say we cut Health, Education and Welfare—and school lunch money. Or Department of Transportation—and federal road money. Are we all agreed that the politicians need the money more than the school kids and the people who use the highways? More than those on relief rolls?

As chairman of the Democratic National Committee, you, Mr. O'Brien, are doing only that which comes naturally. After all, you admit that you're $20 million in the red—and that's just about what you'd receive the first year from the taxpayers.

But in all good conscience, Mr. O'Brien, would you really refuse additional private contributions?

And you, Mr. Humphrey, were you really sincere when you implied that presidential candidates were called upon to sell out to the special interests in accepting campaign contributions from conventional sources? Did President Eisenhower sell out? Did Woodrow Wilson sell out? Did Abraham Lincoln sell out?

And you, Mr. Meany, are you supporting the bill because you think it's good for America—or because you'd like the taxpayers to absorb a substantial portion of the bill you've been paying from the AFL–CIO treasury to back the candidates you've personally smiled upon?

There's no such thing in government as "temporary" and there's no such thing in government as token federal funding. Government is the freewheeling big-time spender—with your tax dollars—and the sky is the limit.

The proposal to extract $1 from the top of every annual income tax payment for the general election campaign only, of the major candidates for president only, is but the beginning of a new concept, a concept which could lead to domination of all elections of all states by the federal government.

At this late hour, a selling job has been done upon the people fo America by the self-serving mass media which would benefit directly from the proposal.

Compared to the big guns which have already been fired, two weekly newspapers in West Virginia are voices in the wilderness.

But shouldn't it be a question of what's right rather than who is right?

The issue here is as fundamental as freedom itself.

Sincerely yours,

W. HERBERT WELCH.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, December 7, 1971*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Msgr. Angelo R. Cioffi, Regina Pacis Roman Catholic Church, Brooklyn, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, and Lord of all creation, from whom all blessings flow, look down upon us, here assembled to carry out our work on the problems facing our Nation at this critical time.

O, give us light to probe them thoroughly, sound judgment to solve them well, and willpower to implement them to the best of our ability.

Bless our labors, O Lord, infuse brotherly love into the hearts of all our people, and grant—we pray—lasting peace to all the Nations of the earth.

"Peace at home, and peace abroad;
Peace to friend, and peace to foe;
Peace to men of good will."

This is the prayer welling up from our hearts, O Father of mercy, O God of peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 5068. An act to authorize grants for the Navajo Community College, and for other purposes.

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

H.R. 6065. An act to amend section 903(c)(2) of the Social Security Act; and

H.R. 6893. An act to provide for the reporting of weather modification activities to the Federal Government.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 6065) entitled "An act to amend section 903(c)(2) of the Social Security Act," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. LONG, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. MILLER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

S. 345. An act to authorize the sale and exchange of certain lands on the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation, and for other purposes;

S. 1115. An act to declare that certain federally owned lands are held by the United States in trust for the Paiute-Shoshone Tribe of the Fallon Reservation and Fallon Colony, Nev.; and

S. 1475. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide for the restoration, reconstruction, and exhibition of the gunboat *Cairo*, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that Mr. CASE was appointed as an additional conferee on the bill (H.R. 11955) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes."

MSGR. ANGELO R. CIOFFI

(Mr. MURPHY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend our distinguished visiting chaplain from New York for a most appropriate and moving opening prayer.

The Brooklyn, N.Y., community, and indeed the entire New York metropolitan area, has long known of the extraordinary contribution of Monsignor Cioffi.

The reverend monsignor was born in Cervinara, Italy, on December 1, 1887, and came to America in 1904 to attend St. John's Seminary in Brooklyn, N.Y.

In 1907 he was sent by the late Bishop Charles E. McDonnell to the American College in Louvain, Belgium, where he was ordained a priest in July 1910.

His first assignment upon returning to Brooklyn was as curate of St. Anthony's Church in Greenpoint where he served for 2 years. He then served for 7 years in Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church, Astoria, Long Island.

In 1919, he was commissioned by the archbishop to start a new parish in Patchogue, Long Island. When he completed that assignment, he returned to Brooklyn to reconstruct St. Rosalia's Church.

Today St. Rosalia's—or Regina Pacis—is a major church in the New York area, and includes a parochial school with 1,200 students, new rectory, a shrine, a convent, and a youth center.

In 1968, President Johnson visited St. Rosalia's in testament to its importance and vitality.

Monsignor Cioffi's most current project is the construction of a senior citizen's residence to provide for ederly citizens who cannot obtain decent housing. This project has attracted the personal praise of Governor Rockefeller and planners throughout the Nation as an outstanding example of effective response to a pressing public need.

Monsignor succeeded in obtaining various funding for this project, and his tenacity and dedication to this most worthy project have brought the residence into reality.

He continues to spearhead the drive to complete the residence and to make it grow, and his energy and selfless interest in the community are now legend in New York.

It is a great pleasure and privilege for the House of Representatives to welcome Msgr. Angelo R. Cioffi today.

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

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Queens.

Mr. ADDABBO. I commend the gentleman in the well and associate myself with his remarks. I wish to also point out the dedicated work of Msgr. Angelo R. Cioffi in behalf of the church and the people of the county of Queens and all he has served in his over 50 years of priesthood. I pray for his continued good health.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I thank the gentleman.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 11309, AMENDING ECONOMIC STABILIZATION ACT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight Tuesday, tonight, December 7, 1971, to file a report on H.R. 11309, to extend and amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, as amended, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is there any reason why we cannot get a rule on this within the week?

Mr. PATMAN. We have requested it, and we have been pressing for it. I have reason to believe that there is a possibility for Thursday morning, but I do not have much encouragement for that time.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. In other words, the chairman of our committee has been assured by the Rules Committee that very serious consideration will be given to granting a rule this week?

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I thank the gentleman for that information.

Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, does the gentleman anticipate it will be brought to the full House this week, maybe Friday?

Mr. PATMAN. No; I do not anticipate it will be brought up this week. The people who have charge of this bill on both sides, the majority and the minority, have quite a bit of homework on this bill to do to get ready. It is very controversial. All kinds of amendments will be offered that we are not acquainted with. It takes some time, and it takes some time for preparation. If we will get the rule on Thursday, we will have a giant step in the right direction.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Further reserving the right to object, if the gentleman is able to obtain a rule on Thursday, and we are able to bring it to the floor on Thursday or Friday, then we would be able to complete the business prior to this weekend?

Mr. PATMAN. From what I have heard about it, there is hardly an expectation that we will finish this week anyway, and besides, if we were to pass this bill on, say, Friday, which is unlikely, we would have to have a conference, and the conference would go into the first part of next week. There is no way to escape the conference, as I see it. I thank the chairman for the information he has provided.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, is it possible that there is someone who cannot be here for personal reasons who is heavily involved in the consideration of this bill?

Mr. PATMAN. I am just talking about the official business before the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. It seems to me if a rule is granted today, the bill could be brought up easily by Thursday.

Mr. PATMAN. If we brought it up Thursday and passed it Friday, we would have a conference beginning the first part of this week anyway. There is no way to escape the conference.

Mr. GROSS. All right, but then there would be that much progress toward getting the business of the session over I cannot help but wonder if there is someone heavily involved in this bill that has some personal matters to take care of, perhaps a trip to Europe or some other junket.

Mr. PATMAN. If I were to attempt to answer that question, I would have to interrogate 434 other Members first.

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

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the chairman—as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, very familiar with the legislation on phase II—Is the House version not very close to the Senate version? And I would suspect that there would probably be only one or two points where the House would be disagreeing with the Senate. I see no reason why the phase II bill, if it receives the rule, cannot come up on Thursday and be passed on Thursday and a conference come in on Friday.

A great many of us are relying on statements by the leadership saying we are going to get out of here around the 10th and have fully scheduled events in our own districts. As one member of the committee who believed what I read about adjournment, I was prepared to fully debate the phase II bill on Thursday. This is the date we were discussing in the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman has stated the points that he knows about on the House side, but there are also amendments on the Senate bill that were not considered in the House at all, and we are going to have controversy, I am sure, on more than one of them.

Mr. REES. I mentioned to my distinguished chairman, that I thought there would be two, at the most three disagreements between the two Houses. I see no reason why some of these amendments cannot be anticipated now, and the discussions can be actually started with the chairman of the committee in the other body.

Mr. PATMAN. If we did not have anything else to do. But remember that the Members who have charge of this bill are also conferees on other bills.

Mr. REES. As a member of the committee who has been on the committee for 6 years but never a member of any conference committee I should like to volunteer right now to be a conferee. I should think the gentleman would be happy to let some of the junior members participate in the conference and help relieve you of your workload. I would be willing to go over to the other side now and open discussions with some of the Senators, to see what can be done to expedite the bill, so we can finish it this week.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman would make a very fine conferee.

Mr. REES. In about 20 years.

Mr. PATMAN. And if it is necessary to call for him he will be considered.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from California yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Would the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency agree—of course, after consultation with the Speaker and the majority leader—if he got a rule Thursday morning, to try to bring the bill to the floor Thursday afternoon after the other scheduled business?

Mr. PATMAN. If that is the only thing holding up adjournment, yes.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

MRS. ROSE THOMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2067) for the relief of Mrs. Rose Thomas.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MARIA LUIGIA DI GIORGIO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2070) for the relief of Maria Luigia Di Giorgio.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

WILLIAM D. PENDER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5657) for the relief of William D. Pender.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 248, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I must know if this bill, as reported to be a similar bill, is identical with H.R. 5657. If not, what are the plans, under the unanimous-consent request, to perfect it? To wit, is the amount of estimated cost exactly the same?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. The amount of estimated cost is the same. The difference is that the House version bars any attorney fees. The Senate bill allows a 10-percent attorney fee. That is the only difference between the two bills.

Mr. HALL. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the House's usual proscription as to attorney fees prevail if we adopt the Senate bill, and is it the intention of the gentleman to amend the Senate bill by striking the Senate language and inserting the House language?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. The latter course is my intention.

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

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 248

An act for the relief of William D. Pender

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William D. Pender, an employee of the Department of the Army, the sum of $3,602.69, in full satisfaction of all claims of the said William D. Pender against the United States for compensation for the loss of household goods and personal effects which he had to abandon in Fairbanks, Alaska, after he was incorrectly informed by the Department of the Army personnel that such goods and effects could not be stored or shipped at Government expense incident to his transfer from Fort Greely, Alaska, to Fort Belvoir, Virginia, and which could not otherwise be disposed of by the said William D. Pender because of prohibitively high commercial storage rates and the shortage of time between the issuance of transfer orders and the reporting date at his new duty station: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF GEORGIA

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 248 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 5657 as follows:

That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William D. Pender, an employee of the Department of the Army, the sum of $3,602.69, in full satisfaction of all claims of the said William D. Pender against the United States for compensation for the loss of household goods and personal effects which he had to abandon in Fairbanks, Alaska, after he was incorrectly informed by the Department of the Army personnel that such goods and effects could not be stored or shipped at Government expense incident to his transfer from Fort Greely, Alaska, to Fort Belvoir, Virginia, and which could not otherwise be disposed of by said William D. Pender because of prohibitively high commercial storage rates and the shortage of time between the issuance of transfer orders and the reporting date at his new duty station: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in the Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The motion was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 5657) was laid on the table.

MRS. ANNA MARIA BALDINI DELA ROSA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3713) for the relief of Mrs. Anna Maria Baldini Dela Rosa.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

CHARLES COLBATH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4310) for the relief of Charles Colbath.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. CARMEN PRADO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6108) for the relief of Mrs. Carmen Prado.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice?

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

There was no objection.

RENE PAULO ROHDEN-SOBRINHO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5181) for the relief of Rene Paulo Rohden-Sobrinho.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

CATHERINE E. SPELL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7312) for the relief of Catherine E. Spell.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice

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

There was no objection.

