hitler was not appeased. Instead, he was tempted to unleash a brutal war against Poland in the belief that the Western Allies would do nothing.

Today, we have a situation in which the Soviet Union is starting Arab aggression in a drive to radicalize the Arab world. The immediate target is Israel. But, the real target is the United States and the interests of the Western democracies.

I am shocked by the response of the so-called tripartite nations.

The United States is making concessions at Israel's expense in the big four power talks on a Middle Eastern settlement. Moscow solidly supports the Arabs while the State Department undermines Israel's bargaining position. Secretary of State Rogers has indicated that we are doing this to avoid embroilment in a Middle Eastern confrontation. This misguided policy can only encourage the aggressors. It invites aggression and signals Moscow to push harder. It tells the Arabs to avoid peace and await American pressures on Israel so that the Arabs can win by diplomacy what they failed to achieve on the field of battle. While Moscow has no qualms about pouring the latest in armaments into the Arab States, the United States is deferring action on Israel's request for balancing arms.

This brings us to France, another party to the tripartite agreement. France has now joined Russia as a major purveyor of arms to the Arabs.

French duplicity has shocked the civilized world. Her recent actions speak louder than her past professions of Liberte, Egalite, and Fraternite.

I was in Paris just a few days ago to assess the situation at first hand, and spoke to Frenchmen in and out of government. I can report to you that France, has, indeed, turned full cycle since 1950 when she subscribed to the tripartite concept. Her subsequent pose as a friend to Israel stands exposed.

There must be some explanation when a highly civilized nation, a nation that inspired the American Revolution, betrays a friend. We would be wrong to conclude that the people of France have suddenly become anti-semites. But, we can be quite correct in assuming that the Pompidou government of France is following the cynical two-faced policy of Charles de Gaulle—and is going even a step further.

France is not motivated by hatred of Israel; nor is her policy attached to any easily recognizable ideals. Rather, her foreign policy is being determined by oil. In this case, justice is being compromised for oil. For this reason, France is ready to build up the military power of the radical and aggressive Arab States against Israel. The French Government is not motivated by considerations of peace or of honor. French policy is based on false dreams of grandeur, power, and wealth—which she is willing to achieve at any price.

France's actions are more understandable when one looks at the French money market. The price for arming the Arabs is presumed to be the attraction of hard currency to safeguard the franc. The money market is thus manipulated. For

money, the French have become merchants of death.

The Arabs have agreed to accept the franc in payment for oil. If Israel had vast quantities of oil in strategic locations, I am sure that the French would still be singing "Hatikvoh" and sending jets to the Israelis. But, we live in an amoral world.

France is also motivated by a dream of empire in the Mediterranean. She had been asked to leave by the Arabs so the French flag could no longer fly in North Africa. But, French jets can fly, making the Arabs dependent upon France for spare parts and training. This is neocolonialism. Yet the so-called leftists of the Arab world are willing to collaborate to have weapons to kill Israelis.

By tactily collaborating with Arab radicalism against Israel and the United States, France is facilitating the Soviet drive in the Mediterranean. The stated Soviet objective is the banishment of the U.S. 6th Fleet from the Mediterranean. France is helping to create a climate in which American influence will be eroded to the degree that this may be achieved, and surprisingly enough, France believed the United States would be very much in favor of French policy initiatives. As Americans we should be deeply concerned about such erosion of our power and influence.

France dreams of dividing power with Russia in the Mediterranean. But, this will be only illusionary power. The French will sell out freedom and gain nothing but contempt in return. The smile will be on the face of the Russian bear—and Paris may once again burn.

I am convinced that some sort of tacit Franco-Soviet diplomacy is emerging. It does not matter whether the arms of the radical Arab States, like Libya, come from Moscow or Paris. They are furnished with the same purpose—the Arab war against Israel.

France conceived the idea of a big four approach to Middle Eastern peace. She has made a mockery of that concept. How can France honestly work for peace when she is embarked on a one-sided campaign to pour the implements of war into the Arab States. The number of French jets to Libya will reach 180. The contract for 54 jets to Iraq has been signed. How can the United States go on maintaining the fiction that we are consulting with a country like France to achieve a just settlement or that French policy balances Soviet policy? In fact, she adds weight to Soviet initiatives in the area.

Let us briefly refer to Britain, the third party to tripartite commitment. Britain is also concerned about oil and investment, not about peace and people. We learn only today that Britain will very probably now ship to Libya the huge Chieftian tanks that Israel ordered, but could not get delivered. Indeed, there is a report that 188 Chieftian tanks will be given to a powerful new Arab armed force to be trained in Libya, possibly by both French and Russian instructors.

I am shocked by what is taking place in Libya, because our own Government is collaborating by ceding the Wheelus Air Force Base ahead of schedule and turning over the radar and electronic equipment, the workshops and facilities to the Arabs. This will enable the Arabs to create a huge air base within range of Israel, but still a reasonable safe distance from Israel air action. France will train and maintain the Arab Air Force.

We now have a situation in which the Arabs are being equipped for a lightening strike against Israel. An overwhelming mass of air power and armored power is being assembled. The finest weapons of Russia and France will be prepared for the final battle.

I regret that our own country has shown such a negative response in the face of this situation. Washington has not rallied to the side of Israel. But, Washington has increased pressure for unilateral Israel concessions. An arms list is being considered. But, even if it approved, how will it be financed? Are we no longer interested in deterring aggression?

The situation is grave, but it is not hopeless. I do not underestimate the resources of Israel and of the Israeli people. I am also deeply moved by the pro-Israel sentiments that so deeply motivate the American people.

I cannot believe that Israel will not get the support she requires. It is up to us, however, to explain the situation to act, and to generate an understanding of the true situation.

Let me share with you some of the actions I have taken following my return from Paris. I learned that President Pompidou of France may be honored next month by an invitation to address a special joint session of the Congress in Washington. I have protested to the Speaker of the House and urged that such a session not be held.

My feelings on this matter are so strong that I will boycott such a special session if it is held.

The policies of President Pompidou which undermine peace and stability in the Middle East are implemented by massive arms sales to radical Arab States in a manner that jeopardizes basic U.S. interests, in that area, as well as the security of Israel.

The latest disclosure, of course, is that President Pompidou is planning an Arab Air Force training center at the U.S. Wheelus Air Force Base from which we are being arbitrarily evicted by the aggressive leftist government of Libya. I feel this is an affront to the American people, who paid for this base and who are shocked by the French escalation of dangerous tensions through irresponsible arms shipments to one side in the Middle Eastern controversy.

In Paris, the other Members of Congress and I were distressed by what we regarded as unfriendly and inhospitable treatment by the Pompidou government. I, therefore, see no reason why this Congress should pay homage to a foreign president who is undermining world peace through prejudiced policies.

President Pompidou has shown contempt for President Nixon's efforts to reduce regional tensions and I do not understand why the administration is inviting him. President Pompidou has made a mockery of the "objective" efforts of the Big Four Nations—proposed by France—to achieve a Middle Eastern settlement.

I hope that the leadership of this Congress will communicate to the White House the feeling that any contemplated honor to President Pompidou would be inappropriate at this time.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. SCHERLE), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUSH (at the request of Mr. SCHERLE), for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. ROE), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. REUSS (at the request of Mr. ROE), for 60 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. DONOHUE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LATTA during his remarks during the consideration of the veto message.

Mr. MIKVA during the consideration of H.R. 860 on Tuesday, January 27, 1970.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCHERLE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BUSH in three instances.
Mr. MCEWEN.
Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.
Mr. QUILLEN in four instances.
Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia.
Mr. NELSEN.
Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.
Mr. WYLIE in two instances.
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
Mr. SCHERLE.
Mr. TAFT.
Mr. MESKILL.
Mr. REID of New York.
Mr. MCCLOSKEY.
Mr. STEIGER of Arizona.
Mr. ASHBROOK.
Mr. LUJAN.
Mr. BOB WILSON.
Mr. SNYDER in three instances.
Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in five instances.
Mr. DICKINSON.
Mr. BRAY in three instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MOLLOHAN in three instances.

Mr. FARBSTEIN in three instances.
Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in two instances.
Mr. EILBERG in two instances.
Mr. KASTENMEIER.
Mr. MOORHEAD in six instances.
Mrs. CHISHOLM.
Mrs. GRIFFITHS.
Mr. DELANEY.
Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.
Mr. WALDIE in three instances.
Mr. RARICK in three instances.
Mr. RODINO in two instances.
Mr. MCCARTHY in two instances.
Mr. OBEY in six instances.
Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama.
Mr. MATSUNAGA in two instances.
Mr. DINGELL in two instances.
Mr. VANIK in two instances.
Mr. HARRINGTON.
Mr. DANIEL of Virginia.
Mr. SCHEUER in two instances.
Mr. REUSS in two instances.
Mr. ECKHARDT.
Mr. LOWENSTEIN in three instances.
Mr. GAYDOS.
Mr. HAGAN in three instances.
Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in six instances.
Mr. DORN in three instances.
Mr. DONOHUE in two instances.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 15149. An act making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 29, 1970, at 12 o'clock noon.

## COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

JANUARY 15, 1970.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1969, to December 31, 1969, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Standing committee: | | |
| Christine S. Gallagher | Clerk | $14,244.24 |
| Hyde H. Murray | Associate counsel | 14,831.90 |
| George F. Missbeck | Printing editor | 8,252.04 |
| Lydia Vacin | Staff assistant | 7,616.76 |
| Martha S. Hannah | do | 7,616.76 |
| Betty M. Prezioso | do | 7,616.76 |
| Catherine L. Bernhardt | do | 7,616.76 |
| Majorie B. Johnson | Staff assistant | $7,616.76 |
| Louis T. Easley | Staff consultant | 11,268.06 |
| William C. Black | General counsel (through Oct. 6). | 7,596 93 |
| Lacey C. Sharp | General counsel (from Nov. 10). | 4,194.14 |
| Investigative staff: | | |
| Fred T. Ward | Assistant staff consultant. | 7,993.50 |
| Mildred P. Baxley | Staff assistant | 7,616.76 |
| Doris Lucile Farmarco | do | 5,482.02 |
| Mary P. Shaw | do | 5,482.02 |
| Nancy McQueen | Staff assistant (through Nov. 30). | 3,897.30 |
| Doris R. Swischer | Staff assistant (from Dec. 1). | 779.66 |
| John A. Knebel | Assistant counsel | 11,554.62 |
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | | $100,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | | 33,367.70 |
| Amount expended from July 1, 1969, to Dec. 31, 1969 | | 55,063.83 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1969, to Dec. 31, 1969 | | 88,431.55 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1969 | | 11,568.47 |