FRANK J. McCABE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1862) for the relief of Frank J. McCabe.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

DONALD L. BULMER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1994) for the relief of Donald L. Bulmer.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. MARINA MUNOZ DE WYSS (NEE LOPEZ)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5579) for the relief of Mrs. Marina Munoz de Wyss (nee Lopez).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

VITO SERRA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5586) for the relief of Vito Serra.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

CARMEN MARIA PENA-GARCANO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6342) for the relief of Carmen Maria Pena-Garcano.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

WILLIAM H. NICKERSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4064) for the relief of William H. Nickerson.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

DUTY-FREE ENTRY OF CARILLON FOR MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3786) to provide for the free entry of a four octave carillon for the use of Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 3786

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty a four octave carillon for the use of Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

SEC. 2. If the liquidation of the entry of the article described in the first section of this Act has become final, such entry shall be reliquidated and the appropriate refund of duty shall be made.

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

DUTY-FREE ENTRY OF CARILLON FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT SANTA BARBARA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4678) to provide for the free entry of a carillon for the use of the University of California at Santa Barbara.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 4678

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty a carillon imported June, 1969, for the use of the University of California at Santa Barbara.

SEC. 2. If the liquidation of the entry of the article described in the first section of this bill has become final, such entry shall be reliquidated and the appropriate refund of duty shall be made.

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

ANTONIO BENAVIDES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2394) for the relief of Antonio Benavides.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. CONCEPCION GARCIA BALAURO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2703) for the relief of Mrs. Concepcion Garcia Balauro.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

FAVORING THE SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 35) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. GROSS and Mr. HALL objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ALBINA LUCIO Z. MANLUCU

The Clerk called the bill (S. 559) for the relief of Albina Lucio Z. Manlucu.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

WILLIAM LUCAS (ALSO KNOWN AS VASILIOS LOUKATIS)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6912) for the relief of William Lucas (also known as Vasilios Loukatis).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 6912

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, William Lucas (also known as Vasilios Loukatis) may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Mr. and Mrs. George Lucas citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act: *Provided,* That the natural parents, or brothers, or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

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

MRS. NORMA McLEISH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7316) for the relief of Mrs. Norma McLeish.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 7316

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Norma McLeish, the widow of a United States citizen, shall be deemed to be an immediate relative and the provisions of section 204 of the Act shall be inapplicable in her case.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 5, strike out the words "deemed to be an immediate relative" and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "held and considered to be within the purview of section 201(b) of that Act".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

ELEONORA G. MPOLAKIS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8540) for the relief of Eleonora G. Mpolakis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 8540

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eleonora G. Mpolakis may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Mike Bellas, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 8, strike out the word "Act." and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "Act: *Provided,* That the natural parents or brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

AFL-CIO SUPPORTS PRICE SUPPORT LOAN INCREASE AND STRATEGIC RESERVE

(Mr. MELCHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified that the largest organized group of consumers in this Nation has given its support to measures to give the grain farmers much needed help which will come before the House this week.

I have just received a telegram from Andrew Biemiller, legislative director of the AFL-CIO, endorsing and urging the House to approve H.R. 1163, Congressman NEAL SMITH's strategic grain reserve bill, with my amendment, cosponsored by numerous other Members, which will raise wheat and feed grain price support loans by 25 percent on the 1971 and 1972 crops.

I include the telegram in the RECORD:

Hon. JOHN MELCHER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

The AFL-CIO supports the Melcher amendment to H.R. 1163, the Strategic Food Reserve Bill. Congressional action is badly needed to increase price support loans on wheat and feed grains by 25% for 1971 and 1972 crops. The House Agriculture Committee has supported the Melcher proposal by

a 19 to 6 vote. House action will help the Nation's farmers while having a negligible impact on consumer prices. It is our understanding that Representative Neal Smith, chief sponsor of H.R. 1163, supports the Melcher amendment. AFL-CIO urges the House to vote for the Melcher amendment and for H.R. 1163 on final passage.

ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
Director, Department of Legislation.

HEARINGS ON PROPOSED "BUSING" AMENDMENTS SCHEDULED

(Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to announce that the Committee on the Judiciary will schedule public hearings to begin early in the second session on proposed amendments to the Constitution and other legislative proposals respecting the transportation and assignment of public school students.

Efforts to desegregate public schools by means of student transportation or student assignment have evoked intense concern and have given rise to a number of proposed constitutional amendments.

Any amendment to the Constitution requires thoughtful and dispassionate study. I am convinced that the Judiciary Committee hearing process will furnish the Members of the House a reasoned and thorough appraisal of the legal and social considerations involved.

Interested parties wishing to testify or present statements to the committee should contact the committee officers, room 2137, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

REPRESENTATIVE FROM DEPARTMENT OF STATE TO BRIEF MEMBERS ON THE INDIAN-PAKISTAN SITUATION

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to make the announcement to the membership as a whole that this afternoon at 3:30 p.m. in the office of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS), the minority whip, H-129, there will be a representative from the Department of State to brief those Members who wish to be briefed on the India-Pakistan situation.

IMMINENCE OF WAR ON THE INDIAN SUBCONTINENT

(Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, in speaking recently on the House floor about the imminence of war on the Indian subcontinent, I suggested that the United States should consider the advisability of suspending both military and economic assistance to India. Since then our Government in separate actions has decided to stop both these forms of aid to India.

News reports indicate that the Indian Government has reacted with indignation to these decisions of our Government, and also to the position which the United States has taken at the United Nations. A well-known editor of an Indian newspaper is reported to have said that New Delhi is "not accustomed to be talked to in such terms," and that "Washington can shove its aid where it wants to."

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, it is most regrettable that military operations on the subcontinent have made it necessary for the United States to suspend our aid. Millions of innocent people will not be receiving food, blankets, medical supplies and other assistance because conditions will make it impossible to continue to provide such humanitarian aid.

The unhappy fact is that war is essentially a crude and cruel instrument for achieving national objectives. The weight of war on the subcontinent will fall immediately and with heavy impact on millions of innocent people, Indians and Pakistanis alike. By resorting to war, India is diverting her strength from the enormous task of providing for the needs of her own people. In the pursuit of her objectives, she seems also in the process of deliberately antagonizing those who have helped her substantially in the past. No matter what the future may hold, India will need substantial help from others. By her actions, and by ill-tempered responses to actions of others, she may be cutting herself off from such help.

EMPLOYMENT-UNEMPLOYMENT IN NOVEMBER

(Mr. LLOYD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Washington Post editorialized on phase I, the freeze, of the President's economic policy stating that it was "ineffectual in the crucial matter of jobs." Let us look at the statistics.

In November, total civilian employment increased by 177,000 and passed the 80 million mark for the first time in history. Total employment has increased by about 1.5 million since June. This is the biggest 5-month increase of employment in 16 years. The strength of the employment picture in November is also seen in an increase in average hours of work per week, especially in manufacturing.

Despite the large increase of employment in the last few months the unemployment rate continues to hover around 6 percent. This is because there has been an extraordinary increase in the number of people in the civilian labor force—working or seeking work—in those same months. However that exceptional rate of increase in the labor force will not continue, and the kind of increase in employment we have been getting will make solid inroads into the unemployment figures. In fact, when the tax measures the administration has recommended actually take effect the rise of employment and reduction of unemployment will speed up.

Mr. Speaker, the Post's unfavorable assessment does not appear to be warranted by all the facts.

LIMITATION ON AGRICULTURAL PAYMENTS

(Mr. MAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House should be alerted to the only chance we will have to impose a $20,000 limitation on agricultural commodity payments in the waning days of the session. We will have an opportunity to do so only if we vote down the previous question on the rule granted yesterday by the Rules Committee for H.R. 1163, the so-called Strategic Reserve bill. Although the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) and I testified before the committee asking them to waive points of order to permit his $20,000 limitation amendment, the Committee refused to do so by a vote of 8 to 7. It therefore becomes necessary to defeat the previous question on the rule before the House can even consider a payments limitation.

We have heard a good deal of concern expressed in recent weeks about the way in which our family farmers are being swallowed up by vertical conglomerates, and other huge agricultural combines. These agrigiants are receiving huge Government payments under present commodity programs which greatly aggravate the grossly unfair competitive advantage they already hold over small and medium sized farmers. Such large payments also discredit the entire farm program in the eyes of the American taxpayer and jeopardize its continued existence.

Members genuinely interested in helping the family farmer can do so by supporting a strict $20,000 limitation of payments amendment to the strategic reserve bill. The issue will be clearly drawn when Members are asked to vote down the previous question on the rule in order to make the amendment in order. Those who really want to help the family farmer can do so by voting "no." Those who prefer to support the big fellows by insuring their continued receipt of huge commodity payments can do so by voting "yes" on the previous question.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 2007, AMENDMENTS OF 1971

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2007) to provide for the continuation of programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. O'NEILL. 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. 437]

Abbitt	Fountain	Morse
Abourezk	Fraser	Murphy, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.	Galifianakis	Pepper
Annunzio	Gallagher	Powell
Ashley	Garmatz	Pryor, Ark.
Belcher	Gray	Pucinski
Biaggi	Hébert	Purcell
Blatnik	Helstoski	Rostenkowski
Broyhill, N.C.	Howard	Roy
Chisholm	Kluczynski	Sarbanes
Clark	Landrum	Scheuer
Clay	McClory	Sisk
Collins, Ill.	McClure	Spence
Culver	McKevitt	Springer
Derwinski	Macdonald,	Steele
Diggs	Mann	Sullivan
Dowdy	Metcalfe	Teague, Calif.
Edwards, La.	Mann	Wiggins
Evins, Tenn.	Mills, Ark.	Wilson, Bob

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 374 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 2007, ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1971

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the statement.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of November 29, 1971.)

Mr. PERKINS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement of the manager be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS).

(Mr. BRADEMAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report and want to address myself to only two or three major points.

First, some have attacked the child development title in this legislation on grounds that it will produce a Sovietization of their children and their takeover by the Federal Government.

This charge is of course thoroughly irresponsible, even, indeed, absurd.

I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that earlier this year, nearly 100 Members of the House in both parties introduced the child development bill and that President Nixon has called for a national commitment to action along the lines of the child development program in this conference report.

But so that there may be no misunderstanding, let me explain how the bill has been carefully drafted to protect the rights of parents and their children.

First, participation in the program is completely voluntary.

Children will not participate unless a parent or legal guardian specifically requests it.

Second, the bill specifically provides that no part of it "shall be construed or applied in such a manner as to infringe upon or usurp the moral and legal rights and responsibilities of parents or guardians with respect to the moral, mental, emotional, and physical development of their children."

The bill provides that children will not be tested unless the parent or guardian is informed and given an opportunity to accept.

To reiterate, the child development program, unlike our public school system, is totally voluntary.

But beyond what I have already said, the legislation provides that decisions on the nature and operation of child development programs are to be made at the community level, with the full involvement of parents.

In other words, parents are assigned a significant role throughout the bill and, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make clear that if there had been any effort in this legislation to reduce the central role of the family in rearing their children, the bill would not have had my support.

So it should be clear that this legislation is aimed at giving the taxpayer some of his money back so that churches, schools, YMCA's, settlement houses, and parents at the local level can provide preschool programs for their children without the control of either State or Federal governments.

Now the second point I want to say a word about, Mr. Speaker, is the charge that States do not have a significant role.

No one who has read the bill thoroughly can substantiate that charge. Indeed, the language is specific in requiring State involvement at every stage: creation of prime sponsors, formation of comprehensive child development plans, and project operation.

Moreover, up to 5 percent of operating funds will become available to States to carry out their functions. In this way, States are encouraged to provide technical assistance and coordination of child programs within their boundaries. The States can thus identify problems, help in solving them, and advise HEW on how effectively programs are meeting child development standards.

But there is still another way in which States may participate in the program. The bill specifically authorizes the Secretary to fund directly any program—including that of a State—whenever he finds that a local community has not submitted a program, submitted an inadequate program, or where a program does not or cannot meet the needs of children.

Indeed, there can be no question that the comprehensive child development program on which the House votes today provides a more important role for the States than does the present Headstart program.

So the argument about an inadequate role for the States is a spurious one.

But the final point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, goes to the importance to children of the kinds of services that would be made available by the passage of this legislation. And I am especially concerned to guess that children of middle-income families as well as poor children will have an opportunity to benefit from the various services provided by the bill—on the basis, above a certain income level of fees paid on a sliding scale basis.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the most eloquent words I have heard about the need for the child development program contained in the conference report today were uttered by President Richard Nixon in February 1969, in a message to Congress in which the President said:

> So critical is the matter of early growth that we must make a national commitment to providing all American children an opportunity for healthful and stimulating development during the first 5 years of life.

President Nixon went on to say, Mr. Speaker, on August 11, 1969, in proposing his Welfare Reform bill:

> The child care I propose is more than custodial. This administration is committed to a new emphasis on child development in the first five years of life.

Mr. Speaker, the bill on which we are about to vote provides Congress an opportunity now to act to make good on the pledge of President Nixon.

The bill on which we are now to vote makes possible a better chance for all the children of America, and I hope the conference report will be adopted.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REID).

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) for yielding. The weakest link in American education in the 1970's is in preschool education, the years from 1 to 5. Educators and psychologists now know that it is in this period of life that a child's greatest rates of learning takes place. Yet there is no organized, readily available voluntary education set up for children in that age group, featuring a broad, socioeconomic mix and available to the middle-income family.

I believe this is the most important education and social bill in recent years. I would point out to the Members that it not only enjoyed the support of a majority of the Republicans in the Senate, including three Members of the leadership—Senator SCOTT, Senator GRIFFIN, and Senator BOB DOLE—but the bill also enjoys in principle very broad support from organizations throughout the country. While these groups may not agree with every detail of the bill, the AFL–CIO, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, ILGWU, the United Steelworkers, League of Women Voters, Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, National Council of Churches, National Council of Jewish Women, United Auto Workers, United States Catholic Conference, Unit-

ed States Conference of Mayors, YMCA, Common Cause, the Day Care and Child Development Council, and many others do support the concept of this legislation.

I believe the bill is consistent with the President's very clear pledge on February 19, 1969, to a "national commitment to providing all American children an opportunity for a healthful and stimulating development during the first 5 years of life." On April 9, 1969, President Nixon said, "I again pledge myself to that commitment." If the House approves this conference report, the President has the opportunity to redeem his pledge to the American people by signing the bill into law.

Throughout the 3 years of negotiations on this bill, we have sought to fulfill the objective. In my judgment, the comprehensive child development title in this conference report preserves a number of important principles that are central to meaningful child development for 7 million preschool children. These principles are:

First. The services to be provided are to be of high quality and of a comprehensive nature. The bill explicitly enjoins custodial care and strives throughout to achieve quality day care that will be a positive educational experience for the child.

Second. No parent or child is in any way compelled to participate in these programs. The entire day care concept is voluntary.

Third. The delivery system of day care programs is basically a local one, so that those organizing and running the programs are from the same neighborhoods as the children and parents to be served, with adequate controls and meaningful powers residing in the prime sponsor agency, such as the city or State.

Fourth. While the Secretary should look first to locally run programs, the conference report and a colloquy in the Senate make clear that the Secretary has very broad discretion in selecting prime sponsors, including the discretion to use the States in order to put into effect the best possible performance in respect to child development. This principle of flexibility and discretion in the interest of most effective programs is vital. It applies also to section 513(b) of the conference report which stipulates that if any common geographical area is included in two prime sponsorship plans, then the Secretary shall select the one "which he determines has the capability of more effectively carrying out the purposes" of this program. In other words, the Secretary could designate a county that includes a smaller city, if the county is more capable, or he could designate a larger city which includes several counties, if the city is more capable.

Fifth. Finally, the fee schedule established in the bill will provide free services to those who need them most, families with incomes below $4,320. Between that income figure and $6,900, nominal weekly fees are charged, ranging from $1 to $5, and above that level, the Secretary will draw up a fee schedule. I would have preferred to see that free services were available to a larger group of families, since it seems to me that in New York City, for example, where so many mothers need and want to work but lack adequate day care for their children, even $2 a week from the family budget is a strain.

Nonetheless, I believe that the fee system in the bill will not price quality day care out of the reach of lower middle-income families and it will encourage a socioeconomic mix in day care programs.

I am happy now to yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee, who has worked very hard on this legislation (Mr. PERKINS) for purposes of a colloquy.

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman a minute and a half.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to propound a number of questions to the manager of the conference report, the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of our committee which handled this bill. I think that the questions and answers will be of great importance both to the Members who must decide how they will vote on the conference report and to the administration.

My questions concern the selection of prime sponsors for child development programs.

It is my understanding of the conference report that a State, a locality, a combination of localities, Indian tribal organizations, or public or private nonprofit agencies or organizations may be designated by the Secretary as a prime sponsor for the purpose of entering into arrangements for the purpose of carrying out child development programs upon meeting the requirements spelled out in the bill.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman is correct. Section 513 so provides in the case of localities and combinations of localities there is a requirement that the units of general local government cover an area having a population of 5,000 or more persons.

Mr. REID of New York. Am I correct also that in considering applications for prime sponsorship, which is called the "prime sponsorship plan," the Secretary is required to act upon plans submitted by localities and combinations of localities, in that order, but he may designate a State as a prime sponsor as to areas where localities or combinations thereof fail to meet the requirements contained in the bill?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. PERKINS. I yield the gentleman 1½ minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. PERKINS. Yes. And that order of consideration applies also to prime sponsorship plans submitted by Indian tribal organizations, so that he must act first on its application, and can designate the State for the area if the Indian tribal organization fails to meet the requirements in the bill.

Mr. REID of New York. Would the gentleman please spell out the prime sponsorship requirements that any applicant must meet.

Mr. PERKINS. Yes. In reviewing plans submitted by localities, combinations of localities, and Indian tribal organizations, or States, the Secretary must make the judgment in each case that:

The plan sets forth "satisfactory provisions" for establishing and maintaining a Child Development Council meeting the requirements of section 514, section 513(a)(2);

The plan provides that the Child Development Council shall be responsible for developing and preparing a comprehensive child development plan, section 513(a)(3);

The plan sets forth arrangements under which the Child Development Council will be responsible for planning, coordinating, monitoring, and evaluating child development programs, section 513(2)(4);

In the case of applicants which are units of government, the plan provides for the operation of programs through contracts with public or private agencies, section 513(a)(5);

The plan contains assurances that the Council has the administrative capacity to provide—itself or by contract or other arrangement—effective and comprehensive child related family, social and rehabilitative services, coordination with educational services, and health and other services, section 513(a)(6);

The plan also includes "adequate provisions for carrying out comprehensive child development programs in the area to be served"—section 513 (b), (c), (d).

Mr. REID of New York. With respect to the last requirement, in determining whether the plan includes "adequate provisions for carrying out comprehensive child development programs," it is anticipated by the conferees that, in addition to other appropriate factors, the Secretary may make a judgment as to the capability of the particular applicant to carry out effectively comprehensive child development programs?

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. REID of New York. And by the term "comprehensive child development programs" do not the conferees expressly contemplate programs of high quality providing the educational, nutritional, social, medical, psychological, and physical services needed for children to attain their full potential?

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman is correct. Sections 501(a)(2), section 571(3) and other provisions of the title make the meaning of that phrase clear.

Mr. REID of New York. So there is a responsibility with the Secretary to satisfy himself that any applicant, whether a locality, a combination, or an Indian tribe or a State, has the administrative capability to marshal resources and to provide effectively or assure access to the educational, social, and other services needed to insure the comprehensiveness and high qualities and standards for programs conducted under the title.

Mr. PERKINS. Yes, subject to the qualification that whatever standards he may apply under these provisions are objective and applied to each case with an even hand; it is not intended as a license to develop standards such as population criteria which would have the

practical effect of excluding a particular class of eligible applicants.

The Secretary's determination of the particular facts on which he bases his decision is conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The conference agreement is explicit on this point, in section 513(h)(2).

Mr. REID of New York. Therefore, if an applicant which is a locality, or a combination of localities, or an Indian tribe lacks the capability to carry out comprehensive programs or if the plan fails to meet the other requirements under the sections which the gentleman has outlined, then the Secretary clearly has the authority to reject that application and to designate a State or other public or private nonprofit agency as prime sponsor, if it meets the requirements.

Mr. PERKINS. Yes. and the requirements that would apply would be the same.

Mr. REID of New York. In summary, then, while the conference bill reflects the judgment that the Secretary should look first to locally run programs—in the interest of parental participation and other elements—the Secretary is not powerless to choose a State over a locality and he is granted ample flexibility and freedom to make reasonable judgments to insure the comprehensiveness and high quality of care for children as long as he is prepared to support them with findings of fact.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. REID of New York. And is it also true that if none of the units of government, whether they be localities or combinations of localities, Indian tribal organizations, or the State itself qualify as prime sponsors, or in certain other specified conditions that he still has authority under the so-called bypass provisions to fund programs directly, and a State, as well as any other public or private agency, could qualify as a grantee under that provision?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes. Section 513 (j) and (k) so provide.

Mr. REID of New York. And am I correct that even in respect to areas where a locality or a combination of localities or an Indian tribe may be designated as prime sponsor, that the State is to have a significant role?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes. The conference bill authorizes the Secretary to utilize up to 5 percent of the funds allocated for use in each State for activities by States, in the nature of technical assistance to localities, combinations thereof and Indian tribes including assisting in the establishment of child development councils, encouraging the cooperation and participation of State agencies and the full utilization of resources, and developing information useful in reviewing prime sponsorship plans and comprehensive child development plans submitted by localities, combinations thereof, and Indian tribes. Section 513(a) and section 515(b)(3) require that the Governor have the right to review prime sponsorship plans and comprehensive plans, respectively, with the right in each case, to submit comments to the Secretary.

Mr. REID of New York. Although the Secretary would not be bound by those comments, would they be among the factors he could consider in making the determinations relating to prime sponsorship which we discussed earlier?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. REID of New York. So one may reasonably conclude that under the conference bill the Secretary has the authority to significantly involve the States, in order to assure high quality care.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman is correct. That is the intent.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank my colleague very much. If he will bear with me for one further point, the conference report authorizes $2 billion in appropriations for child development care for the first year in which it is fully spelled out—to wit, fiscal 1973; $100 million is provided for fiscal 1972 for startup activities. It has been my understanding that the $2 billion authorization is intended by the conferees as a goal which we have established, without knowing what the total picture may be at the time of appropriation; for example, we do not know what may be available from other sources such as the family assistance plan, H.R. 1, if that should become law.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman is correct. The authorization is, of course, subject to the appropriation process and to the influence of various factors, as the gentleman suggests.

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

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as a person who first introduced child development legislation long before the Headstart program began, and one who has worked for child development legislation all during the development of this bill, I wish I could come before you and urge you to support the conference report, but I cannot.

To me this conference report is an administrative monstrosity. It is impossible for it to work out properly. All the problems we saw with the inception of the Economic Opportunity Act through OEO are going to be visited upon this program and the way it operates, and the regional offices will be running these programs just as they have been doing under OEO. At the present time the members will recognize that in the case of elementary and secondary schools of the country it was necessary to consolidate them so that they would be adequate administrative units. At one time a small unit like a one-room schoolhouse could administer the program when education support was limited to the local area, but this is a Federal program completely, and it is not possible for a community of 5,000 to 10,000 to be a prime sponsor. As I pointed out in my remarks on December 1, 1971, page 43903, such a community would have few—15 to 30—children funded under expected appropriation. By restricting the State it will mean the regional office will administer them, not the small local group.

It has been indicated a number of times in the conference report as I read it, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare himself has said:

> The present language mandates in all cases priority be given to local prime sponsors, with the states left only as residual catch-all for geographical areas which have submitted either no applications or a wholly inadequate application for prime sponsorship. In effect, we would be wholly powerless to choose a state application over a local application, even if the state application would better assure quality care for children.

It is as clear as can be that this is not the local control program that many expect but rather control residing in the Federal Government that should go and can only go to sizable enough unity of government—primarily the State. Really we are not talking about taking power away from local committees but away from the regional office and giving it to the State and large combinations of localities which can only be possible if the Secretary has complete authority to designate the State or such combination as prime sponsor.

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

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK).

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, as one who has for a long time been a strong supporter of early childhood development and of legal services and of OEO, this is a very difficult vote. While I think it is imperative that the OEO be extended, while there is an excellent legal services program which we have in the conference report, I think that the early childhood development section of this report makes it mandatory that for the long-range soundness of anything we can constructively do in this area, this conference report should today be defeated.