W. R. POAGE,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 15, 1970.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1969, to December 31, 1969, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Kenneth Sprankle | Clerk and staff director (to Oct. 31, 1969); special assistant (from Nov. 6, 1969). | $11,763.55 |
| Paul M. Wilson | Assistant clerk and staff director (to Oct. 31, 1969); clerk and staff director (from Nov. 1, 1969). | 15,727.68 |
| Jay B. Howe | Staff assistant | 15,572.94 |
| Robert L. Michaels | do | 12,384.86 |
| Robert M. Moyer | do | 15,572.94 |
| Ross P. Pope | do | 7,786.47 |
| G. Homer Skarin | do | 15,572.94 |
| Eugene B. Wilhelm | do | 15,572.94 |
| Hunter L. Spillan | do | 14,687.28 |
| Aubrey A. Gunnels | do | 14,458.14 |
| Samuel R. Preston | do | 14,458.14 |
| Henry A. Neil | do | 14,458.14 |
| Francis G. Merrill | do | 13,820.46 |
| Keith F. Mainland | Staff assistant to chairman. | 13,820.46 |
| George E. Evans | Staff assistant | 13,820.46 |
| Earl C. Silsby | do | 13,820.46 |
| Peter J. Murphy | do | 12,897.78 |
| William G. Boling | do | 1,852.24 |
| John M. Garrity | do | 10,895.88 |
| Robert Foster | do | 10,895.88 |
| Milton B. Meredith | Special assistant | 8,558.58 |
| George A. Urian | do | 7,680.12 |
| Dempsey B. Mizelle | do | 7,363.32 |
| Robert C. Nicholas | do | 7,204.86 |
| Thomas Kingfield | do | 7,204.86 |
| Donald E. Richbourg | do | 6,817.20 |
| Gary C. Michalak | do | 5,052.60 |
| Samuel W. Crosby | Special assistant | 15,572.94 |
| Lawrence C. Miller | Editor | 11,113.44 |
| Paul V. Farmer | Assistant editor | 7,521.72 |
| Francis W. Sady | Administrative assistant. | 5,979.18 |
| Austin G. Smith | Clerical assistant | 6,190.08 |
| Naomi A. Rich | do | 5,668.44 |
| Gerard J. Chouinard | do | 5,668.44 |
| Dale M. Shulaw | do | 5,001.30 |
| Daniel V. Gun Shows | do | 3,887.70 |
| Judith A. Cain | do | 3,007.23 |
| Randolph Thomas | Messenger | $4,693.38 |
| Robert C. Gresham | Clerk to minority (to December 15, 1969). | 14,062.40 |
| Gerald F. Meyer | Clerk to minority | 1,041.93 |
| Enid Morrison | Staff assistant to minority. | 8,558.58 |
| Patrick M. Hayes | Clerk-stenographer | 5,979.18 |
| William J. Neary | do | 5,979.18 |
| Mary H. Smallwood | do | 5,979.18 |
| Catherine M. Voytko | do | 5,979.18 |
| John F. Walsh | do | 5,979.18 |
| T. Robert Garretson | do | 5,979.18 |
| Joan A. Corbett | do | 996.53 |
| Jennifer J. Neilson | do | 5,001.30 |
| Robert Carrere | do | 1,201.82 |
| Leta M. Buhrman | do | 4,982.65 |
| Margaret A. Riley | do | 1,707.07 |
| Arlene G. Genther | do | 5,480.92 |
| Peggy C. Ehringhaus | do | 5,979.18 |
| Jimmy Ray Fairchild | do | 5,979.18 |
| Patricia Hutchinson | do | 5,979.18 |
| Neta C. Messersmith | do | 5,979.18 |
| Winifred A. Pizzano | do | 5,979.18 |
| William T. Reece | do | 2,304.80 |
| Adrienne Buel | do | 1,196.43 |
| Katherine D. Coupe | do | 5,979.18 |
| Barbara B. Blum | do | 5,979.18 |
| David H. Kehl | do | 5,948.10 |
| Mary Ann Bond | do | 4,847.28 |
| Elizabeth Smith | do | 3,735.12 |
| Mike Crew | do | 5,979.18 |
| Ronald A. Rash | do | 3,301.48 |

Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1969, $532,099.96.

GEORGE H. MAHON,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 15, 1970.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1969, to December 31, 1969, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Paul J. Mohr | Director, surveys and investigations staff. | $13,149.24 |
| Cornelius R. Anderson | Assistant director, surveys and investigations staff. | 12,361.80 |
| Leroy R. Kirkpatrick | do | 12,361.80 |
| Lillian M. Mackie | Stenographer | 6,746.64 |
| Mary Alice Sauer | do | 6,386.04 |
| Agriculture, Department of: | | |
| Robison, J. F | Investigator | 5,345.85 |
| Diels, M. H | do | 5,605.67 |
| Export-Import Bank: | | |
| McNair, K. D | Editorial assistant | 4,383.90 |
| Federal Bureau of Investigation: | | |
| Bennett, C. L | Investigator | 9,400.08 |
| Bosko, A. P | do | 7,743.20 |
| Brummitt, D. A | do | 8,685.84 |
| Carson, D. W | do | 9,163.60 |
| Currall, W. G | do | 9,183.52 |
| Davis, W. L | do | 529.92 |
| Franklin, R. M | do | 8,958.96 |
| Funkhouser, P. K | do | 7,077.12 |
| Goedtel, J. G | do | 8,958.96 |
| Groover, L. C., Jr | do | 7,192.32 |
| Hanson, J. F | do | 9,183.52 |
| Hieronymi' N. H | do | 447.36 |
| Ivy, C. M | do | 8,657.20 |
| Law, W. C | do | 9,506.32 |
| Magee, E. H | do | 9,400.08 |
| Maher, M. F | do | 6,366.00 |
| McGahey, H. B | do | 9,383.52 |
| Michalski, J. E | do | 8,958.96 |
| Sanderlin, C. H | do | 8,280.00 |
| Schaum, E. V | do | 8,280.00 |
| Scully, J. E | do | 8,958.96 |
| Shannon, A. J | do | 9,400.08 |
| Smith, H. J | do | 8,280.00 |
| Thompson, I. M | Stenographer | 702.38 |
| Torrence, R. E | Investigator | 424.40 |
| Welch, W. H., Jr | do | 9,616.64 |

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Federal Bureau of Investigation—Continued | | |
| Wood, H. B | Investigator | $9,400.08 |
| Health benefits | | 986.96 |
| Life insurance fund | | 720.81 |
| Retirement fund | | 11,577.17 |
| Federal Highway Administration: | | |
| Marikle, H. J | do | 2,747.58 |
| HEW, Department of: | | |
| Read, M. J | do | 10,762.78 |
| U.S. Tariff Commission: | | |
| Taylor, J. A | do | 2,032.45 |
| Veterans' Administration: | | |
| Casteel, R. T | do | 9,667.98 |
| Travel expenses | | 57,057.90 |
| Miscellaneous expenses | | 467.49 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $890,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | ---------- |
| Amount expended from July 1, 1969 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 364,501.08 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1969 | 525,498.92 |

GEORGE H. MAHON,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 13, 1970.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1969, to December 31, 1969, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| John R. Blandford | Chief counsel | $16,747.50 |
| Frank M. Slatinshek | Assistant chief counsel | 16,626.36 |
| Earl J. Morgan | Professional staff member. | 16,289.40 |
| William H. Cook | Counsel | 16,289.40 |
| Ralph Marshall | Professional staff member. | 12,897.78 |
| John J. Ford | do | 12,897.78 |
| George Norris | Counsel | 12,384.12 |
| James F. Shumate | do | 11,833.86 |
| Mary Jo Sottile | do | 8,259.72 |
| Oneta L. Stockstill | Executive secretary | 9,972.30 |
| Berniece Kalinowski | Secretary | 8,114.10 |
| L. Louise Ellis | do | 8,114.10 |
| Edna E. Johnson | do | 8,114.10 |
| Dorothy R. Britton | do | 8,114.10 |
| Doris L. Scott | do | 8,114.10 |
| Innis E. McDonald | do | 6,088.14 |
| D. Carleen Poole | do | 5,150.43 |
| Ann R. Willett | do | 5,062.86 |
| Brenda J. Gore | do | 4,652.31 |
| Constance E. Hobart | do | 4,454.70 |
| Emma M. Brown | do | 4,408.50 |
| James A. Deakins | Clerical staff assistant | 6,135.18 |
| Issiah Hardy | Messenger | 4,400.82 |

STAFF, ARMED FORCES INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE
(Pursuant to H. Res. 105 and 106, 91st Cong.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| John T. M. Reddan | Counsel | $16,289.40 |
| John F. Lally | Assistant counsel | 11,833.86 |
| Richard A. Ransom | Professional staff member. | 11,833.86 |
| William H. Hogan, Jr | Assistant counsel (from Oct. 1). | 4,252.47 |
| Albert R. Simonds | Professional staff member. | 4,575.77 |
| Rose C. Beck | Secretary | 6,088.14 |
| Adeline Tolerton | Clerk | 4,939.68 |
| Joyce C. Bova | Secretary | 4,238.58 |
| William B. Short | Clerical staff assistant | 6,660.42 |
| Sanford T. Saunders | Security officer | 6,135.18 |
| Phyllis Seymour | Secretary (through July 23). | 1,036.80 |
| James Edward Humes | Clerical staff assistant (through Aug. 31). | 1,007.32 |
| Kenneth W. Tompkins | Messenger (through Aug. 31). | 720.42 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures, H. Res. 106 | $175,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 59,963.41 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 81,194.32 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 141,157.73 |
| Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1970 | 33,842.27 |

L. MENDEL RIVERS,
*Chairman.*

DECEMBER 31, 1969.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1969, to December 31, 1969, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Standing committee staff: | | |
| Paul Nelson | Clerk and staff director. | $16,685.75 |
| Orman S. Fink | Minority professional staff member. | 16,685.75 |
| Charles B. Holstein | Professional staff member. | 15,541.98 |
| Curtis A. Prins | Chief investigator | 14,114.34 |
| Benet D. Gellman | Counsel | 15,541.98 |
| Joseph C. Lewis | Professional staff member. | 16,673.40 |
| Mary W. Layton | Secretary to minority | 9,211.50 |
| Donald G. Vaughn | Assistant clerk | 7,800.96 |
| Total | | 112,255.66 |
| Investigative staff (H. Res. 271): | | |
| Jeanne Abrams | Secretary | 4,724.16 |
| Linda M. Barnes | do | 4,693.38 |
| Richard C. Barnes | Assistant clerk | 4,712.02 |
| L. Marie Chaillet | Secretary | 3,869.68 |
| Richard D. Cook | Minority staff investigator. | 4,353.61 |
| Lucien B. Crosland | Research assistant | 1,469.50 |
| Jane N. D'Arista | do | 3,262.38 |
| James F. Doherty | Counsel | 14,473.38 |
| Dolores K. Dougherty | Assistant clerk | 7,299.96 |
| Robert J. Geline | do | 5,003.10 |
| Linda Hechtman | do | 5,062.86 |
| Laurance G. Henderson. | Professional staff member. | 16,673.40 |
| Helen Hitz | Assistant clerk | 7,792.98 |
| Linda Leah Hoff | Secretary | 4,393.14 |
| Joseph J. Jasinski | Professional staff member. | 12,369.24 |
| Mary-Helen Kesecker | Secretary | 3,413.52 |
| Mary E. Kirk | Assistant clerk | 4,393.14 |
| Mildred S. Mitchell | do | 8,206.08 |
| Margaret L. Rayhawk | Secretary | 6,715.26 |
| Alicia F. Shoemaker | Minority staff secretary. | 8,961.90 |
| Elizabeth Stabler | Professional staff member. | 10,342.05 |
| Peter D. H. Stockton | do | 10,179.84 |
| Gary Tabak | Counsel | 5,000.46 |
| Robert E. Torrance | Assistant clerk | 3,979.26 |
| Total | | 161,344.30 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures, H. Res. 271 | $442,500.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 146,575.05 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 180,483.44 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 327,058.49 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1969 | 115,441.51 |