There is not any question but that there is need for the first two sections of this bill. I will not dwell on them except to say strongly I deeply regret that in the defeat of this conference report today—and I hope this House will accomplish that—there will be a temporary moving away from the highly desirable legal services corporation. The proposal in this bill in this area is good, the idea is a very much needed one, and I hope we can move soon in that particular direction when we have finished our operations today.

But this particular child development act mixes up the strong need with a very poor potential solution. There is great need for a long step forward in the Federal Government, in my opinion, to do something sound and constructive. We could go through the hours of testimony about working mothers and about a series of needs which have arisen in specific areas of the country and in specific locations, some of them in government, where we should have a sound program in this field, but at this moment we have come up with an administrative monstrosity which should be defeated today.

Mr. Speaker, before commenting in greater detail on the child development provisions in the conference report before us today, I would like to emphasize

my longtime support for comprehensive early childhood education and childcare legislation.

On February 9, 1970, along with members of the Republican Task Force on Education and Training which I chaired, I introduced the Comprehensive Headstart Child Development Act of 1970, H.R. 15776. Shortly thereafter, in April of 1970, our task force issued a report analyzing the need for early childhood services in the United States which was entitled "Report on Programs for Early Childhood." In both the 91st and 92d Congresses, I worked closely with Members from both sides of the aisle, with interested individuals and groups, and with the administration, to devise a sound comprehensive child development bill.

I am still convinced, as I was when I introduced H.R. 15776 almost 2 years ago, that there is a real need for federally supported comprehensive child development programs throughout this Nation. At the same time, I believe Congress is obligated to develop legislation which will provide a sound and workable administrative system from the start.

The legislation before us today does not provide for such a system. In fact I fear that the provisions of the conference report establishing the delivery system for child development programs are so unworkable that it would be better to have no legislation at all at this time than to pass this report as it stands now.

The principal problem with the delivery system is that the population level for prime sponsorship—not program operation, but prime sponsorship—has been reduced in conference to 5,000; and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has been given far too little authority to exercise his judgment in choosing among applicants for prime sponsorship.

I think there has been some unfortunate misunderstanding that smaller communities would not be able to run their own programs if the cutoff for prime sponsorship were a large figure. This is a complete misconception. Not only would smaller communities be able to run their own programs as program operators with larger units being prime sponsors, it would actually be easier for them to do so because they would not have to cope with the complex and specific Federal requirements which the bill establishes for prime sponsors. In fact, as program operators rather than prime sponsors, they would be able to set up programs which were designed specifically for their own needs.

On the surface, the points of distinction between prime sponsorship and program operation may seem insignificant. Let me stress that, on the contrary, these distinctions spell the difference between efficient administration—and the economically sound use of Federal dollars which results from such administration—and chaotic redtape—and the waste of Federal dollars which we all know results from such redtape. I believe it is patently absurd to create thousands upon thousands of eligible prime sponsors who can apply directly to HEW. What kind of bureaucracy will HEW have to set up in order to process these applications? The prospect is truly appalling.

Still another problem is that a small program under the prime sponsorship of a small community will have to go to HEW if they need special expertise not available in their community. I believe it would be far better if this community as a program operator could go to an intermediary prime sponsor—a larger governmental unit—for the special expertise necessary to maintain high quality child development programs.

Early in the development of this legislation, I favored limiting prime sponsorship, and the direct Federal involvement which prime sponsorship entails, to States or to units of 500,000 population. With this population level steadily reduced, I was prepared in conference to support a final compromise which I felt was as far as we could possibly go. This compromise would have given the Secretary of HEW the discretion to choose among prime sponsors rather than mandating him to designate one particular prime sponsor. Unfortunately, even this provision was unacceptable to a majority of the members of the conference committee.

With a background of long involvement in child care legislation and my personal convictions on the need for these services, it has not been an easy decision to oppose passage of this report. I deeply regret the fact that the fate of the Legal Services Corporation and the Office of Economic Opportunity extension are tied to the child development provisions. Although I would prefer it if the conference committee had not seen fit to restrict the President in delegating OEO programs, I still support the extension of OEO. And I strongly support the provisions of the conference report establishing the Legal Services Corporation. We worked long and hard to come up with a compromise that would be agreeable to all parties on this matter, and I wish we could pass this part of the bill separately today.

I feel strongly, however, that the delivery system called for in the child development provisions of the conference report would be so unworkable that we would be far better off defeating the report today. We should then begin immediately on three separate measures: an immediate extension of the OEO authorization, the establishment of a Legal Services Corporation, and finally, new and sound comprehensive child development legislation.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. HANSEN), 2 minutes.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I rise to regretfully urge the defeat of the conference report. I do that as one who has been an early and strong supporter of child development legislation and one who applauds the sincere and constructive efforts of all of those on both sides of this question to bring to this floor the kind of child development bill that could generate the broad support that would assure continued and adequate funding of one of the most important and needed programs in the area of education that can come before this Congress.

The need still is for the kind of a bill which will provide the legislative framework which can mobilize and organize and direct the resources and manpower and collective concerns of this country and apply them toward the obvious needs of young children.

The bill which was originally introduced—and indeed the bill as it emerged from the subcommittee—still offered a real hope for providing that kind of leadership and that kind of impetus. It was a good bipartisan bill.

But that is not the bill before us today. The bill before us today has been significantly redirected to the point that there is no real hope for generating the kind of meaningful State participation—participation of the whole partnership of States and communities, the private sector and the Federal Government—that is essential for success. If our goal is, as I believe it should be, to help young children, to develop the kinds of services that will identify and respond to the needs of young children, then this bill will not do it. The early childhood services that are so urgently needed are too important to be launched by legislation that is so hopelessly defective.

Because of my strong conviction that we can write a much better bill, I urge the defeat of the conference report.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER).

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I share with the gentleman from Oregon the hope that it will be possible, if the conference report is defeated, as I believe it should be, for us to come back and to establish a legal services corporation and to continue the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Sharing the feelings of the gentleman from Idaho and of the gentleman from Oregon about the problems in the child development section, let me turn my attention to two other provisions in this conference report which lead me to believe it ought to be defeated.

One has to do with a provision contained in the conference report which was in the Senate bill but which was not in the bill as passed by the House, which would effectively prohibit the Office of Economic Opportunity from delegating or transferring programs. Since this program started in 1964 eight programs have been delegated by the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. The prohibition runs directly contrary to the concept of the agency as originally intended by the Congress and as the President of the United States said he believes it ought to be. This provision ought not to be in the conference report. For this reason, I urge that we defeat the conference report, so that this provision may be stricken.

Beyond that the House conferees, in my judgment, much too quickly receded and accepted the earmarking contained in the bill as passed by the other body. What the earmarking effectively does to the local Community Action Agencies is to say that no matter what the needs are determined to be in the local community it does not make any difference, that we in the Congress have more wisdom and

have more judgment, and we believe that alcohol and drug abuse are more important than day care or legal services or any other single program of OEO, and we say to them, "You are not allowed to make a judgment at the local level. We will make it at the Federal level."

The earmarking provision will work to inhibit the agency from doing the job which needs to be done in terms of innovation, research and development, and will make it more difficult for the local Community Action Agency effectively to carry out the programs which are determined at the local level.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the issue of prime sponsorship. It is important that everyone understand how the delivery system in the bill was designed to work. It would work through a prime sponsor, which is the vehicle for securing funds, and which establishes a child development council that in turn develops a comprehensive plan for services for the prime sponsorship area. Within the prime sponsorship area there may be any number of individual programs, each of which will have a project policy council composed of parents and parent-approved members. The project policy committee will assist in developing the local program plan.

Many people have become confused about who would be eligible for funds and have the impression that unless the population limitation was reduced to a small number, such as 5,000 which is now in the bill, the bill would be only for big cities and States. This is simply not the case. If the population limitation were set at 100,000 as in the bill originally reported by the Select Subcommittee on Education, or at 500,000 as I would prefer, individual cities or local units of government would still develop their own plans on an individual basis, but would submit an application for funds through a single State, large city, or federally recognized Indian tribal organization application which has been approved for prime sponsorship. If units of 5,000 or more population are allowed to become prime sponsors, the Federal Government could conceivably have as many as 5,000 applications to process and handle. This would be a totally unrealistic administrative task and would make effective monitoring impossible. But even aside from these bureaucratic considerations, this type of prime sponsorship plan would not accomplish our goal of coordinating child development activities on the local, State, and Federal level. It is important that comprehensive services be made available to children. This can only be done through a delivery system which has a limited number of prime sponsors. This is a crucial issue on which the success of the child development legislation rests. In its present form, I do not believe the legislation can be effectively implemented.

Mr. Speaker, my vote against the conference report is a very difficult one to make. The bill contains a section I regard as one of the best and most necessary pieces of legislation to come before the 92d Congress. That is the section establishing an Independent Legal Services Corporation.

The House and Senate conferees reached a totally commendable compromise on the Legal Services Corporation. The most difficult question of the composition of the board was resolved in a manner that assures the legal aid program's independence and effectiveness in representing the poor.

All 17 members of the Board of Directors are appointed by the President, subject to the advice and consent of the Senate, and are selected from among members of the public, the judiciary, and low-income client population, former poverty lawyers, and representatives of professional legal organizations.

The framework of the Legal Services Corporation has been developed with great care for the people to be served for a strict accounting of program funds, for sound organization, and for the highest standards and ethics of the legal profession. This legislation can improve our entire system of justice in this country, and it is a model of what good law should be.

I am distressed that this legislation—and the delivery of legal services to the poor—is now put in jeopardy because of the chaos-inviting delivery system in the child development section of the bill.

I want to stress most forcefully—my deep misgivings over the conference bill have nothing to do with the legal services section. I hope the legal services section will appear word for word, precisely as it is, in a new OEO bill that deserves to become law.

For these reasons, in addition to those outlined by my colleagues, I urge the defeat of the conference report so that we might begin anew to do a better job.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MAZZOLI).

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in support of the conference report. I rise in support of it with the full knowledge that many of my colleagues on the committee and in the House are troubled by various aspects of the bill, primarily the legal services and the child development aspects.

I served on this committee, as many of us did, and worked with it and attended the hearings, and I believe a reliable appraisal of the good and the bad in the conference report shows that there is more good than there is bad and that it is more helpful than it is harmful. Therefore it ought to be supported.

I know that the child development portions will be discussed, so I would like to turn my attention for a moment to the Neighborhood Youth Corps provisions in the conference report.

I believe the Neighborhood Youth Corps is a very important part of this conference report and a very important part of the Office of Economic Opportunity bill. The Neighborhood Youth Corps impresses me as one of the programs in my district in Louisville, Ky., which has had and has provided help to the 16- and 17-year old dropouts and those kids who do not have a chance in this world. This project is designed to prepare enrollees to return to school or for admission to community colleges, and it prepares them to take their place in society.

I hope as we look at this bill and evaluate the conference report we keep in mind that this is an up or down vote. We cannot excise from this conference report any portion that we disagree with. We must vote it up or down.

I think, ladies and gentlemen, we have reached the point where we make a value judgment. We have to take this thing on balance. When I say "on balance," I believe personally—and I hope that the House will concur—that this bill has good in it and will provide opportunities for our children and therefore it ought to be supported.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN).

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, in all good conscience I cannot support this conference report. I am well aware of the fact that there has been a limited good in some of the programs, such as Neighborhood Youth Corps, and Headstart when it was in OEO and a limited benefit—in comparison to the billions spent—in some others, but it seems to me we cannot look at a narrow portion of a multibillion-dollar program and fail to ask questions about these billions that have been spent on the war on poverty and with very unsatisfactory results.

I have told the chairman—and I must say I have great respect for my chairman and support him on most of the bills that come out of our committee—but I can never again support the OEO programs unless there is a drastic change in the direction—major changes in administration so the promises made can be kept—so the billions spent will actually benefit the poor. Any serious study of the OEO in the last several years would show hundreds of millions of dollars have gone down the drain with comparatively small benefits for the intended beneficiaries, the poor. A study would show that we have financed revolutionaries with Federal funds; it would show that we have paid people incarcerated in penal institutions a larger sum of money to pursue a college education than we have paid GI's who have returned from Vietnam to pursue their college education. It would show, Mr. Speaker, that the so-called poverty program has caused the establishment of many consulting firms and corporations that are out for one purpose only, and that is to get contracts out of the Office of Economic Opportunity. As defense funds become more limited, defense contractors have spun off corporations to get OEO contracts.

It would show that many people with high salaries and very lucrative contracts have made a good thing out of poverty, but the poor people of this country have benefited very little.

Mr. Speaker, a study would show that we have spawned community action agencies too many times that have not been interested in providing concrete help but have been more interested in providing rhetoric and in receiving high salaries, themselves.

It would show that there have been hundreds of thousands of dollars in community action agencies that have never

been accounted for and in some cases charges of outright embezzlement.

The record of the Job Corps could never justify the hundreds of millions of dollars that have been spent on that in terms of placement of graduates of the Job Corps program.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the poor people have been studied and surveyed and analyzed ad nauseum.

I have said before on the floor of the House that we are spending this year and every year recently over $42 billion in Federal, State, and local funds on programs exclusively designed for the poor and for which the middle-income people and the low-middle-income people are not eligible. This includes OEO, welfare—but does not include social security.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the time ought to have assured, with the state of the economy in this country what it is, that Congress and the public begin to ask why, with the expenditure of $42 billion for not only OEO but other programs exclusively designed for the poor, why do we have so much poverty in this country today and why have we made so little progress. Why are not our overlapping multitudinous programs working better. What is wrong?

Mr. Speaker, I think some of the answers can be found in an article—and I am amazed that the Washington Post would carry it—but in last Sunday's Washington Post there appeared an article entitled "Street Gangs: Hustling the Do-Gooders."

Mr. Speaker, we have spent millions of dollars on programs financing gangs and this article in the Washington Post starts out as follows:

> Whether a sucker is born every minute or every hour, an unusually large number of them seem to land in some Government social service agencies and among foundation grant-givers. These are well-intentioned suckers, to be sure, but suckers nonetheless—people who are so eager to do good that they are often easy touches for the hustlers.

Mr. Speaker, a careful reading of this article by the Members of this House would surely raise questions about where we are going in the expenditure of Federal funds and why we are financing gangs on the basis that they are the ones who can somehow rehabilitate the juvenile delinquents of this country.

The article further says that "the OEO grant-givers made no effort to examine the facts or to provide either training or technical grants for the administration of the funds."

I urge my colleagues to read the entire article as well as Tom Wolfe's: "Maumauing, the Flak-Catcher."

So, Mr. Speaker, I would find it impossible to live with my conscience and any longer support a program that does not have a radical change in direction—with administrative requirements for responsible expenditure of funds.

I also submit one final suggestion, Mr. Speaker. As I see it, in the child development program we have another case of reverse incentive. Instead of the program as it came out of the Committee on Ways and Means where there was an incentive for people on welfare to get off welfare—and for day care centers for their children when they worked—we now find if parent or parents stay home and do nothing, their children are able to have the day care provided free of charge. A welfare mother—doing nothing would have free day care for her children in most States under the conference report provisions. A working mother with two children would have to pay if she makes over $1,300.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we get rid of this newest reverse incentive in this country and spend our money more wisely. Program after program, in recent years, have reverse incentives built in. If you are a good citizen, work hard, pay your own way—none of the programs are for you.

As Saul Alinsky said:

> "In some ways, middle class groups are more alienated, more out of the scene than the poor. There aren't any special funding programs for them. They don't have a special anything except getting constantly clobbered by taxation and inflation."

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD the full text of the article which appeared in the Washington Post and to which I have referred:

STREET GANGS: HUSTLING THE DO-GOODERS

(By Richard W. Poston)

Whether a sucker is born every minute or every hour, an unusually large number of them seem to land in some government social service agencies and among foundation grant-givers. These are well-intentioned suckers, to be sure, but suckers nonetheless—people who are so eager to do good that they are often easy touches for the hustlers.

Rarely have they been easier targets, though, than in the case of giving large sums to city street gangs, a nationwide practice that came into vogue during the late 1960s as a way of aiding ghetto youths. And few gang members have been more adept at prying loose the grants than those in "The Real Great Society" on New York City's Lower East Side.

Built primarily around the leaders of two violent gangs—Angelo Gonzales from the Dragons and Carlos (Chino) Garcia from the Assassins—this ghetto group was clothed in an aura of glamor, advertised from coast to coast, and became one of the most widely used models for promoting federal and private grants to street gangs. It was one of the most incredible games of myth-making in the history of American social service.

Born in New York City to hard-working Puerto Rican parents who never ceased worrying about him, Angelo was indoctrinated in his early teens into the sordid life of the ghetto streets. He never finished high school, and his prowess as a street fighter, his ability to brag and cheat and con, enabled him to rise to the prestigious position of a Dragon warlord.

"As a warlord," he told me, "I was the guy who said when we would fight another gang. I had to be the first cat on the scene.

I had a suicide squad we called the Magnificent Seven that took the most dangerous risks. Man, we did about everything, fight, mug, steal."

At age 15, he and three members of his cadre followed an elderly man into an elevator, killed him, and stole his money—$2.60. Angelo was caught and, as a juvenile, was sentenced to 3½ to 5 years. In prison, he decided that would be his last criminal act.

The same ghetto conditions that produced Angelo also created Chino. Born in Puerto Rico as one of six children, he was brought to New York by his parents at age 5. Within a few years he, too, adapted to the streets. During his teens, Chino, like Angelo, developed a large muscular build. He dropped out of school at the 9th grade level and rose rapidly as a hoodlum, roaming the streets and subways with a mugging ring and building his reputation in the Assassins.

"We used to go into another gang's territory," he said to me, "and play knock-knock. We would go to a guy's door and knock, then shoot the cat that opened it. We did sniping from rooftops or from anywhere we could hide. We pulled robberies. Mostly mugging. And we made money with whores and homosexuals. We gave them protection."

Chino was in and out of jail so many times that even he could not remember how often, and at 17 he was told by the police to leave the country, or else.

He went into "exile" in his native Puerto Rico. There, feeling weary of the violent life, Chino made up his mind that he, too, would look for something new.

Both Angelo and Chino returned to Manhattan's Lower East Side in the summer of 1964. The two gang leaders started running together again, looked up their former street friends—many of whom had become either junkies or pushers—found the Dragons and the Assassins virtually dissolved, and set out to form a new gang, this time to "do something positive." What that might be they didn't know—perhaps combat delinquency, start legitimate businesses, prevent riots. Like many street youths, their imaginations were almost without limit, and despite several tempting opportunities to make real "bread" by working for the Mafia, they stuck to their dreams of fabulous good works. But except for a small club room they fixed up in an empty basement, from which they were evicted for too much partying, that was about it—dreaming, drinking, smoking pot, interludes with girls, and in their flights of fantasy, doing all the great and wonderful things they talked about.

What changed all this were persons from outside the ghetto. First came two brothers, Mike and Fred Good, then in their early 20s. They came from a middle-class family in a Philadelphia suburb, wound up on the Lower East Side, and through a series of chance events became loyal confidants to Chino and Angelo and their street friends. Short on experience in social problem-solving but long on idealism, exceptionally bright and eager to improve the human enterprise, Mike and Fred found the gang leaders the most exciting individuals they had ever met. They rented an apartment to serve as club headquarters and immersed themselves in Angelo's and Chino's dreams of good works.

Following closely on the heels of Mike and Fred came a young professor named Charlie Slack. Charlie, who had a Ph. D. from Princeton, personified the avant-garde. He also had the flair of a Hollywood press agent and a string of personal contacts with people in influential positions almost everywhere. Charlie, too, became a confidant of the gang leaders, and with his promotional talent, along with that of Mike and Fred, scores of prominent individuals, college students and professional grantsmen were attracted to the apartment to join in nightly "rap sessions" in which the dreams of good works soared to ever ascending heights—leaving all who came carried away by the romantic notion of tough gang leaders out to reform and rehabilitate one of the nation's most vicious social jungles, the Lower East Side of Manhattan.

"With Charlie in the picture," said Fred, "it became a really insane, Disneyland kind of framework. Nothing we said we could do seemed too big or impossible."

Meanwhile, in Washington war had been declared on poverty, and a crash effort was under way to find projects that the government could support. From bright young bureaucrats and private consulting firms that

mushroomed to get in on the poverty business, from professors, foundation executives, psychiatrists, clergymen and an assortment of well-to-do amateurs, came a new idea: Members of urban street gangs, despite their history of delinquent behavior, are not really bad guys, but talented neighborhood youths who possess charismatic powers of leadership that make them uniquely equipped to serve as conduits for federal and private money with which to organize slum-trapped young people into worthwhile activities.

Among many professionals active in the antipoverty campaign, this idea gained rapid acceptance, and at Mike's and Fred's apartment the flamboyant Charlie soon realized that it wouldn't be at all difficult—indeed, would be an interesting lark—to build the Lower East Side gang leaders into national celebrities.

So, billed as the "West Side Story" boys, now in the vanguard of a ghetto youth movement that could make the poverty war succeed, Charlie put the newly named Real Great Society on a circuit of personal appearance tours that reached across the nation. Taking cues supplied by their middle-class promoters and confidants—including eloquent quotations from Jefferson to Kennedy to Johnson—the gang leaders were provided with platforms on college campuses, at national and regional conventions, and at local service clubs. They were put on television and radio, extolled in the press and in several leading national magazines, wined and dined by local bigwigs, and wound up their evenings with the inevitable girls and parties. At every stop it was a repeat performance, and almost every time they brought their audience to standing ovations with stories of how they as big-city gang leaders were reforming New York's Lower East Side—even converting it into an area of "smiling cops."

As the fantasy grew so did the stories, and being human, the gang leaders began to believe their own publicity. At the University of Wisconsin they so impressed an audience of judges, probation officials, and police officers that in the heat of the moment, Angelo, quoted in the Wisconsin State Journal, climaxed one speech with the sweeping announcement, "Juvenile delinquency in New York is dead."

"It was a traveling road show," said Charlie. "Full of heroics, way overblown, a terrific attention getter. And the guys got so they could really play it. They were natural born actors anyway. They loved an audience. They loved attention. They were crazy about traveling. They had a ball, and I had a ball just being with them."

Having had his fun, Charlie eventually dropped from the scene and moved on into the consulting business. But by that time the myth had grown to dramatic proportions, the famous image that made The Real Great Society a magic name in antipoverty circles had been established, and the gang leaders themselves were so widely credited with achievements they had not accomplished that it was no longer necessary for them to settle down to the real work of actually doing the things they had talked and dreamed about.

Then, to confirm the image, Fred, along with other promoters who came in from outside the ghetto, put out proposals that started a flow of foundation grants—$15,000, $25,000, $50,000, and more. Several projects were begun including three new businesses—all of which soon failed because of mismanagement and inadequate guidance. Highly publicized, but with no mention made that they had failed, these ventures increased still further the fame of the Lower East Side gang leaders and greatly enhanced the idea of federal and private financing of urban street gangs throughout the nation.

Then came the largest and most important project to fuel the myth. This was an educational program known as the "University of the Streets," which used voluntary teachers and offered vitrually any subject that a group of six or more youths wanted to study. Started in the summer of 1967 with a private grant of $25,000, the project in 1968 brought the gang leaders a quarter of a million dollars from the Office of Economic Opportunity. But again, certain important facts were carefully omitted from the publicity—and from the campaign that brought in the federal money.

One of the most glaring omissions was that the University of the Streets was neither started nor operated by the gang leaders, but by Fred and other volunteers who came in from outside the ghetto, along with many unglamorous poor people in the neighborhood who were not members of The Real Great Society. This omission further embedded one of the major myths upon which the government grant was based; that the gang leaders were doing the work that made it possible for sources of outside aid to reach thousands of ghetto youths. With the romanticism toward street gangs that had built up in Washington—for which the promoters of the Real Great Society were largely responsible—the OEO grant-givers made no effort to examine the facts or to provide either training or technical guidance for the administration of the funds. It was simply assumed that the gang leaders, by virtue of being gang leaders, now widely renowned as social reformers, already had all the expertise they needed to qualify them as managers of the government money.

Those who actually were organizing and operating the University of the Streets, fully aware that the magic gang reputation was making the federal and private financing possible, were willing—at least for a while—to go along with the myth. They let everyone continue believing that the university was the gang leaders' own doing.