WRIGHT PATMAN,
*Chairman.*

DECEMBER 31, 1969.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY
SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1969, to December 31, 1969, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Anita F. Allison | Secretary | $6,387.34 |
| Terrence Boyle | Minority research associate. | 3,314.91 |
| Kenneth W. Burrows | Staff director | 16,642.08 |
| Michael T. Corbett | Assistant clerk | 5,747.54 |
| Patricia A. Eley | do | 4,099.23 |
| David Glick | Counsel | 16,524.48 |
| George Gross | do | 14,435.22 |
| Emily Hightower | Secretary | 958.98 |
| Casey Ireland | Minority staff member | 16,524.48 |
| Barbara Kling | Minority secretary | 4,881.96 |
| Margaret J. Leary | Secretary | 8,206.08 |
| John J. McEwan | Housing consultant | 2,062.74 |
| Gerald R. McMurray | Research assistant | 10,736.34 |
| John Nicholson | Minority staff member | 3,834.40 |
| Margaret J. Seeley | Research associate, minority. | 1,354.80 |
| Ellen M. Stamper | Secretary | 3,271.55 |
| Catherine Smith | Minority secretary | 200.11 |
| Doris M. Young | Assistant clerk | 6,886.38 |
| Total | | 126,068.62 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 272) | $250,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 98,339.69 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 130,382.68 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 228,772.37 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1969 | 21,277.63 |

WRIGHT PATMAN,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 15, 1970.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1969, to January 1, 1970, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Hayden S. Garber | Counsel | $12,562.80 |
| Clayton D. Gasque | Staff director | 10,823.34 |
| Donald J. Tubridy | Minority clerk (terminated July 15, 1969). | 854.28 |
| Leonard O. Hilder | Investigator | 9,679.28 |
| James T. Clark | Clerk | 14,129.64 |
| Othello Steinkuller | Secretary | 7,792.98 |
| Betty C. Alexander | do | 7,204.86 |
| Peggy L. Thornton | do | 7,204.86 |
| Sara Anna Watson | Assistant counsel | 7,204.86 |
| Leslie S. Ariail | Stenographer (terminated July 15, 1969). | 406.51 |
| John E. Hogan | Minority clerk | 9,118.47 |
| Temporary Investigating Committee: | | |
| Camille G. Butler | Secretary | 4,298.66 |
| Charles E. Jackson | Investigator | 3,128.92 |
| Whitney L. Turley | do | 761.99 |
| Victor Christgau | Investigator (terminated Nov. 30, 1969). | 6,339.00 |
| Marcellus C. Garner | Temporary clerk-typist (terminated September 15, 1969) | 1,531.30 |
| Susan E. Spitler | Stenographer (terminated August 30, 1969). | 1,082.42 |
| John Peacock | Temporary clerk-typist (terminated August 31 1969). | 1,148.48 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $100,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 13,964.72 |
| Amount expended from July 1, 1969, to January 1, 1970 | 23,290.77 |
| Total amount expended | 37,255.49 |
| Balance unexpended as of January 1, 1970 | 62,744.51 |

JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 15, 1970.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR—STANDING COMMITTEE

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1969, to December 31, 1969, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Robert E. McCord | Chief clerk and senior specialist (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | $16,747.50 |
| Hartwell D. Reed, Jr. | General counsel (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 16,747.50 |
| William F. Gaul | Associate general counsel (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 16,747.50 |
| Benjamin F. Reeves | Editor of committee publications (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 16,398.40 |
| Louise Maxienne Dargans. | Research director (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 16,747.50 |
| Marian R. Wyman | Special assistant to chairman (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 13,346.70 |
| Austin P. Sullivan, Jr. | Legislative specialist (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 11,261.66 |
| Louise M. Wright | Administrative assistant to chief clerk. | 10,091.91 |
| Minority: | | |
| Michael J. Bernstein | Minority counsel for Education and Labor (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 16,747.50 |
| Charles W. Radcliffe | Minority counsel for Education (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 16,747.50 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | (1) |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | $131,640.80 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 151,583.67 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 283,224.47 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1969 | (1) |

CARL D. PERKINS,
*Chairman.*

[1] Contingent fund.

JANUARY 15, 1970.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR—FULL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING STAFF

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1969, to December 31, 1969, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Jeannine M. Anderson | Secretary (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | $4,431.60 |
| Donald M. Baker | Associate counsel (Labor) (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969)[5] | 16,747.50 |
| Goldie A. Baldwin | Legislative assistant (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 5,878.20 |
| Donald F. Berens | Administrative assistant (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 9,907.92 |
| William H. Cable | Junior researcher (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 3,194.34 |
| Elizabeth A. Cornett | Administrative assistant (Dec. 15–31, 1969). | 692.71 |
| Lelia T. Cornwell | Administrative assistant (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 5,645.16 |
| Eydie Gaskins | do | 5,645.16 |
| Janet R. Inscore | Secretary (July 1–31, 1969). | 4,131.78 |
| Richard G. Lim | Junior researcher (July 1–Aug. 15, 1969). | 742.19 |
| Shirley R. Mills | Secretary (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 6,402.10 |
| David E. Pinkard | Assistant clerk (July 1–Aug. 31, and Oct. 1–15, 1969). | 963.35 |
| Ruth A. Ruttenberg | Assistant clerk (July 1–Aug. 31, 1969). | 770.68 |
| Michael D. Sherman | do | 701.08 |
| Mary L. Shuler | Secretary (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 5,645.16 |
| Jeanne E. Thomson | Legislative assistant (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 8,259.72 |
| Mary P. Tkacik | Assistant clerk (Aug. 1–31, 1969). | 350.54 |
| Nancy J. Tyler | Junior researcher (July 19–Dec. 31, 1969). | 2,162.92 |
| John E. Warren | Junior researcher (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 3,887.65 |
| Minority: | | |
| Robert C. Andringa | Minority professional staff assistant (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 9,359.82 |
| Sheldon J. Batchelder. | Research assistant (Nov. 10–Dec. 31, 1969). | 992.87 |
| John R. Buckley | Chief investigator (July 1–Sept. 1, 1969). | 4,290.17 |
| Glenda D. Campbell | Secretary (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 2,872.56 |
| Richard W. Carlson | Research assistant (Aug. 5–Sept. 11, 1969). | 747.40 |
| Sue Ann Clark | Clerical assistant (July 1–15, 1969). | 276.27 |
| Robert L. Durst, Jr. | Clerical assistant (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 4,491.90 |
| Louise W. Finke | Secretary (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 6,166.56 |
| Mary Jane Fiske | Research analyst (July 1–31, 1969). | 1,298.83 |
| Thaddeaus A. Garrett, Jr. | Clerical assistant (July 1–Sept. 30, 1969). | 1,818.00 |
| Anita M. Gerhardt (Kreke). | Secretary (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 4,627.95 |
| Crawford C. Heerlein | Minority clerk (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 11,268.06 |
| Will Henderson | Assistant clerk (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 4,200.48 |
| Thomas W. Johnson | Clerical assistant (July 1–31, 1969). | 440.89 |
| Martin L. LaVor | Research consultant (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 9,542.94 |
| Ruth G. Macknet | Secretary (July 1–Oct. 31, 1969). | 1,094.10 |
| James S. Nathanson | Research assistant (July 1–Aug. 31, 1969). | 1,212.00 |
| David E. Nelson | Research assistant (July 1–Aug. 18, 1969). | 969.60 |
| Stephanie A. Pedler | Clerical assistant (July 1–Aug. 31, 1969). | 202.38 |
| Thomas H. Rhodes | Research assistant (Dec. 18–31, 1969). | 221.35 |
| Walter J. Sears, III | Clerical assistant (July 1–Aug. 31 and Dec. 8–31, 1969). | $1,676.60 |
| Dorothy L. Strunk (Livingston). | Secretary (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 4,120.98 |
| Mary Ann Wagosh | do | 3,792.37 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $409,600.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 143,902.24 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 163,286.88 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 307,189.12 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1969 | 102,410.88 |

CARL D. PERKINS,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 15, 1970.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION NO. 1

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1969, to December 31, 1969, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Bland Ballard | Staff assistant (Dec. 1–31, 1969) | $1,010.78 |
| Christina L. Bitting | Secretary (July 28–Dec. 31, 1969). | 3,408.28 |
| Harry J. Hogan | Counsel (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 10,000.92 |
| Sally K. Kirkgasler | Research assistant (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 4,662.58 |
| Terry Eileen Shupp | Assistant clerk (July 1–Aug. 31, 1969). | 523.28 |
| Robert L. Short | Research assistant (Nov. 10–Dec. 31, 1969). | 1,021.55 |
| Marilyn Rae Stapleton | Staff assistant (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 6,895.98 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $60,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 23,258.58 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 27,572.82 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 50,831.40 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1969 | 9,168.60 |

CARL D. PERKINS,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 15, 1970.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, NO. 2

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the "Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946," Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1969, to December 31, 1969, inclusive,

together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Jeunesse M. Beaumont | Clerk (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969) | $6,788.97 |
| Dana F. Hubbard | Assistant clerk (July 1–Aug. 31, 1969). | 501 76 |
| Christopher J. Kennan | Assistant clerk (July 1–31, 1969). | 500.51 |
| Charles J. Lantz | Assistant clerk (July 1–Aug. 31, 1969). | 701.08 |
| Rogers Clark Martindell | Assistant clerk (July 1–31, 1969). | 250.88 |
| William George Phillips | Staff director (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 13,386.75 |
| Dan.el H. Pollitt | Special counsel (July 1–Nov. 30, 1969). | 3,694.88 |
| Daniel Rutledge Pollitt | Assistant clerk (July 1–Nov. 30, 1969). | 601.24 |
| Anne Williamson Risdon | do | 520.58 |
| James E. Scarff | Assistant clerk (July 1–31, 1969). | 500.51 |
| George R. Steffener | Assistant clerk (July 1–Sept. 30, 1969). | 999.99 |
| Allen Tate Wood | Assistant clerk (Sept. 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 1,111.08 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $60,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 22,160.57 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 29,941.85 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 52,102.42 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1969 | 7,897.58 |

CARL D. PERKINS,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 15, 1970.

GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR NO. 3

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1969, to December 31, 1969, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Adrienne Fields | Clerk (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | $7,014.78 |
| S. G. Lippman | Special counsel (Oct. 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 1,501.53 |
| Gary B. Sellers | Special consultant (Oct. 1–31, 1969). | 101.19 |
| Robert E. Vagley | Director (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 13,790.28 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $60,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 21,768.48 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 23,306.91 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 45,075.39 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1969 | 14,924.61 |

CARL D. PERKINS,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 15, 1970.

GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION NO. 4

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1969, to December 31, 1969, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Cynthia A. Crites | Staff director, (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | $8,806.56 |
| Thomas J. Gerber | Assistant (July 1–Aug. 31, 1969). | 1,464.38 |
| Sharlene P Hirsch | Education specialist (Sept. 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 4,321.13 |
| John F. Jennings | Counsel (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 11,011.86 |
| Alexandra J. Kisla | Clerk (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 5,233.38 |
| Jeff M. Schecter | Research assistant (July 1–Aug. 31, 1969). | 881.78 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | 60,000.000 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 22,683.54 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 33,463.79 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 56,147.35 |
| Balance unexpended as of December 31, 1969 | 3,852.67 |

CARL D. PERKINS,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 15, 1970.

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR NO. 5

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1969, to December 31, 1969, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Loretta A. Bowen | Clerk (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | $6,174.42 |
| Daniel H. Krivit | Counsel (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 11,268.06 |
| Marcia Sue Nelson (Gencher). | Research assistant (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 4,955.10 |
| Catherine R. Romano | Secretary (Sept. 15–Dec. 31, 1969). | 1,768.47 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $60,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 18,071.23 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 27,203.22 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 45,274.45 |
| Balance unexpended as of December 31, 1969 | 14,725.55 |

CARL D. PERKINS,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 15, 1970.