But as time went on, strains developed between the gang leaders and the university's organizers and staff over how the school was to be run—and by whom. The gang-leaders, with their inflated self-image, became increasingly determined to control the money and maintain the high living to which they had become accustomed. But the workers became increasingly resistant and the rebellion grew. The myth upon which the financing had been based was becoming, to the workers, more of a liability than an asset.

Through a series of maneuvers the workers managed to get Muhammad Salhuddeen, a locally respected black man of the streets in his late 30s, who had attempted to arbitrate the conflict, appointed director. With that accomplished, the workers gained the support of a group of neighborhood parents and decided to convert the University of the Streets into an independent operation free from the Real Great Society influence. But as this move took shape, the gang leaders, seeing their most valuable source of funds in danger of slipping away, reverted to their violent past.

Repeatedly they tried to get rid of the workers, but the workers refused to quit. The resulting internal power struggle caused the bulk of the government's $253,557 to be wasted, and brought the University of the Streets to a standstill. OEO, still enamored by the myth, backed the gang. With this support from Washington, along with assurances that they could close the university entirely and still be eligible for federal funds, the gang leaders, with a band of cronies from the streets, moved in and physically demolished the project. Doors were torn from hinges, light fixtures ripped out, windows smashed, library books thrown on the floor.

But that didn't seem to disturb the Washington grant givers. The Real Great Society they were was awarded additional federal grants totaling $155,000, money which resulted in little more than another payroll operation in the maze of human despair that still prevails on Manhattan's Lower East Side.

Meanwhile, the workers at the University of the Streets, led by Muhammad—whose patient efforts to keep the peace were all that avoided bloodshed on the day the project was wrecked—repaired the damage. Then, after a year of mostly payless paydays and almost unbelievable struggle to keep the project alive—able to gain only meager financial support because it no longer had the famous gang image—the program was gradually put back into operation. Finally, in 1970, it succeeded in gaining financial aid from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, plus additional funds from New York City and a few private sources. At present, the University of the Streets is supplying vocational training to approximately 300 Lower East Side street youths. It has become an independent neighborhood program, and the workers' productivity is not a myth.

But myths about street gangs seem to persist. Certainly, few could quarrel with the goal of opening new opportunities to the millions of ghetto youths who need help. But to regard urban street gangs as appropriate instruments for accomplishing this urgent task, to publicize and build them into something they are not, is to set our society up for million-dollar hustlers.

If we are to help ghetto youths, we must be honest with ourselves and as objective as possible about the facts in each case. Every street gang is not a "youth group" uniquely suited to lead the necessary social reforms; many gangs must use brutal beatings and murders to recruit dues-paying teenagers. Nor can we fall for the line that some of the larger street gangs, such as those on Chicago's South Side, are major political powers; the fact is that their chief opponents are the residents in the very neighborhoods in which they operate.

We also must be less romantic about how grant money is used. It may not sound very glamorous, but appropriate supervision over the funds is essential, as is counseling by workers committed to constructive change. Unless we do become more realistic, it will be difficult to say which is the greater obstacle to delivering the help that is needed—the gangs or the "establishment."

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT).

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the House will shortly cast what may be properly characterized as our paramount moral vote of the session. During the 7 years since its inception in 1964, the antipoverty program has afforded a modest shield of protection to the disadvantaged—the poor, the elderly, the young, the nonwhites. While the bulk of its programs which have received maximum publicity have been urban-oriented, it has also provided economic and social assistance to the oft-forgotten but ever-present rural poor.

Until 1969, this Nation was winning the war against poverty. Unfortunately, the tide has turned in the opposite direction. Latest statistics indicate that in 1970 the number of poor persons increased by over 1 million from the 1969 level. The rejection of the conference report before us could but result in yet a further setback in our efforts to eliminate want and misery from this Nation.

It has been my heartfelt hope that

this year would not witness but yet another repetition of the acrimonious debate and division which unfortunately has been the biennial hallmark of OEO extensions. The House Education and Labor Committee under the dedicated and skillful leadership of its Chairman, CARL PERKINS, fashioned a bill which was cleared by the committee on a bipartisan vote of 32 to 3. The House followed suit on October 1 by giving its approval to the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1971, 251 to 115, a majority of both parties voting in the affirmative.

The conference report in all significant areas, incorporates the House position. In light of this, I was therefore disappointed to learn that all but one of the Republican House conferees had refused to sign the report.

I am informed that this was the result of White House pressure and that the administration has mounted an all-out fight against House adoption of this report. It has been aided and abetted by some of the most vicious rightwing propaganda I have ever witnessed.

I will readily concede to those who must judge every action, every vote, solely on the bookkeeping basis of political assets as against political liabilities, that many Members can undoubtedly vote against antipoverty with political impunity. But I do not believe that we can answer the roll today on the basis of such narrow and shortsighted criteria. Neither do I think that a majority of the House, at this season of the year certainly, will elect to turn indifferently its back on our less fortunate fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that this body would choose, less than 3 weeks before Christmas, to play the role of an unreformed Ebenezer Scrooge.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on many occasions I am proud to be associated with the remarks and view point of my distinguished friend, the Speaker of the House, but on this occasion I differ with the gentleman very strongly.

The White House is opposed to this legislation and to this conference report, and it is doing as any administration has sought to do where it differs with a legislative conclusion to express its will. Therefore, I certainly disagree with the observation made by my distinguished friend, the Speaker of the House. I cannot imagine any lobbyists, if that is what you want to call them, from the White House, influencing the distinguished Member from the State of Oregon, the gentlewoman (Mrs. GREEN).

I think she has a reputation in this body of expressing her own views, some of which I agree with and some of which I do not. But her explanation of the need and necessity for reform of OEO ought to convince any open-minded person that this conference report should be defeated. She has over the years supported the OEO legislation.

She has made a study in depth—and not just this year but over the years, and certainly the arguments made by her should be most significant for those who have an open mind on whether or not this conference report should be defeated.

But there are other parts of the conference report that also ought to be discussed and considered and which, in my opinion, justify the need and the necessity for the defeat of the conference report.

We have a new section or title here involving legal services. Legal services over the years has been in trouble from the west coast to the east coast and from the northern border to the South.

An honest attempt was made by the administration to come up with a legal services organization that would have more autonomy. The ABA, the American Bar Association, submitted its proposal to provide a legal services operation.

But this conference report goes contrary to what the administration recommended. It is contrary in certain aspects to what the American Bar Association recommended. The conference report is fundamentally in opposition in a very important part to the recommendations of the administration and to some extent to the American Bar Association.

The Child Development Act is opposed here by five Members on our side. I think four of them are basically interested in the child development program and their opposition is not the concept but to the way that the conference committee has provided for the delivery system of the services.

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER), and the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. HANSEN) are not opposed to the child development program—but they cannot swallow this program and, therefore, I think we ought to be guided by their observations and by their comments.

For the reasons given by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) and for the reason that the conference report is contrary to the administration's recommendations on legal services, and for the reasons given by the gentleman from Minnesota and others, in my opinion, the conference report ought to be voted down. I think we can do a better job on this legislative package if not this year then certainly next year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER).

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) for yielding and giving me an opportunity today to express my views.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that in the last 5 years as a Member of this distinguished body, honored as I am to be in this Chamber, I have not yet voted for a perfect piece of legislation.

I think the question we have to ask ourselves as we analyze any bill is whether or not it serves its basic purpose and if it has flaws, whether or not those flaws are fatal to the realization of the goal of the legislation itself.

It seems to me that the concept of quality child development services in itself is urgently needed in America today.

It would be wonderful if every child in America could grow and flourish in the warmth and security of a happy, healthy home under the loving care and attention of its mother or a close relative.

It is to the credit and benefit of our society that many million American children do just that. They are fortunate.

But it is also a fact of life that many do not, many cannot, many will not. I repeat, this is a fact of life.

In the real world of today, many mothers work, out of choice or necessity. Others may be sick, or otherwise simply incapable of caring adequately for their children.

The result is children whose preschool or after-school care ranges from none at all to catch-as-catch-can babysitters.

No care is the cheapest solution to the problem, but what price do we pay in the lack of security and guidance? Baby sitters cost money, be they adequate or inadequate, and there are not nearly enough to go around. In our mobile society, older family members, who used to be nearby, now live in another State.

Those of us concerned about this situation have worked to develop a sound, plausible answer to a situation that is by no means ideal but which, nevertheless, is a real one in this country today.

And that is a system of quality day care facilities, supported by Federal funds, that can offer the very best environment and care that it is humanly possible to provide in such a setting. What is the Federal stake in the situation? It is the working women, who, knowing their children are well cared for, have peace of mind, and it is the children of America who can be better, happier citizens because of it.

Lest anyone doubt the reality of their need, let me pass on to you the experience I have had in regard to the subject of day care.

I have long been interested in the subject of day care and have been involved in developing a program, almost always with the benefit of counsel and information provided by experts, by the social engineers who speak from drawing boards and learned analyses. As the issue moved to the forefront and awaited congressional approval, I decided to find out what the people for whom it was being prepared thought about it.

Two weeks ago, I held a hearing on day care in the city of Fall River, Mass., in my congressional district. Fall River was appropriate for such a hearing because it is a heavily industrialized city of 100,000 where nearly half the entire work force is women. Many of them are the sole support of their families. And many have the added handicap of a different mother tongue than English.

The estimate is that there are some 8,000 working women in Fall River with children under the age of 14. This means upwards of 25,000 children who require some kind of day care. And that is one

city in the United States, which, I am sure, has many, many counterparts.

So more than 650 people came to the hearing. They ranged across the entire spectrum of Fall River's population, from the chamber of commerce to organized labor, from the individual working mother to the personnel manager of a large insurance company. Some spoke, others spoke only by their presence. And they were unanimous in their response: they all want a system of quality day care centers. Their emphasis was on need and on quality.

I would not want it on my consicence that we have denied them in their need because of details. We must not lose our perspective and become preoccupied with hair-splitting while the needs of millions of women and children remain unfulfilled.

Our principal concern should be with the concept itself and with the criteria for quality of care extended to these children. The 25 criteria for sponsorship set up in this legislation are so complicated and so restrictive that I see it as self-perfecting. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is the ultimate arbiter of whether applicants meet this criteria and I have a great deal of regard for Mr. Richardson. I feel that he himself will constitute the toughest criterion.

But this is not just a concept. It builds on the Headstart experience which we know has proven valuable, not only to the children, but also to both their parents. This too embodies the freedom of choice, and, once that choice is made, totally involves the mothers and fathers who themselves derive benefit from what is probably an even deeper awareness of the needs of their children.

We have child care now under the social security program, so there is no great precedent here. What is here is the question of whether we want a custodial function or quality that produces an end result: better parents and better children.

Is the price too high? We spend a great deal of money on programs to combat drug abuse and school dropouts. Why not spend some in a preventive function and hopefully obviate the need for federally funded drug and dropout programs in the future.

All of us know there is usually a considerable difference between authorization and appropriation and that we have control of both. If the $2 billion authorization in this bill is really the nose of the camel under the tent, it is our privilege and responsibility to see that a more realistic amount is made available, keeping in mind that there is an ability-to-pay fee system provided for.

I feel very strongly that this program should include personal participation by way of fees. I do not foresee it as totally funded by the Federal Government. For one thing, fees will introduce a socioeconomic mix which I think is necessary to the success of the program itself.

If the delivery system is imperfect, it can be corrected by practice and experience. Let us not be guilty of presumption and condemn a program before the fact. Is there no recourse to us in future sessions? Do we go out of business when we approve this bill?

The situation is not perfect, but it is real.

Let us respond to it now.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER).

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER) is in the Chamber, I would be glad to yield for a question. I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman. I appreciate his yielding to me. I would just like to mention further the testimony of some people in support of this program. I know that the public hearing in Fall River demonstrated a broad spectrum of support that far surpassed any of my expectations as to the interest, the concern, and the need. Those who participated in the hearing, from representatives of the Chamber of Commerce to working men from the unions, the school superintendent, a psychologist, social workers, Headstart mothers, and the waitresses at the very public building in which the meeting was held and who asked to testify showed that we could have held hearings all night long because women who work, and with whom I am particularly concerned, need the peace of mind to know that their children are safe. It seemed to me that the outpouring of sentiment was testimony from the real world that we do not often get in Washington, where such sentiments are distilled by the pronouncements of experts.

Those who spoke were extremely strong in their support and their announcements of the need for quality day care and child development services. The key word here is "quality." It seems to me that quality is the highest criterion.

The importance of quality is what this conference report stresses, and I urge its passage.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SCHEUER. I totally agree with our gentle colleague from Massachusetts. If ever there was a classic case of washing the baby down the sink with the bath water, this is it. There is not a Member on either side of this Chamber who has not had some reservations about virtually every piece of legislation they have voted on. I have voted in the last 7 years on perhaps 1,500 pieces of legislation. I would vouch that not one of them was delivered to us perfectly cast in a heavenly mold from Mount Sinai or Mount Olympus. We are imperfect human beings dealing in this poverty problem, the most extraordinarily complicated, anxiety-ridden, tension-ridden problem that urban civilization has ever produced. Of course, these are flaws. Of course, there has been imperfect administration by the Democratic administration that preceded this as well as by the present administration.

But let us get on with the job of giving our children, the middle class and poor children alike—the preschool training they urgently need.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, the House today has a great responsibility as well as an opportunity to enact into law a comprehensive program for the benefit of children. So often in the 7 years of experience that I have had before this body dealing with programs that benefit children we are merely asked to take into consideration compensatory education programs to help alleviate the problems that children encounter after they have reached school age or have become teenagers. These compensatory programs have not by and large been entirely successful, because we are trying to reach these children too late with too little money.

We have been faced by enormous research documentation and reports which indicate that where we have failed in American education is by not according attention and concern to the very young child. This is precisely what the early childhood education bill does. It provides funding at the time the children are impressionable, where their educational opportunities will produce the dividends which we are seeking when they enter into formal education.

There are 5 million young children today who could benefit from a program such as is conceived under our early childhood education amendment in this comprehensive legislation. These young children will be given an opportunity not only for educational adventures at an early age, but also for a comprehensive approach toward their social and behavioral attitudes which are crucial in the development of these children as they begin their formal education.

There are many millions of young children who are today in day care centers that provide no educational content at all. They are merely being provided custodial services. This program will allow us to extend this program and provide them with these educational services.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will support this legislation.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS).

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of valid reasons for objecting to this bill and to this conference report but, in the time available, I shall confine myself to the inclusion in this package of the Brademas or child development amendment.

As the sponsors of this amendment say, it is the most sweeping—and, I think we might fairly add, the most revolutionary—program of child care by and on the part of the Government of the United States in all of our history.

With this program the Federal Government enters into every home, into every playroom, into every nursery in the United States of America.

It enters, I may add, surreptitiously and by the back door—presented here in this House one afternoon as a 60-plus

page so-called amendment, without a rule, in violation of all orderly procedure, and voted on and adopted by three votes by a House most of which knew little or nothing of the subject matter before it.

This mammoth and very expensive program of "child development" is, as its sponsors emphasize, not merely for those who need help and assistance and a chance they may never have had at the welfare or the poverty level, nor is it merely day care for the children of the working poor—its thrust, admittedly, is for an overall program of custody, nutrition, education, training, and social indoctrination from a tender age—not at the hands of the family, but at the hands of the Federal Government, and covering people of every economic and social level in our society.

True, today we are presented with a voluntary program. But in view of the obvious disposition of many of those who support this measure to believe that the State can do a better job of child rearing than can the American family, and in view of the trend of modern society, I think we are entitled to wonder how many years it will be before we are back here considering a bill involving some form of direct or indirect compulsion.

And why should you and I—taxpaying and self-supporting Americans—why should we, in any case, have made available to us, on any basis, a program which permits us to have our children largely raised by Federal welfare workers and bureaucrats? This is a job we ought to do ourselves.

I am not interested in technical arguments about the details of delivery systems.

I say that it is wrong in principle and contrary to our heritage and our traditions for the Government of the United States to take over from the parents of America, on any basis, the education, the training, and the rearing of America's children.

If we do this, we change the America we have known—and we change it, in the long run, for the worse, not for the better.

We trade in the old American belief in the private family and home—however humble—for the gospel of social welfare, administered by the case worker and presided over by the politician.

In good conscience we ought not to do this.

I urge the ejection of the conference report.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER).

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

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

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, from the text of the debate in the Senate, as it appeared in the RECORD for December 2, 1971, on the question of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1971, it would seem that the proponents are relying on the proposition that institution of the so-called comprehensive child development program will, when operational, strengthen the family unit. To suggest that the proposition is wrong would seem to me to be almost self-evident. But let me explore further.

It would seem that proponents of comprehensive child development do not fully understand the implications of their prescriptions, or else, as a matter of strategy, they are verbally denying what they in fact are attempting to do. I would like to think that it is the former, but in any event their fundamental stated premise is that comprehensive child development will strengthen the family. We should address ourselves to this suppressed premise of the bill.

The "child development" program, we are told by the bill, will be carried out through a system of local "child development" centers as authorized and chosen by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. These centers will be established, we are told, not for custodial purposes, not to release the welfare mother for work, but to provide a system of child development services which are needed by millions of children. It would seem that if one accepts the proposition of such need, one is actually saying that the family is not able or willing successfully to undertake its assigned task. Because universality is recommended as a future objective, one has to conclude that the premise is that the family is unable to perform successfully. If, in the alternative, the proponent would deny this, then what he must say is that a child has an inherent need for the services which will be made available at the child development centers, services which the child simply cannot get at home. If he would deny that also, then he will have successfully denied the need for the program.

Therefore, in analyzing the program we are able to say that either the family has failed, or there is an inherent need for some kind of communal, institutional arrangement if children are going to successfully "develop." The only other option is that a proponent would believe both; he could not reject both without rejecting the program. But, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what the advocates of child development have been doing. They have merely asserted the need for child development centers without ever having analyzed the need.

To consider whether child development strengthens the family, it was necessary to look to need, as suggested by the proponents. To fulfill either or both of those needs, as analyzed, is the substance of the program—in this case it is either that the family has failed in its responsibility to its children or that it is inherently defective, except perhaps in certain select situations. But in either case, one cannot really contend that the objective of the program is to strengthen the family. To do so is pure strategy, devoid of the substantive considerations of the so-called child development program. This program will not strengthen the family, but is an attack—veiled or otherwise—on the family itself. No amount of rhetoric will obscure that fundamental point.

Mr. Speaker, I include Senator PAUL FANNIN's remarks taken from the Senate debate at this point in the RECORD:

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I shall vote against this conference report. Almost 3 months ago this body approved Senate bill 2007, which included among other things a proposal entitled a "comprehensive child development" program which according to section 501(a) (1) of the bill is required, because millions of children are suffering from the lack of "child development" services. Furthermore, the language of the bill notes that Congress has determined that "child development programs" are "essential to the achievement of the full potential of the Nation's children." To begin with Mr. President, I am not at all sure that the Congress, or anyone else, for that matter, has determined beyond doubt any such thing.

On the contrary, recent sociological and psychological studies are confirming what man seems to have intuitively known all along: that a child, out of the natural environment of the parent-child relationship, suffers. In the formative years, major inroads on time and allegiance into the singular relationship of the parent to his child can cause severe harm. We are now hearing that institutional care is less effective than the natural relationship the child has with his parent, even if the latter is not blessed with a Ph. D. In considering this so-called child development program we ought not be sidetracked by overly optimistic rhetoric which, when employed by the sponsors and proponents, would lead us to the conclusion that comprehensive services of the nature indicated in this bill are essential to the development of a child's full potential and are inherently superior to the individual relationship of parent and child.

There are many problems with this so-called child development program, not the least of which is the fundamental premise upon which the program is drafted. Many who oppose this program have been rightly concerned over the apparent open-ended financial commitment we will be making should we adopt "child development." The conference report, No. 92-682, authorizes a $2 billion, 1 hundred million expenditure by the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972. The original legislative sponsors have promised us that an annual doubling of amounts will be needed to deliver in basic forms these allegedly desirable services to children who just do not know how bad off they really are. Secretary Richardson and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have been quoted to the effect that we are talking in terms of about $20 billion at initial program operational levels.

In addition, the administration of this program is another factor which has troubled more than a few. The provision for prime sponsorship and cultural units whose numbers exceed 5,000, will engender a bureaucratic monstrosity heretofore unknown to this city—and as the Members know, this is not a city in which bureaucracy is unknown.

As important as these considerations may be, they presume the acceptability of the program itself. Simply because a program might have been made less expensive or provision made for more efficient administration does not mean that we should sanction the program. Mr. President, this call for child development, a misnomer which more properly should be designated child control and reform, is not a good program. Its premises are very wrong and most dangerous, for apart from the beautiful words, is the notion that the parent is a failed experiment. To be sure, the conference report has tightened up considerably on the language dealing with parental permission, but Mr. President, when we get down to basics we must determine how this program will be realized. When instituted, the parent-child relationship will be significantly altered, and done so on the suppressed premise that so-called professionals are allegedly better equipped to fashion the personalities and destinies of your youth.

Some have contended that all this business about parent and child is a phony issue. However, we have only to look to the words of key child development sponsors to conclude that not only is the value of the individualized parent-child relationship a real issue, it is the fundamental issue; not just to me and those who are unalterably opposed to this experiment, but to those advocating massive governmental intervention into the lives of those as young as 18 months.

As strange as it might seem to most Americans, there are many who feel that the parent ought not be trusted with the responsibility of bringing up his child, although it should be pointed out that the advocates always talk in terms of "shared responsibility" and "partnership." A key advocate of institutional intervention into child upbringing is Dr. Reginald Lourie, president of the Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children. Dr. Lourie testified before a congressional committee, saying that—

"There is serious thinking among some of the future-oriented child development research people [himself no doubt included] that maybe we can't trust the family alone to prepare young children for this new kind of world which is emerging."

He indicated that the shortcomings of the family is one of the reasons why they felt they needed to have access to the babies.

I might add parenthetically that any real concern for this new kind of world ought to be directed toward holding in check the enthusiasm of those Orwellian planners who, using government as the agency of their selected reform, feel that they can bring up America's children better than one's own parents.

Dr. Lourie views the current relationship that a child is exclusively within the authority of his parents as depriving the child of much needed and desirable professional and institutional child development. It is Lourie's thesis that a new order of child is mandated for his brave new world—and it is because the child has been cloistered within the family relationship that he is destined to lead the imperfect life. To insure against that, Dr. Lourie contends that access to children must be had during the first 2 years of life because it is then that the brain will be growing faster and absorbing its impressions and establishing its subsequent habits which will be with the child throughout his days. Lourie said:

"[The brain] is then . . . most plastic and most available for appropriate experience and corrective interventions."

Mr. President if we have anything to fear it ought to be those who suggest that what this sorry world needs is corrective interventions into the forming personalities of our young.

Another who has endorsed these child development techniques is Arlene Skolnick, who, in the August 1971, issue of Psychology Today, went to the brink with her rhetoric when she titled her little piece "Families Can Be Unhealthy for Children and Other Living Things." In this article Miss Skolnick contends that comprehensive child development programs are "a means of rescuing children" from the isolation that is family life whether it be from families of affluence or poverty. She further contends that the "family—read: parent—is not a psychological necessity" and that it is "the myth of the family" which "blinds us to the dangers" of our present child development arrangements—which is to say that families can be unhealthy for the children and other living things.

One congressional sponsor said in support of this bill that with the adoption of comprehensive child development we will have finally recognized that the "child is a care of the State." Mr. President, the child is not the care of the State, he is a care of his parents and the parents are a care of themselves and their adulthood. To suggest otherwise is subversive of the true and proper ordering of life.

Now one might respond that such is not the proposition of the bill before this body. But the language of the bill and the intent of the framers requires one to conclude that a basic lack of faith in the parent as properly responsible for the children's development is the essence of the bill. The language of the bill indicates that rich and poor alike just do not have what it takes to be good parents. Some however, restrict their condemnation to poor parents. Well, Mr. President, the amount of money one has has nothing to do with the true quality of a father or mother. To suggest that one is going to be a lousy parent, because he is poor is snobbish and dangerous.

We are told in this bill that all children should have comprehensive child development services and that universality should be the program's ultimate objective. No other conclusion is possible: The parent is a failed experiment.