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION NO. 6

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1969, to December 31, 1969, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Jack G. Duncan | Counsel (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | $9,542.94 |
| Mary K. Gillespie | Staff assistant (July 1–Aug. 31, 1969). | 381.66 |
| Arlene Horowitz | Assistant clerk (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 3,750.42 |
| Ronald L. Katz | Research assistant (July 28–Dec. 31, 1969). | 5,134.99 |
| Nancy A. Neilen | Clerk (July 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 3,739.79 |
| J. Tim Parsons | Research assistant (from Nov. 1–Dec. 1, 1969). | 1,040.42 |
| Frank Sullivan, Jr | Research assistant (July 1–Aug. 31, 1969). | 751.14 |
| Evelina P. Thompson | Assistant clerk (July 1–July 15, 1969). | 147.62 |
| Nancy J. Tyler | Special assistant (July 1–July 18, 1969). | 187.63 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $60,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 20,548.75 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 28,907.83 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 49,456.58 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1969 | 10,543.42 |

CARL D. PERKINS,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 15, 1970.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1969, to December 31, 1969, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Boyd Crawford | Staff administrator | $13,110.53 |
| Roy J. Bullock | Senior staff consultant | 16,747.50 |
| Albert C. F. Westphal | Staff consultant | 16,747.50 |
| Franklin J. Schupp | do | 15,960.24 |
| Harry C. Cromer | do | 15,727.68 |
| Philip B. Billings | do | 12,250.08 |
| Marian A. Czarnecki | do | 15,727.68 |
| Melvin O. Benson | do | 13,239.72 |
| Everett E. Bierman | do | 11,995.50 |
| John J. Brady, Jr | do | 9,564.42 |
| John H. Sullivan | do | 9,564.42 |
| Robert J. Bowen | Clerical assistant | 6,096.00 |
| June Nigh | Senior staff assistant | 11,708.94 |
| Helen C. Mattas | Staff assistant | 10,417.26 |
| Helen L. Hashagen | do | 9,571.56 |
| Louise O Brien | do | 9,296.28 |
| Dora B. McCracken | do | 7,680.12 |
| Jean E. Smith | do | 6,072.48 |
| Nancy C. Peden | do | 5,520.84 |
| Paula L. Peak | do | 7,323.72 |
| Diane Gallagher | Clerical assistant | 2,906.88 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $200,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 62,553.00 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 70,650.25 |
| Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 133,203.25 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1969 | 66,796.75 |

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 12, 1970.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1969, to December 31, 1969, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| | |
|---|---|
| Expenses, July 1–Dec. 31, 1969: | |
| Full committee | $40,476.47 |
| Military Operations Subcommittee | 56,441.58 |
| Government Activities Subcommittee | 37,352.42 |
| Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee | 50,434.75 |
| Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee | 34,022.79 |
| Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee | 58,075.44 |
| Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee | 41,820.88 |
| Conservation and Natural Resources Subcommittee | 57,615.25 |
| Special Studies Subcommittee | 64,240.82 |
| Total | 440,480.40 |

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Salaries, full committee, July 1–Dec. 31, 1969: | | |
| Christine Ray Davis | Staff director | $16,747.50 |
| James A. Lanigan | General counsel | 16,747.50 |
| Miles Q. Romney | Associate general counsel. | 14,259.48 |
| Lawrence P. Redmond | Professional staff member. | 9,657.42 |
| Dolores L. Fel'Dotto | Staff member | 7,792.98 |
| Ann E. McLachlan | do | 7,553.40 |
| Charlotte C. Bickett | do | 6,951.42 |
| Gene P. Spory | do | 6,895.98 |
| John Philip Carlson | Minority counsel | 16,747.50 |
| William H. Copenhaver. | Minority staff member (July 1–Sept. 30, 1969). | 6,389.34 |
| William P. Russell | Minority staff member (transferred from special investigative staff on Dec. 1, 1969). | 1,298.83 |
| Full committee, special investigative staff, Hon. William L. Dawson, chairman: | | |
| William P. Russell | Minority staff member (transferred to full committee on Dec. 1, 1969). | 5,504.60 |
| Thomas H. Saunders | Minority staff member (Nov. 24–Dec. 31, 1969). | 1,285.29 |
| Clara Katherine Armstrong. | Minority research assistant. | 6,951.42 |
| Julia J. Norrell | Research assistant (Oct. 15–Dec. 31, 1969). | 3,169.15 |
| Catherine S. Cash | Secretary | 6,190.08 |
| Annie M. Abbott | do | 6,158.70 |
| Mabel C. Baker | Staff member | 4,608.66 |
| John L. Dodson | Clerical staff | 4,570.20 |
| Ralph T. Doty | Clerical staff (Nov. 17–30, 1969). | 233.57 |
| John W. McGarry | Professional staff member. | 607.14 |
| Expenses | | 1,197.66 |
| Total | | 40,476.47 |
| Military Operations Subcommittee, Hon. Chet Holifield, chairman: | | |
| Herbert Roback | Staff administrator | 16,747.50 |
| Douglas Dahlin | Staff attorney | 10,395.48 |
| John Paul Ridgely | Investigator | 9,268.02 |
| Joseph C. Luman | Defense analyst | 8,373.77 |
| Catherine L. Koeberlein. | Research assistant | 6,713.13 |
| Mollie Jo Hughes | Clerk-stenographer (July 1–Oct. 31, 1969). | 4,126.72 |
| Kathryn McQuay Rosenbaum. | Clerk-stenographer (Dec. 1–31, 1969). | 750.15 |
| Expenses | | 66.81 |
| Total | | 56,441.58 |
| Government Activities Subcommittee, Hon. Jack Brooks, chairman: | | |
| Ernest C. Baynard | Staff administrator | $13,820.46 |
| C. Don Stephens | Research analyst | 8,259.72 |
| Irma Reel | Clerk | 6,190.08 |
| Lynne Higginbotham | Clerk-stenographer | 6,190.08 |
| Druenette Fleischmann. | Secretary (July 1–31, 1969). | 1,763.56 |
| Michael McGettigan | Investigator (Nov. 15–Dec. 31, 1969). | 831.79 |
| Expenses | | 296.73 |
| Total | | 37,352.42 |
| Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Hon. L. H. Fountain, chairman: | | |
| James R. Naughton | Counsel | 13,820.46 |
| Delphis C. Goldberg | Professional staff member. | 13,820.46 |
| William Donald Gray | Research analyst | 7,970.35 |
| Dr. Robert S. McCleery | Consultant (July 1–Sept. 30, 1969) (July 1–Nov. 30, 1969). | 6,604.77 |
| Bebe B. Terry | Clerk-stenographer | 5,823.84 |
| Marjorie W. Vanderbilt. | Clerk-stenographer (Oct. 23–Dec. 31, 1969). | 1,411.05 |
| Maureen A. Sheridan | Clerk-stenographer (July 1–31, 1969). | 782.23 |
| Expenses | | 201.59 |
| Total | | 50,434.75 |
| Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Hon. John A. Blatnik, chairman: | | |
| Elmer W. Henderson | Counsel | 14,435.22 |
| I. Warren Harrison | Legal assistant | 7,976.16 |
| Veronica B. Johnson | Clerk | 6,951.42 |
| Gilda K. Calderone | Clerk (Dec. 22–31, 1969) | 187.52 |
| Ralph T. Doty | Clerical staff (Dec. 1–31, 1969). | 500.51 |
| Kathleen Marie Harris | Clerk (Oct. 27–Nov. 30, 1969). | 661.91 |
| Maryann Conway | Clerk (July 1–Oct. 22, 1969). | 3,083.17 |
| Expenses | | 226.88 |
| Total | | 34,022.79 |
| Foreign Operations and Government Subcommittee, Hon. John E. Moss, chairman: | | |
| Vincent J. Augliere | Staff administrator | 13,820.46 |
| Norman G. Cornish | Professional staff member. | 13,820.46 |
| Jack Matteson | do | 12,451.08 |
| James L. Nelligan | do | 11,084.40 |
| Elizabeth Jayne Bodecker. | Secretary | 6,1 0.08 |
| Expenses | | 708.96 |
| Total | | 58,074.44 |
| Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, Hon. Dante B. Fascell, chairman: | | |
| M. Joseph Matan | Counsel | 13,820.46 |
| Charles A. Intriago | Assistant counsel | 8,252.04 |
| Stuart E. Bossom | Legal assistant | 7,086.06 |
| Millicent Y. Myers | Clerk | 6,190.08 |
| Frances M. Turk | Stenographer (Aug. 1–Dec. 31, 1969). | 2,838.30 |
| Joyce E. McAbee | Clerical assistant (Oct. 9–Dec. 31, 1969). | 1,254.05 |
| Shirley A. Sisson | Stenographer (July 1–31, 1969). | 734.75 |
| Leah A. Simms | Clerical assistant (July 1–Sept. 12, 1969). | 1,000.80 |
| Expenses | | 644.34 |
| Total | | 41,820.88 |
| Conservation and Natural Resources Subcommittee, Hon. Henry S. Reuss, chairman: | | |
| Phineas Indritz | Counsel | 13,820.47 |
| Laurence A. Davis | Assistant counsel | 11,326.86 |
| David B. Finnegan | Assistant counsel (Dec. 1–31, 1969). | 1,887.81 |
| F. Clement Dinsmore | Legal assistant (Nov. 6–Dec. 31, 1969). | 1,826.97 |
| Josephine Scheiber | Research analyst | 7,117.74 |
| Catherine L. Hartke | Stenographer | 6,190.08 |
| Edna Gass | Professional staff member (July 1–Oct. 31, 1969). | $7,011.42 |
| Gerald Schatz | Professional staff member (July 1–Aug. 31, 1969). | 2,246.26 |
| Expenses | | 6,187.65 |
| Total | | 57,615.25 |
| Special Studies Subcommittee, Hon. John S. Mohagan, chairman: | | |
| Louis I. Freed | Staff administrator | 13,820.46 |
| Jacob N. Wasserman | Counsel | 12,711.66 |
| Hershel F. Clesner | do | 12,659.52 |
| Peter S. Barash | Legal analyst | 8,806.56 |
| Charles P. Witter | Staff member | 7,292.04 |
| Marilyn F. Jarvis | Stenographer | 6,699.60 |
| Expenses | | 2,250.98 |
| Total | | 64,240.82 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures, H. Res. 214, 91st Cong | $850,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 378,311.53 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 440,480.40 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 818,791.93 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1969 | 31,208.07 |

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 16, 1970.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1969, to December 31, 1969, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Julian P. Langston | Chief clerk | $16,747.50 |
| Robert D. Gray | Auditor | 12,897.78 |
| David S. Wolman | Personnel analyst | 12,897.78 |
| Louis Silverman | Assistant clerk | 8,558.58 |
| Robert H. Frank | do | 7,204.86 |
| Elizabeth Melvin | do | 5,575.20 |
| Mary F. Stolle | do | 3,183.38 |
| Gurney S. Jaynes | do | 5,155.26 |
| Rita A. Stewart | do | 4,345.38 |
| Melvin M. Miller | Minority clerk | 14,007.36 |
| Judith M. Squires | Assistant clerk, minority. | 3,590.22 |
| John C. d'Amecourt | Staff director, Subcommittee on Library and Memorials. | 7,557.36 |
| Thomas J. Hart | Assistant clerk | 3,921.71 |
| Judith K. Holes | do | 4,947.42 |
| Ava Jacobs | do | 693.61 |
| Carolyn L. Jana | do | 4,040.28 |
| Gwenda R. Green | do | 3,963.96 |
| Henry L. Belky | Legislative counsel | 1,652.08 |
| Stephen Rosenbaum | Assistant clerk | 836.84 |
| Margaret Ann Castor | do | 3,436.84 |
| Eric Honick | do | 716.12 |
| Walter S. Hasty | do | 310.03 |
| Thomas A. Tangretti | Printing clerk | 5,773.23 |
| Robert M. Kurrus | Assistant clerk | 1,005.60 |
| Victoria Schomburg | do | 600.91 |
| Salig Bendit | do | 3,722.23 |
| Elizabeth R. Kenney | do | 300.62 |
| Pamela K. Diab | do | 1,602.43 |
| Joyce Santangelo | do | 859.21 |
| Paula Scruggs | do | 1,584.98 |
| Alex Sanger | do | 800.19 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $800,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 16,662.34 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | $67,387.19 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 84,049.53 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1969 | 715,950.47 |

SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 9, 1970.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1969, to December 31, 1969, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Sidney L. McFarland | Staff director and chief clerk. | $16,673.40 |
| William L. Shafer | Consultant on mining, minerals, and public lands. | 15,356.28 |
| Lewis A. Sigler | Counsel and consultant on Indian affairs. | 14,702.58 |
| Dixie S. Barton | Clerk | 8,068.08 |
| Patricia Ann Murray | do | 8,068.08 |
| Patricia B. Freeman | do | 7,109.88 |
| Susan A. Gardner | do | 6,566.34 |
| Charles Leppert, Jr | Assistant counsel and consultant on territorial affairs. | 13,609.26 |
| Lee McElvain | Assistant counsel and consultant on national parks. | 10,251.42 |
| Kathleen Sandy | Clerk | 6,566.34 |
| Salaries paid pursuant to H. Res. 117, 91st Cong. | | |
| Edward Gaddis | Messenger | $4,009.74 |
| Marston L. Becker | Printing clerk | 7,046.46 |
| Mariam Waddell | Clerk | 5,482.02 |
| Jim T. Casey | Consultant on irrigation and reclamation. | 12,897.78 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $115,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 27,181.71 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 51,224.68 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 78,406.39 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1969 | 36,593.61 |

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 19, 1970.

COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1969, to December 31, 1969, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Standing committee: | | |
| Donald G. Sanders | Chief counsel | $15,410.46 |
| Alfred M. Nittle | Counsel | 12,808.44 |
| Glenn E. Davis | Editorial director | 13,760.10 |
| Robert M. Horner | Chief investigator (transferred from Investigating Committee Nov. 1, 1969). | 3,751.14 |
| William G. Shaw | Research director (transferred from Investigating Committee Dec. 1, 1969). | 1,869.99 |
| Standing committee—Continued | | |
| Donald T. Appell | Investigator (retired Oct. 31, 1969). | $8,484.36 |
| William A. Wheeler | do | 7,899.04 |
| Juliette P. Joray | Recording clerk | 9,822.00 |
| Mary M. Valente | Administrative secretary. | 8,129.40 |
| Anniel Cunningham | Chief, files and reference. | 7,624.68 |
| Helen M. Gittings | Research analyst | 7,600.92 |
| Lorraine N. Veley | Secretary | 5,979.18 |
| Investigating committee: | | |
| Margie D. Biggerstaff | do | 4,269.12 |
| Robert L. Blackburn | Assistant documents clerk (resigned Sept. 7, 1969). | 1,107.58 |
| Daniel Butler | Assistant documents clerk. | 4,447.02 |
| Mary Jo Chapman | Clerk-stenographer | 2,961.84 |
| Sara Janice Coil | Secretary | 4,600.98 |
| Susan Kay Daniels | Information classifier | 3,519.30 |
| Florence B. Doyle | Clerk-stenographer | 3,773.28 |
| David J. Duross | Clerk-typist (July 1–Aug. 31, 1969). | 885.76 |
| Elizabeth L. Edinger | Editor | 6,895.98 |
| Rochelle E. Epstein | Clerk-typist | 2,975.58 |
| Emily Francis | Information analyst (retired Oct. 31, 1969). | 2,749.44 |
| James L. Gallagher | Research analyst | 7,315.80 |
| Ruth Ann Gerbec | Information classifier | 3,171.66 |
| Christine Haynes | Information classifier (resigned July 3, 1969). | 52.86 |
| Darlyn B. Henderson | Clerk-typist (July 1–Aug. 18, 1969). | 708.61 |
| Robert M. Horner | Chief investigator (transferred to standing committee Nov. 1, 1969). | 7,666.28 |
| Isobel Hurwitz | Information classifier (appointed Nov. 1, 1969). | 1,057.22 |
| L. William Ivory, Jr | Assistant documents clerk (appointed Dec. 4, 1969) | 412.92 |
| Doris R. Jaeck | Information analyst | 3,887.70 |
| Mildred James | Clerk-typist | 3,156.60 |
| Millie Fay Lee | Secretary (appointed Aug. 6, 1969). | 3,576.14 |
| Gail B. Lewis | Information classifier (appointed Aug. 18, 1969). | 2,343.50 |
| John F. Lewis | Coordinating editor (appointed Nov. 1, 1969). | 3,668.22 |
| B. R. McConnon, Jr | Investigator | 7,841.10 |
| Kathleen C. Marche | Information classifier | 3,171.66 |
| Virginia Masino | Receptionist | 3,044 28 |
| David Muffley, Jr | Documents clerk | 4,345.38 |
| Monica Rae Munger | Clerk-typist | 3,044.28 |
| Maureen P. Ontrich | Information analyst | 3,956.34 |
| Alma T. Pfaff | Research analyst | 4,547.10 |
| Peggy Pixley | Editorial clerk | 3,956.34 |
| William T. Poole | Research analyst | 4,120.16 |
| Stuart Pott | Investigator (appointed Sept. 2, 1969). | 3,306.42 |
| Rosella A. Purdy | Clerk-typist | 1,117.68 |
| Josephine B. Randolph | Secretary | 4,955.10 |
| Herbert Romerstein | Investigator | 7,585.08 |
| Stephen H. Romines | Assistant counsel | 8,259.72 |
| Karen Sue Russell | Information classifier (appointed Dec. 1, 1969). | 458.80 |
| Jean W. Rutledge | Secretary | 5,210.10 |
| Richard A. Shaw | Investigator | 7,569.24 |
| William G. Shaw | Research director (transferred to standing committee Dec. 1, 1969). | 9,493.95 |
| Linda Spirt | Clerk-stenogrpaher | 4,200.48 |
| Barbara C. Sweeny | do | 3,895.32 |
| Katherine W. Taylor | Information classifier (resigned Aug. 22, 1969). | 916.26 |
| Neil E. Wetterman | Investigator | 6,668.38 |
| Billie Wheeler | Clerk-stenographer (resigned Oct. 31, 1969). | 1,974.56 |
| Barbara G. Bolt | Information classifier (resigned Aug. 31, 1969). | 1,057.22 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $400,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 160,955.01 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 205,094.13 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 366,049.14 |
| Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1970 | 33,950.86 |

RICHARD H. ICHORD,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 19, 1970.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1969, to December 31, 1969, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Clerical staff: | | |
| W. E. Williamson | Clerk | $16,747.50 |
| Kenneth J. Painter | First assistant clerk | 13,383.00 |
| Marcella Johnson | Assistant clerk | 7,945.50 |
| Frank Mahon | Printing editor | 8,806.56 |
| Mary Ryan | Clerical assistant | 6,284.16 |
| Mildred H. Lang | do | 6,284.16 |
| Hazel J. Collie | Staff assistant | 7,905.36 |
| Elsie M. Karpowich | Clerical assistant | 6,284.16 |
| Edwin Earl Thomas | Staff assistant | 5,917.02 |
| Marion M. Burson | Staff assistant (minority). | 13,383.00 |
| Professional staff: | | |
| Andrew Stevenson | Professional staff coordinator (to C.O.B. Oct. 31, 1969). | 11,165.00 |
| William J. Dixon | Professional staff member. | 16,747.50 |
| James M. Menger | do | 16,747.50 |
| Robert P. Guthrie | do | 16,747.50 |
| Kurt Borchardt | Professional staff member (from Dec. 1, 1969). | 2,791.25 |
| Additional temporary employees under H. Res. 116 and 320: | | |
| Lewis E. Berry, Jr | Minority counsel | 16,747.50 |
| Helen M. Dubino | Staff assistant (minority). | 12,547.86 |
| Barbara L. Bullard | Clerical assistant (minority). | 5,528.58 |
| Darlene G. McMullen | do | 3,590.22 |
| Eleanor A Dinkins | Clerical assistant | 6,284.16 |
| F. Martin Kuhn | Staff assistant | 11,011.86 |
| Michael A. Taylor | do | 11,011.86 |
| Theodore H. Focht | Special counsel | 12,696.78 |
| Christine M. Fawcett | Clerical assistant (minority). | 3,857.22 |
| Walter J. Graham, Jr | Staff assistant | 11,011.86 |
| Joseph T. Kelley | Messenger (to C.O.B. Aug. 18, 1969). | 660.83 |
| William S. Townsend | Staff assistant | 11,011.86 |
| Special subcommittee on investigations: | | |
| Robert W. Lishman | Chief counsel | 16,747.50 |
| Daniel J. Manelli | Attorney | 11,598.72 |
| James R. Connor | Staff assistant | 11,348.88 |
| Elizabeth G. Paola | Clerical assistant | 6,284.16 |
| Russell D. Mosher | Staff assistant | 4,662.54 |
| S. Arnold Smith | Attorney | 11,598.72 |
| William T. Druhan | Staff assistant | 11,598.72 |
| James P. Kelly | Chief investigator | 12,540.42 |
| James F. Broder | Special assistant | 11,348.88 |
| Robert L. Rebein | Staff attorney | 11,348.88 |
| Benjamin M. Smethurst. | Special assistant | 11,348.88 |
| Elizabeth A. Eastman | Clerical assistant | 5,505.30 |
| Lucy M. Gossett | do | 5,614.08 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $595,00.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 177,593.49 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 266,959.37 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 444,552.86 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1969 | 150,447.14 |

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 15, 1970.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person em-

ployed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1969, to December 31, 1969, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Standing committee staff: | | |
| Bess Effrat Dick | Staff director | $16,747.50 |
| Herbert Fuchs | Counsel | 15,541.98 |
| Benjamin L. Zelenko | General counsel | 15,541.98 |
| Garner J. Cline | Counsel | 13,300.08 |
| R. Frederick Jett | do | 12,600.00 |
| Donald G. Benn | Associate counsel | 11,341.50 |
| Jerome M. Zeifman | Counsel | 11,339.30 |
| Frances Christy | Clerical staff | 8,829.84 |
| Jane C. Caldwell | do | 8,098.74 |
| Gertrude Clara Burak | do | 7,204.86 |
| Carrie Lou Allen | do | 6,817.20 |
| Lorraine W. Beland | do | 6,817.20 |
| Roberta E. Eisenberg | do | 6,346.86 |

SALARIES PAID JULY 1 THROUGH DEC. 31, 1969, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 93 AND 118, 91ST CONG.

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Investigative staff: | | |
| Pearl Chellman | Clerical staff | $3,963.98 |
| Katherine L. Ely | Clerical staff (through Sept. 30, 1969). | 2,204.25 |
| James J. Faris | Counsel | 8,259.72 |
| Paul S. Fenton | Associate counsel | 6,605.52 |
| Howard W. Fogt, Jr | Assistant counsel | 6,895.98 |
| William B. Forti | Economist | 9,635.94 |
| Austin T. Fragomen, Jr. | Assistant counsel (as of July 14, 1969). | 5,655.73 |
| Phyll.s R. Goldberg | Clerica staff | 3,414.62 |
| Alma B. Haardt | do | 5,564.88 |
| Toni T. Harrington | Clerical staff (as of Aug. 1, 1969). | 3,443.15 |
| William Thomas Hutton. | Assistant counsel | 5,505.30 |
| Mary Jordan | Cerical staff (through Aug. 31, 1969). | 1,515.70 |
| Katherine Ely Kaplan | Clerical staff (as of Oct. 1, 1969). | 2,204.25 |
| Michael Kelemonick | Clerical staff | 5,875.62 |
| John J. Lokos | Assistant counsel (through Dec. 15, 1969). | 7,187.68 |
| Florence T. McGrady | Clerical staff | 5,979.18 |
| Bernice McGuire | do | 4,131.78 |
| Thomas E. Mooney | Assistant counsel | 5,505.30 |
| Franklin J. Polk | Associate counsel | 11,011.86 |
| O'Wighten Delk Simpson. | Investigator | 4,955.10 |
| Mary G. Sourwine | Clerical staff | 5,295.54 |
| Annelie Tischbein | Clerical staff (as of Aug. 14, 1969). | 2,772.43 |
| Toni Alleyne Taylor | Clerical staff (through July 31, 1969). | 688.63 |
| Louis S. Vance | Messenger | 4,200.48 |
| Rosalie C. Werback | Clerical staff (as of Nov. 3, 1969). | 1,048.77 |
| John F. Winslow | Assistant counsel | 6,895.98 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $250,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 102,587.42 |
| Amount expended from July 1 through Dec. 31, 1969 | 136,868.40 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 3 through Dec. 31, 1969 | 239,455.82 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1969 | 10,544.18 |

EMANUEL CELLER,
*Chairman.*

FUNDS FOR PREPARATION OF UNITED STATES CODE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE, AND REVISION OF THE LAWS

| | |
|---|---|
| A. Preparation of new edition of United States Code (no year): | |
| Unexpended balance June 30, 1969 | $10,489.57 |
| Legislative Appropriation Act, 1970 | 150,000.00 |
| Total funds | 160,489.57 |
| Expended July 1–Dec. 31, 1969 | 32,319.33 |
| Balance, Dec. 31, 1969 | 128,170.24 |
| B. Preparation of new edition of District of Columbia Code: | |
| Unexpended balance June 30, 1969 | $35,254.47 |
| Expended July 1–Dec. 31, 1969 | 27,622.15 |
| Balance, Dec. 31, 1969 | 7,632.32 |
| C. Revision of the laws, 1970: | |
| Legislative Appropriation Act, 1970 | 38,000.00 |
| Expended July 1–Dec. 31, 1969 | 16,859.42 |
| Balance, Dec. 31, 1969 | 21,140.58 |

DECEMBER 31, 1969.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1969, to December 31, 1969, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Robert J. Ables | Chief counsel | $13,956.25 |
| Bernard J. Zincke | Counsel | 15,727.68 |
| Ned P. Everett | do | 13,428.30 |
| Richard N. Sharood | Minority counsel | 11,084.40 |
| Robert J. McElroy | Chief clerk | 15,170.52 |
| William B. Winfield | Clerk | 10,562.28 |
| Frances P. Still | Assistant clerk | 8,160.06 |
| Vera A. Barker | Secretary | 7,809.00 |
| Virginia L. Noah | do | 7,394.94 |
| Albert J. Dennis | Investigator | 6,009.20 |
| Investigations committee staff: | | |
| Donald A. Watt | Editor | 8,527.92 |
| Norman M. Barnes | Investigator | 4,508.58 |
| Lucye L. Summers | Secretary | 5,482.02 |
| Diane G. Kirchenbauer | do | 4,508.58 |
| Jane C. Wojcik | do | 6,096.00 |
| Pauline M. Dickerson | do | 6,919.74 |
| Ernest J. Corrado | Counsel | 11,004.66 |
| Thomas A. Clingan, Jr | do | 11,707.59 |
| Joseph S. Helewicz | Investigator | 2,673.18 |
| Albert J. Dennis | do | 3,004.60 |
| Ronald L. Schwartz | Assistant clerk | 944.81 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $135,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 50,261.19 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 76,104.30 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 126,365.49 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1969 | 8,634.51 |

EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 15, 1970.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1969, to December 31, 1969, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Standing committee staff: | | |
| Johnson, Charles E | Chief counsel and staff director. | $16,747.50 |
| Bray, B. Benton | Associate staff director | 16,501.02 |
| Martiny, John H | Counsel | 16,501.02 |
| Irvine, William A | Assistant staff director | 16,501.02 |
| Standing committee staff—Continued | | |
| Kazy, Theodore James | Senior staff assistant | $16,501.02 |
| Fortune, Francis C | Coordinator | 12,302.22 |
| Smiroldo, Victor C | Senior staff assistant | 10,744.64 |
| Thornton, Elsie E | Clerk | 9,700.38 |
| Wells, Barbara M | Secretary | 7,394.94 |
| Simons, Blanch M | do | 7,125.66 |
| Investigative staff pursuant to H. Res. 268 and 301 of the 91st Cong. 1st sess. | | |
| Aylward Philip John | Intern (November 1–December 14, 1969): | $477.84 |
| Barton Richard A | Staff assistant | 8,721.12 |
| Bates, Kathryn E | Secretary | 5,334.42 |
| Bebick, Joan E | do | 3,963.96 |
| Bingaman, Deanne L | do | 4,993.56 |
| Breeskine, Steven D | Junior staff assistant (to August 24, 1969). | 859.70 |
| Brown, Lorraine L | Secretary | 4,408.50 |
| Davis, Stewart A | Staff assistant | 8,497.26 |
| Devlin, Ralph J | do | 12,160.80 |
| Dowd, Maureen B | Intern (to August 24, 1969). | 644.51 |
| Flanagan, Carol A | Secretary | 5,233.38 |
| Gabusi, John B | Staff assistant | 9,915.06 |
| Gandel, Judith R | Intern (to August 17, 1969). | 603.70 |
| Gould, George B | Staff assistant | 11,011.86 |
| Green, Thelma R | Secretary | 5,979.18 |
| Harding, Delois | Secretary (from December 15, 1969). | 327.26 |
| Hardy, Leroy C | Research assistant (to July 31, 1969). | 1,447.05 |
| Hart, Sally | Secretary | 4,408.50 |
| Hoffman, Robert Bruce | Research assistant (from Oct. 1–Oct. 31, 1969). | 833.55 |
| Howard, Alton M | Printing editor | 8,259.72 |
| Jones, Dolores D | Secretary (July 14–Aug. 3, 1969). | 361.65 |
| Kennedy, Thomas R | Staff assistant | 9,077.40 |
| Lloyd, Max T | do | 14,313.00 |
| Maginnis, Patricia A | Intern (to Aug. 17, 1969). | 661.10 |
| Matchett, Francis T | Investigator | 7,757.28 |
| Maull, Cynthia | Intern (to Sept. 12, 1969). | 1,055.74 |
| Moore, George M | Senior staff assistant (minority) (to Aug. 25, 1969). | 4,982.10 |
| Myers, Lois G | Secretary | 5,497.56 |
| Napier, Margaret G | do | 4,408.50 |
| Investigative staff, pursuant to H. Res. 268 and 301 of the 91st Cong., 1st sess.: | | |
| Noonan, Paula E | Intern (to Aug. 17, 1969). | $603.70 |
| Olson, Lynne | Staff assistant (to July 31, 1969). | 413.02 |
| Palmer, Fred D | Research assistant (from Sept. 8, 1969). | 4,398.79 |
| Pendleton, Maria R | Document clerk | 7,117.74 |
| Peters, Dorothy L | Assistant document clerk. | 6,080.34 |
| Quigley, Michael A | Intern (to Aug. 24, 1969). | 644.51 |
| Raymond, Anthony J | Staff assistant (minority) (from Oct. 1, 1969). | 5,061.30 |
| Short, Helen Y | Secretary (Sept. 25–Nov. 30, 1969). | 1,431.08 |
| Snipes, Justine P | Secretary | 6,346.86 |
| Tessler, Mark | Intern (to Aug. 24, 1969). | 644.51 |
| Ward, Sara L | Secretary | 7,076.70 |
| Williss, Donna Linn | do | 4,408.50 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $412,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 147,342.54 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 201,029.02 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 348,371.56 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1969 | 63,628.44 |

THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
*Chairman.*

DECEMBER 31, 1969.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from

July 1, 1969, to December 31, 1969, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Standing committee: | | |
| Richard J. Sullivan | Chief counsel | $16,634.22 |
| Lester Edelman | Counsel | 13,262.40 |
| Lloyd Rivard | Engineer consultant | 13,760.01 |
| Clifton W. Enfield | Minority counsel | 16,211.04 |
| Stephen V. Feeley | Subcommittee clerk | 10,251.42 |
| Dorothy A. Beam | Executive staff assistant. | 9,183.30 |
| Meriam R. Buckley | Staff assistant | 6,903.90 |
| Sterlyn B. Carroll | do | 6,041.16 |
| Anne K. Gartland | Staff assistant (terminated Nov. 30, 1969). | 4,723.70 |
| Investigating staff: | | |
| Richard C. Peet | Assistant minority counsel. | 13,760.10 |
| Thomas Smrekar | Subcommittee clerk (terminated Oct. 3, 1969). | 5,547.11 |
| Audrey G. Warren | Subcommittee clerk | 9,843.48 |
| Sheldon S. Gilbert | Associate minority counsel. | 8,977.44 |
| Augusta P. Peterson | Subcommittee clerk | 7,648.56 |
| Robert F. Spence | do | 7,680.12 |
| Joseph A. Italiano | Editorial assistant | 7,434.60 |
| Erla S. Youmans | Minority staff assistant | 7,315.80 |
| Sara B. Hilber | do | 4,870.44 |
| Linda Coberly Williams | do | 4,408.50 |
| Julie E. Wood | Staff assistant (terminated Nov. 30, 1969). | 3,519.45 |
| Harvey C. Simms, Jr. | Clerical assistant (terminated Sept. 12, 1969). | 1,043.78 |
| Nancy Brayer | Staff assistant (as of Sept. 1, 1969). | 2,896.92 |
| Ronald L. Martinson | Subcommittee clerk (as of Oct. 15, 1969). | 2,640.06 |
| Maryann D. Conway | Staff assistant (as of Oct. 23, 1969). | 2,070.99 |
| Emily B. Loosier | Staff assistant (as of Nov. 4, 1969). | 1,573.98 |
| Peggy Lynn Clements | Staff assistant (as of Dec. 1, 1969). | 703.89 |
| Special Subcommittee on Federal-Aid Highway Program: | | |
| Walter R. May | Chief counsel | 16,493.16 |
| John P. Constandy | Assistant chief counsel. | 15,356.28 |
| Salvatore J. D'Amico | Associate counsel | 11,584.02 |
| John P. O'Hara | do | 11,584.02 |
| Carl J. Lorenz, Jr. | do | 11,760.36 |
| Robert G. Lawrence | do | 10,647.76 |
| George M. Kopecky | Chief investigator | 14,427.54 |
| Sherman Willse | Professional staff member. | 11,584.02 |
| Paul R. S. Yates | Professional minority staff member. | 12,815.88 |
| Kathryn M. Keeney | Chief clerk | 7,299.96 |
| Stuart M. Harrison | Staff assistant | 8,775.48 |
| Mildred E. Rupert | do | 5,948.10 |
| Agnes M. GaNun | do | 5,761.68 |
| Shirley R. Knighten | do | 4,962.78 |
| Martha E. Downie | Minority staff assistant. | 5,381.04 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $486,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 231,790.52 |
| Amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 19, 1969 | 231,790.52 |
| Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 260,953.80 |
| Deficit as of Dec. 31, 1969 | −6,744.32 |

GEORGE H. FALLON,
*Chairman.*

---

JANUARY 15, 1970.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1969, to December 31, 1969, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Waller Batson (Nov. 1–12, 1931). | Professional staff member (P). | $2,986.56 |
| Laurie C. Battle | Counsel (P) | 16,747.50 |
| Robert D. Hynes, Jr. | Minority counsel (P) | 14,335.86 |
| Mary Spencer Forrest | Assistant counsel (P) | 9,183.30 |
| Winifred L. Watts | Secretary (C) | 6,959.34 |
| Jonna Lynne Cullen | do | 4,955.10 |
| Anne Battle (July 1–9, 1939). | do | 1,265.94 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Total | 56,433.60 |
| Funds authorized for committee expenditures | 5,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previous reported | 852.12 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 1,555.55 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 2,407.67 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1969 | 2,592.33 |

WILLIAM M. COLMER,
*Chairman.*

---

JANUARY 15, 1970.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession. and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1969, to December 31, 1969, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Charles F. Ducander | Executive director and chief counsel. | $16,747.50 |
| John A. Carstarphen, Jr. | Chief clerk and counsel. | 15,936.72 |
| Philip B. Yeager | Counsel | 15,936.72 |
| Frank R. Hammill, Jr. | do | 15,302.10 |
| James E. Wilson, Jr. | Technical consultant | 14,610.90 |
| Mary Ann Robert | Secretary | 6,393.90 |
| Emily Dodson | do | 6,127.38 |
| Carol F. Rodgers | do | 5,979.18 |
| June C. Stafford | do | 5,979.18 |
| Virginia Robison | do | 5,979.18 |
| Investigating staff: | | |
| Richard P. Hines | Staff consultant | 14,610.90 |
| Harold A. Gould | Technical consultant | 14,610.90 |
| Philip P. Dickinson | do | 12,667.02 |
| W. H. Boone | do | 15,936.72 |
| Joseph M. Felton | Counsel (through September 1). | 3,357.68 |
| William G. Wells, Jr. | Technical consultant | 12,160.80 |
| K. Guild Nichols, Jr. | Staff consultant | 8,259.72 |
| James A. Rose, Jr. | Minority staff | 11,004.66 |
| John M. Drewry | Special counsel (to October 31). | 6,794.66 |
| Frank J. Giroux | Printing clerk | 7,442.52 |
| Elizabeth S. Kernan | Scientific research assistant. | 7,189.08 |
| Denis C. Quigley | Publications clerk | 5,979.18 |
| Kiernan U. Cashman | Secretary | 4,947.42 |
| Martha N. Rees | do | 3,428.64 |
| Patricia J. Speed | do | 4,408.50 |
| Richard K. Shullaw | Assistant publications clerk. | 1,464.96 |
| Marion Kathleen Phair | Clerical assistant (to August 31). | 601.24 |
| Michael Torres | do | 662.36 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $350,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 187,573.18 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 155,022.71 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 342,595.89 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1969 | 7,404.11 |

GEORGE P. MILLER,
*Chairman.*

---

JANUARY 5, 1970.

COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1969, to December 31, 1969, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| John M. Swanner | Staff director | $16,747.50 |
| Robert G. Allett | Senior staff member | 15,131.88 |
| Bennett Wolfe | Assistant staff director | 13,375.50 |
| Mariann R. Mackenzie | Secretary | 8,474.28 |
| Tempie W. Whittington | Assistant clerk | 4,002.12 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 204; Mar. 12, 1969) | $20,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 170.30 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 5,485.92 |
| Total amount expended from Mar. 12 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 5,656.22 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1969 | 14,343.78 |

MELVIN PRICE,
*Chairman.*

---

JANUARY 15, 1970.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1969, to December 31, 1969, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Standing committee: | | |
| Oliver E. Meadows | Staff director | $16,673.40 |
| Edwin B. Patterson | Counsel | 15,541.98 |
| Billy E. Kirby | Professional aide | 13,790.28 |
| John R. Holden | Professional staff member. | 13,790.28 |
| George W. Fisher | Clerk | 15,541.98 |
| Helen A. Biondi | Assistant clerk | 9,650.28 |
| Alice V. Matthews | Clerk-stenographer | 6,660.42 |
| George J. Turner | Assistant clerk | 4,440.28 |
| Morvie Ann Colby | Clerk-stenographer | 6,472.26 |
| Marjorie J. Kidd | do | 6,190.08 |
| Investigative staff: | | |
| Philip Eugene Howard | Investigator | 13,699.80 |
| Helen Lee Fletcher | Clerk-stenographer | 2,906.88 |
| Chrystelle E. Fletcher | do | 4,693.38 |
| Audrey A. Powelson | do | 4,878.12 |
| Patricia J. Wilton | do | 4,878.12 |
| Thomas R. Link | Clerk-messenger | 1,579.74 |
| Thomas E. Laubacher, Jr. | do | 677.40 |
| Kenneth C. Levine | do | 466.76 |
| Vance L. Gilliam | Records clerk | 1,409.64 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $150,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 39,269.00 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | $55,990.86 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 95,259.86 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1969 | 54,740.14 |

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 12, 1970.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1969, to December 31, 1969, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| John M. Martin, Jr. | Chief counsel (C) | $16,932.84 |
| William H. Quealy | Minority counsel (P) to Oct. 1, 1969. | 8,466.42 |
| Richard C. Wilbur | Minority counsel (P) from Oct. 1, 1969. | 15,346.47 |
| John Patrick Baker | Assistant chief counsel (P). | 14,999.70 |
| Robert B. Hill | Professional staff (P) | 8,999.70 |
| William T. Kane | do | 14,313.00 |
| James W. Kelley | do | 13,699.80 |
| Harold Lamar | do | 12,897.78 |
| Florence Burkett | Staff assistant (C) | 5,567.46 |
| Virginia Butler | do | 7,600.92 |
| William C. Byrd | do | 5,085.96 |
| Mary Clare Fitzgerald | Staff assistant (C) from Nov. 10, 1969. | 1,246.92 |
| Grace Kagan | Staff assistant (C) | 7,600.92 |
| June Kendall | do | 8,359.32 |
| Richard Kirkpatrick | Staff assistant (C) from Oct. 1, 1969. | 5,000.46 |
| Jerry Knebel | Staff assistant (C) | 5,008.98 |
| Elizabeth Price | do | 5,528.58 |
| Jean Ratliff | do | 4,345.38 |
| Gloria Shaver | do | 6,967.26 |
| Eileen Sonnett | do | 6,307.68 |
| Shirley Vallance | do | 5,008.98 |
| Caroje Vazis | do | 5,008.98 |
| Hughlon Greene | Document clerk (C) | 6,041.16 |
| Walter Little | do | 6,041.16 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $50,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 2,089.12 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 3,537.48 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 5,626.60 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1969 | 44,373.40 |

WILBUR D. MILLS,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 14, 1970.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1969, to December 31, 1969, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Harold J. Warren | Clerk and counsel | $13,820.46 |
| Charles S. Brewton | General counsel | 13,579.08 |
| George T. Ault | Professional staff member. | 9,409.26 |
| Cary H. Copeland | do | 7,680.12 |
| Thomas L. McNamara | do | 1,328.71 |
| Mattie I. Echols | Secretary | $4,870.44 |
| Mary Donna Stone | Clerk-typist | 1,112.64 |
| Patricia Gail Abrahamson. | do | 1,112.64 |
| Robert A. McMasters | Clerk assistant | 531.99 |
| Connor W. Patman, Jr. | do | 448.39 |
| Thomas B. Wheatley | do | 447.99 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $107,950.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 54,451.14 |
| Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 54,451.14 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1969 | 53,498.86 |

JOHN SPARKMAN,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 9, 1970.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1969, to January 1, 1970, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| L. N. Woodworth | Chief of staff | $19,999.98 |
| Lincoln Arnold | Assistant chief of staff | 16,673.40 |
| Arthur Fefferman | Chief economist | 16,508.82 |
| Nicholas A. Tomasulo | Legislation counsel | 14,969.34 |
| Robert R. Smyers | Refund counsel | 14,961.60 |
| Dennis P. Bedell | Assistant legislation counsel. | 10,736.34 |
| James H. Symons | Statistical analyst | 14,144.88 |
| John Germanis | do | 11,011.86 |
| James M. LaMarche | Administrative assistant. | 11,011.86 |
| Harrison B. McCawley | Refund attorney | 11,011.86 |
| Herbert L. Chabot | Legislation attorney | 10,460.76 |
| Joseph P. Spellman | do | 9,635.94 |
| Joseph E. Fink | Statistical clerk | 9,190.32 |
| Anastasia Connaughton | do | 9,190.32 |
| Michael D. Bird | Economist | 11,011.86 |
| Joanne McDermott | Secretary | 6,605.52 |
| Blanche Nagro | Secretary (refund) | 5,450.94 |
| Albert Buckberg | Economist | 10,997.40 |
| Linda Savage | Secretary | 5,210.10 |
| Elizabeth L. Ruth | do | 4,713.77 |
| June Matthews | do | 4,408.50 |
| Mary W. Gattie | do | 4,955.10 |
| Linda Buckley | do | 3,590.22 |
| Bernard M. Shapiro | Legislation attorney | 6,056.82 |
| Richard Trotter | do | 6,267.16 |
| Leon W. Klud | Economist | 7,196.94 |
| John Broadbent | Legislation attorney | 10,460.76 |
| Marcia B. Rowzie | Secretary | 4,124.16 |
| Sheila Johnson | do | 3,296.95 |
| Sharon M. Feinsilber | do | 3,590.22 |
| Jamie L. Daley | do | 4,739.52 |
| F. M. Hubbard | Attorney | 917.60 |
| Hollis Dixon | Accountant | 8,259.72 |
| Carl E. Bates | Refund attorney | 3,701.46 |
| Amelia Del Carmen | Secretary | 561.34 |
| Mary Helen Breen | do | 334.05 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $564,777.50 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported (Jan. 1–July 1, 1969) | 253,100.47 |
| Amount expended from July 1, 1969, to Jan. 1, 1970 | 297,350.04 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1969, to Jan. 1, 1970 | 550,450.51 |
| Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1970 | 14,326.99 |

WILBUR D. MILLS,
*Chairman.*

DECEMBER 31, 1969.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CRIME

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1969, to December 31, 1969, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Stephen N. Abrams | Press assistant (Sept. 24). | $1,753.99 |
| Michael Amrine | Research director (Sept. 10). | 5,554.18 |
| Thomas H. Barksdale, Jr. | Special counsel (Oct. 1). | 4,503.39 |
| Avanell K. Bass | Office manager | 5,505.30 |
| Leroy C. Bedell, Jr. | Staff investigator | 6,505.59 |
| Beverly Bondy | Secretary | 3,857.22 |
| Hansonia L. Caldwell | Clerk-typist (July 1–Sept. 5). | 1,356.31 |
| Arthur E. Cameron | Associate counsel/assistant to chairman. | 11,011.86 |
| Marian E. Canty | Secretary to the chairman (Oct. 1). | 2,500.65 |
| Frederick B. Collison | Investigator (Oct. 20) | 2,466.37 |
| J. Elizabeth Cremens | Research assistant (Sept. 2–Oct. 31). | 917.60 |
| Joseph M. Cribben | Associate chief investigator. | 11,011.86 |
| John B. Culverhouse | Assistant hearings officer (July 1–Oct. 2). | 1,835.00 |
| Mabel Duran | Secretary (Aug. 27) | 3,445.34 |
| Robert H. Fleming | Information director (July 11). | 12,988.57 |
| Mary M. Goulart | Finance officer | 5,233.38 |
| Julian F. Granger | Associate chief investigator. | 8,806.56 |
| Deborah Hastings | Research assistant (Sept. 9). | 2,025.22 |
| Rebecca Susanne Herman. | Secretary (July 7–Sept. 5). | 1,108.09 |
| Alberta Elise Heyman | Secretary (Oct. 13) | 1,555.76 |
| Rebecca S. Hoffert | Investigator (Sept. 1) | 3,358.59 |
| Daniel J. Hurson | Investigator (July 3–Sept. 9). | 1,197.44 |
| Kathleen M. Johnson | Secretary (Sept. 29–Nov. 4). | 2,308.80 |
| John F. Kane | Hearings officer | 9,907.92 |
| Richard W. Kurrus | Chief counsel (July 1–Dec. 31). | 16,508.82 |
| Amelia T. Lasser | Secretary to the chief counsel (July 1–Dec. 31). | 5,505.30 |
| Raphael J. Madden | Messenger research assistant (July 1–Aug. 31). | 1,102.58 |
| Thomas F. McBride | Deputy chief counsel (July 1–Dec. 31). | 15,131.88 |
| Patrick T. McGahn, Jr. | Special counsel (Sept. 17–Oct. 30). | 148.41 |
| Kathleen M. Mitchell | Research assistant secretary (July 1–Aug. 15). | 897.56 |
| Joseph L. Nellis | Special counsel (Sept. 2–Nov. 6). | 3,608.87 |
| Albert W. Overby, Jr. | Associate counsel | 10,179.84 |
| Michael D. Petit | Press officer | 9,359.82 |
| Mary G. Poore | Secretary | 4,677.96 |
| Andrew Radding | Assistant counsel | 7,157.34 |
| Larry Reida | Associate chief counsel (July 7). | 12,454.60 |
| Margaret M. Schauer | Secretary (July 9) | 4,543.61 |
| Michael C. Shea, Jr. | Assistant counsel (Oct. 13). | 2,818.24 |
| Arnold G. Shulman | Assistant counsel (July 7). | 7,533.21 |
| James F. Southerland | Executive director (Nov. 7). | 3,869.33 |
| William W. Stoudenmire | Research assistant (July 1–Sept. 3). | 1,256.58 |
| George R. Sullivan, S. J. | Research assistant (July 1–Aug. 15). | 897.56 |
| Margaret S. Thompson | Clerk-typist (July 7–Aug. 15). | 260.25 |
| Marilyn H. Yost | Secretary (Oct. 16–Nov. 30). | 1,188.73 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $375,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 17,848.87 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | $317,423.44 |
| Total amount expended from May 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 335,272.31 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1969 | 39,727.69 |

CLAUDE PEPPER,
*Chairman.*

DECEMBER 30, 1969.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON HOUSE RESTAURANT

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from August 1969 to December 31, 1969, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Thomas J. Campbell | Staff director | $7,294.97 |
| Judy A. Crowe | Secretary | 1,777.40 |
| Total | | 9,072.37 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $40,000.00 |
| Amount expended from Aug. to Dec. 31, 1969 | 9,258.65 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1969 | 30,741.35 |

JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 21, 1970.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1969, to December 31, 1969, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Gregg R. Potvin | General counsel | $16,673.40 |
| Patricia Anne Bishop | Secretary | 4,408.50 |
| Justinus Gould | Counsel | 14,076.12 |
| Howard Greenberg | Consultant | 15,518.76 |
| Thomas J. Oden | Counsel | 6,234.96 |
| Henry A. Robinson | do | 14,076.12 |
| Marlyn Wilkinson | Secretary | 4,017.36 |
| Duane G. Derrick, Jr. | Research analyst | 1,976.32 |
| Myrtle Ruth Foutch | Clerk | 7,434.60 |
| Charles E. O'Connor | Counsel | 15,518.76 |
| Evelyn M. Blomquist | Secretary | 4,078.38 |
| William A. Keel, Jr. | Research analyst | 15,410.46 |
| Edward D. Boyt | Staff assistant | 3,443.76 |
| Bryan H. Jacques | Staff director | 16,673.40 |
| Berry C. Williams | Counsel | 14,076.12 |
| Joanna G. O'Rourke | Secretary | 4,131.78 |
| Christine A. Santoro | do | 3,037.44 |
| Jeanne Arnow McNaughton. | do | 3,590.22 |
| Donna M. Santoro | do | 3,489.12 |
| Paul M. Geier | Research assistant | 950.64 |
| Susan E. Driggers | Secretary | 428.30 |
| Fred M. Wertheimer | Minority counsel | 12,160.80 |
| Marjorie N. Lisle | Secretary, minority | 4,693.38 |
| John M. Finn | Assistant minority counsel. | 8,006.82 |
| Bernadette O. Romanesk | Staff assistant, minority. | 2,851.71 |
| Julia G. Stivers | Secretary, minority | 244.43 |
| Gail E. Danckert | Staff assistant, minority. | 346.28 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $390,000.00 |
| mount of expenditures previously reported | 162,563.13 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1969 | $205,010.91 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1969 | 367,574.04 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1969 | 22,425.96 |

JOE L. EVINS,
*Chairman.*

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1554. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting a report of audit of the Exchange Stabilization Fund for fiscal year 1969, pursuant to the provisions of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1555. A letter from the General Manager, United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a report of the disposal of foreign excess property during fiscal year 1969, pursuant to the provisions of 63 Stat. 398 (40 U.S.C. 514); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1556. A letter from the Assistant to the President of the American Academy of Arts and Letters transmitting the report of the Academy for the year 1969, pursuant to the provisions of law; to the Committee on House Administration.

1557. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of the publication entitled "Gas Supplies of Interstate Natural Gas Pipeline Companies, 1968"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1558. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General for Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a report on positions in Grades 16, 17, and 18, pursuant to the provisions of section 5114(a), title 5, U.S.C.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## 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. GALLAGHER: Committee on Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, 12th report of meeting (Rept. No. 91-809). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY (for himself and Mr. MONTGOMERY):

H.R. 15593. A bill to provide for the production of an adequate supply of upland cotton to meet domestic and export requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama:

H.R. 15594. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax-exempt status of, and deductibility of contributions to, certain private schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEVILL (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. NICHOLS, and Mr. FLOWERS):

H.R. 15595. A bill to compensate States and local educational agencies for the replacement cost of all public school buildings and facilities owned by them which have been or will be closed or abandoned by such agencies by reason of: (1) any order issued by a court of the United States; (2) compliance with any plan, guideline, regulation, recommendation, or order of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; (3) decisions arrived at by such State and local educational agencies in good faith efforts to comply with the decision of the United States Supreme Court requiring desegregation of public schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BEVILL (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. NICHOLS, and Mr. FLOWERS):

H.R. 15596. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax-exempt status of, and the deductibility of contributions to, certain private schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 15597. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 15598. A bill to provide for payments in lieu of real property taxes, with respect to certain real property owned by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey:

H.R. 15599. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to modify the qualifying period for salary protection of certain postal field service employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DORN (by request):

H.R. 15600. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to liberalize the provisions relating to payment of pension, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 15601. A bill to increase the rates of pension and income limitations under the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 15602. A bill to provide assistance to local educational agencies in constructing needed school facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 15603. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to include chiropractors' services among the benefits provided by the insurance program established by part B of such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 15604. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, to require that the label of drug containers, as dispensed to the patient, bear the established or trade name, the quantity and strength of the drug dispensed; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 15605. A bill to provide for a National Laboratory for Environmental Science; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 15606. A bill to prohibit the use of the name of any certain deceased servicemen unless consent to so use the name is given by the next of kin of the servicemen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 15607. A bill to prohibit the exclusion of dog guides for the blind from certain public carriers, transport terminals, and other place of business which operate in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 15608. A bill to amend the act of June 28, 1948, as amended, relating to the acquisition of property for the Independ-

ence National Historical Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 15609. A bill to establish a sonic boom and aircraft noise damage fund to provide for the payment of damages caused by sonic booms and other aircraft noise; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHISHOLM (for herself, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MIKVA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. RHODES, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SISK, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. WIDNALL):

H.J. Res. 1069. Joint resolution extending for 4 years the existing authority for the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Mary McLeod Bethune; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H.J. Res. 1070. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania):

H.J. Res. 1071. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Environmental Quality and Population Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. KEE, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BEVILL, and Mr. REES):

H. Con. Res. 493. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress with respect to peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAFT:

H. Con. Res. 494. Concurrent resolution to provide early appropriations for Federal educational programs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HICKS, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. MIKVA, and Mr. MOSS):

H. Res. 806. Resolution to provide for record voting in the Committee of the Whole House upon the assent of one-fourth of the Members present; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA (for himself, Mr. OBEY, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PIKE, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. REES, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. ST. ONGE, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. VANIK, and Mr. YATES):

H. Res. 807. Resolution to provide for record voting in the Committee of the Whole House upon the assent of one-fourth of the Members present; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Res. 808. Resolution to provide funds for the study and investigation authorized by H. Res. 17; to the Committee on House Administration.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 15610. A bill for the relief of Jesus Cruz-Figueroa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROTH:

H.R. 15611. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Donald Ashworth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 15612. A bill for the relief of the Lockport Canning Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

381. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Metropolitan Citizens Advisory Council, Washington, D.C., urging Congress to override the presidential veto relative to the health, education, and welfare appropriation bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

# SENATE—*Wednesday, January 28, 1970*

The Senate met at 10:30 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL).

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art from everlasting to everlasting, whose grace is sufficient for all our needs, renew us in wisdom and in strength. May Thy presence prompt judgments which lead to fullness of life for all men. Help us so to live that the truth of the Divine Master may be fulfilled in us—

*Blessed are the poor in Spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.*

*Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.*

*Blessed are they who hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled.*

*Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God.*

In the name of Him who incarnated the words He spoke. Amen.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations received today, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

Hon. EUGENE J. McCARTHY, a Senator from the State of Minnesota, attended the session of the Senate Tuesday, January 27, 1970.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order entered on yesterday, the Chair now recognizes the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN).

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me, without losing his right to the floor, to allow me to make some requests and to proceed for not to exceed 10 minutes, without any time being taken out of the time allotted to him?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I will gladly yield to the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana.

## THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 27, 1970, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ANOTHER MONTANAN GUNNED DOWN IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last March 12, Harry P. Gelsing was gunned down as he walked to his home at 810 Tuckerman Street NW., here in the District of Columbia. Harry Gelsing was a Montanan. He was a medical researcher who had no immediate family and lived alone here in Washington. For 10 months—until January 15—Harry remained in the Washington Hospital Center paralyzed and lingering halfway between life and death. He died and he is now a statistic; a casualty of street crime; a loser in the war against crime.

It has been said that this murder stemmed from a senseless, brutal "let us get this guy" kind of attack by a gang of hoodlums. That is the kind of criminal we must deal with; that is the kind of senseless, wanton act we are seeking to prevent. In return, I think we must be absolutely relentless in our pursuit of these twisted misfits who cannot live or function normally in society; we must redouble our efforts to assist our police and law-enforcement officials. But that is not all we must do.

Harry Gelsing was a kind and gentle man. I knew him personally, and all of us who knew him can testify to the fine character of the man—to his warm and gentle nature. What a contrast he must have presented to those who attacked him, dragged him into an alley, and gunned him down mercilessly. Why? For kicks? For excitement? Or just because