Here I should like to return to the point that not only is this view outrageous, it is, pure and simply, wrong. Recent studies by Dr. Konrad Lorenz among others have yielded results just the opposite to what the Louries and Skolnicks would have us believe. Lorenz contends that institutional child care in which parental responsibilities are assumed even in part by an agency can cause what psychiatrists call "the disease of nonattachment." Among the manifestations most often connected with "nonattachment" is the inability to cope with or discipline one's own aggressive impulses and the tendency toward emotional mutation where the lack of a consistent and dominant family atmosphere in the formative years find children later who are unable to feel joy, grief or remorse.

Mr. President, only sketchily have I been able to express my thoughts and concerns over what I see as the fundamental issue involved in title V of this bill—Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1971. There is no doubt in my mind that the firmness of our national mental health is directly related to the vitality and integrity of our family life traditions. I am also convinced that this experiment whether we choose to call it child development or child control is an adventure which will prove progressively destructive to the institutions and traditions of family. I am especially sure that if the American people knew and understood what we may very well be on the verge of approving that there would be loud and convincing objection to this radical departure from our sound family arrangements. In fact, although this bill has been largely ignored by the popular media, there has still been growing alarm over what we might be about to do.

And that brings us to a final question, what are we about to do if we approve comprehensive child intervention? About the only thing we know is that child development centers will be established to recreate our kids in a textbook image. But absent from the legislation is just exactly what that means. During the House debate on September 30, 1971, an inquiry was made as to the nature of "child development services" and no answer was given.

Listen to what child development proponent Alice M. Rivlin, writing in the December 1 Washington Post, said:

"While there is some vagueness about what 'child development' actually is . . ."

Let us stop right there. "Vagueness?" That means no one has bothered to spell out what we are about to do. What this bill in fact does is grant the authority over to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to determine what it ought to do to make children good and pure. What that means is that the Louries and Skolnicks will be drafting the programs. That I am not sure is really something I want seen done—with my children or anybody else's children.

But Miss Rivlin told us more when she wrote, that while the program is vague as to its tools:

"It is very clear what this program is *not*. (Her emphasis). First it is *not* just a babysitting operation to provide custodial care for children while their mothers work."

At least Miss Rivlin is honest about the whole thing. Many have heard and accepted the idea that all we are about to do is establish day-care centers for working mothers. Nothing could be further from the truth, what we are about to do is sanction massive psychological and sociological interventions—corrective interventions—as Dr. Lourie tells us—to produce what Dr. Lourie thinks would be a better child.

Mr. President, what we have before us is a serious challenge to the family. What we have is another step toward the Orwellian vision of 1934. It is said that these fears are "pretty farfetched," because this program is going to be voluntary. The response is overly legalistic and avoids how the program will and necessarily operate. Even language in the conference report provides for funds to solicit recruits for the child reformation centers. Further, when the program is being operated by those training in its advancement, does anyone seriously believe that the parent will have anything other than a de facto obligatory arrangement. I am not impressed with the protection provided by the bill, because it is clear what the sponsors and proponents have in mind, whether they know it or not it is 1984. It is communalization of what should be personal and private. It is a disaster. It should be defeated.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, it is contended by the proponents of this legislation that there are millions of deprived children, deprived, one assumes, of established child development services. For the sake of argument, let us assume the proponents have correctly assessed the situation, though I should point out that the proponents extravagantly overstate the need. But let us assume they are correct. Will child development programs, when instituted as outlined in this bill, help them, or will it further retard them?

Evidence of psychology indicates that the children would not be helped. Significant psychological research is pointing to the proposition that institutionalized child care is dangerous for the child's mental well-being. Findings have indicated over and over again that the younger the child, the more danger such programs could be to his psychological development. It has also been shown that it is dangerous to the mental health of a child for him to be shifted from one center to another, to be cared for by one nurse after another, to be administered to by one technician after another. This could lead to the development of an insecure, unloving child and could foster a destructive adult personality.

Dr. Konrad Lorenz calls this syndrome the "disease of nonattachment." It takes the form of an inability to cope with one's aggression, and of a profound emotional stultification. And its cause is the lack of a strong family atmosphere.

Dr. Dale Meers has recently completed a study of "International Day Care: A Selective Review and Psychoanalytic Critique." Some of his observations and

conclusions are deeply unsettling, and I wonder that the advocates of child development can so blithely fail to take them into account. Let me quote a few passages from this report.

Depersonalization can readily take place in institutions; it is demonstrable in private homes; and it is a chronic potentiality in group care of children. . . .

The early years from birth through three appear developmentally as the time of maximum psychiatric risk, and failures of psychobiologic adaptations are manifest in a progression that includes marasmus, autism, childhood schizophrenia, and an extended range of poorly understood pathologies. . . .

. . . clinical experience does provide dramatic evidence of the apparent irreversibility of psychological damage incurred in early and prolonged institutional care. Further, psychiatric and psychoanalytic experience constantly reaffirm the enormity of pain and effort necessary to modify even the more benign psychoneurotic disturbances. The clinician is less fearful of gross pathology that might derive from Day Care, than of incipient, developmental impediments that would be evident in later character structure . . .

This is indeed a dreadful panorama of possibilities to spread before ourselves, and to wish to undertake upon our shoulders.

The United States in 1964 became the first nation to subsidize a radical conspiracy against its own legal system. This it did through OEO's so-called legal services program—a program I prefer to call an "illegal disservice." The objectives were laudable enough: To give the poor greater access to the courts by providing competent legal assistance at little or no cost. Few could argue with this.

But from the best of intentions have come the worst of actions. Today the legal services program of the national poverty agency—a program we are asked to perpetuate and make "independent"—stands as a monument to tunnel vision. Legal services is helping some of the poor, but at what cost.

The tip of the financial iceberg is seen in the Reginald Heber Smith Fellowship program. "Reggies" as they are called, are given a crash program in instant revolution, sometimes termed poverty law, and assigned to legal services programs throughout the country.

The press has reported on Reggies who have become pillars of the antidraft movement, defenders of narcotics users and builders of a counterculture that feeds like a parasite off the taxpaying majority of Americans. A recent magazine article told of a young Reggie who drew a $10,000 stipend from the Federal Treasury—the American taxpayer—while he cavorted about his commune, working for the "movement" and enjoying the pleasures of group sex.

Reggies have been implicated in the bloody killings of San Quentin that saw revolutionaries assassinate prison guards with a gun believed to have been purchased through the legal services program.

In scores of States and hundreds of communities radical young lawyers of legal services have tried to make instant history through legal action that serves no purpose other than the harassment of mayors, Governors, legislators, and city officials.

An effort ostensibly to produce instant change in archaic laws against the poor, these suits are usually little more than headline catching ego trips for lawyers who tired of the substantive but unglamorous role of individual advocacy. It is more fun to sue the State in a class action and get front page play—than to quietly prevent a poor old lady from being evicted by a crooked landlord.

Law reform has become the rallying cry for legal services but in most instances that ennobling term is but a euphemism for "let us sue the Governor and get famous."

The House should ask whether these generic defects in the legal services program are addressed in the conference report we debate today. The reply must be that they are neither addressed nor redressed.

Radical law groups can still submit lists of completely unacceptable candidates to the President of the United States to force a radical composition of the legal services corporation board of directors. The President does not have the prerogative of guidance that should be his in determining the makeup of the board.

Political activities by legal services lawyers while technically prohibited, is not clearly forbidden; that distinction being left to the corporation board, once established.

But more important is the thrust of the corporation spelled out in the bill's activities and powers section.

Despite the salubrious phrases the corporation will still have lawyers marching stridently into court to sue the establishment for any real or imagined grievance against the so-called client community.

The establishment is the elected body of local government officials who have a far more legitimate claim to conduct than have the lawyers.

And the suit will be not at the expense of the radicals themselves, but at the expense of the people being sued, the quiet nonradical middle Americans who elect the mayors and Governors and who pay most of the taxes that Congress arbitrarily doles out to radicals.

Our conduct could not be more illogical were we a fire department pumping water on one side of a fire, and gasoline on the other.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK).

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I want to make clear at the outset that I am not opposed to economic opportunity. We are a nation founded upon economic opportunity. I believe every person should have such opportunity to the maximum amount possible. And, many people throughout our Nation do need a helping hand to get themselves and their families out of poverty. Who could not support the intent of a program we had hoped would bring our underprivileged back above the poverty level into the life we like to call the American way of life to walk with dignity and pride?

Yet, I remain deeply disturbed by the comprehensive child development provisions embodied in this conference report.

I do not oppose realistic programs of Federal assistance to State and local governments to help establish and maintain day care centers for the children of working mothers. If we, after all, intend to require work or work training of a parent or parents as a condition of eligibility for welfare assistance, then it is only fitting to make provision for the care of dependent children.

Thus, I support the establishment of day care centers for working mothers as provided for in H.R. 1. However, there is a world of difference between day care centers for working mothers and the comprehensive child development program contained in this conference report. There is no question about the importance of the early childhood years. But, in the midst of the efforts to assist children, I hope everyone recognizes that this child development proposal is not in any sense of the word an antipoverty measure.

There is real danger that more harm than good can come from these so-called child development provisions. This language would create a Federal bureaucracy with the authority to strongly influence and possibly control the character of our children—to mold them psychologically, socially, morally, educationally. This legislation addresses itself to the question of national child advocacy. It moves toward the question of collectivized child rearing. It raises the question of whether parents will be a major factor in their children's lives, or whether the Federal Government should be authorized to mold the character of our youngsters.

We have seen what has happened over the past decade as educators have determined that their business is to correct mistakes which they feel have been made in the home. This is understandable. Mistakes are made in the home. But, mistakes are also made in the schools. With this measure we would have Federal bureaucrats, who think they know much better than the parent how the child should be treated, using the child development programs as vehicles to reach their social objectives—conditioning the child through behavioral techniques to adopt the attitudes and values which the social planners believe to be the most desirable.

Are we to make our children wards of the Government?

As legislators, we ought to be deeply concerned about any program which accepts as an underlying premise that American parents are not able and do not have the right to bring up their children.

Have we had so much regimentation, so much conscription, so much sacrifice of freedom in the interest of security and total training for all, that we have taken away the initiative of the people and the development of will and moral stamina so parents can raise and train their own children? Are we going to free the mothers in order to enslave their children?

Are we, after all, going to accept Professor Skinner's suggestion that the real threat to the survival of the human race is Western man's illusions of individual

free will and individual dignity? Freedom and dignity must go, he said—they are only illusions anyway. He proposes instead a kind of benign tyranny—a peace on earth arrived at through behavioral technology—a programing of people by a system of rewards, to behave just as the programer wishes. And, herein lies the basis of this child development proposal.

Beyond my philosophical opposition, I believe there are very important practical reasons to oppose this measure. The complicated delivery system has been described to us over and over again. What it boils down to is that even if a combination of localities or the State is better equipped or has a greater capacity to administer programs which are to serve the needs of a particular area, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare must still approve the city as the prime sponsor. Think about the number of applications the Federal Government might receive. The House-Senate conference committee has, it seems to me, designed a delivery system for the child development provisions that is unworkable and worse than no system at all.

There is a cost factor which must not be ignored. Under the conference language, as I understand it, the cost would be a soaring $31.9 billion, if all the estimated 40 million eligible children participate. Free services go to children of families of four with incomes of less than $5,250 annually. But then the formula goes from there to provide partial subsidies to families making up to and, in some cases, well beyond $20,000 a year.

The day care and headstart programs had as basic goals the assistance of low income families. The provisions we are discussing today go well beyond this, obviously. These child development provisions create hopes which cannot possibly be fulfilled. The result will serve only to increase the frustration and bitterness which the poor of this Nation feel. Another unfulfillable promise has been made which can only lead to another round of accusation and recrimination about where the blame lies.

Too many pieces of legislation have offered panaceas for every social and economic ill, boosting the hopes and aspirations of millions. Then, when the final appropriation is considerd, through limitations on the income of the Federal Government, we are unable to meet the financial requirements for implementation of the programs.

I felt it was a serious mistake to add the child development provisions to the OEO legislation in the first place. And, I continue to oppose, for practical reasons, the inclusion of this hastily considered child development language, title V, in the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1971. In all good conscience, I must vote against this conference report today.

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

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

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the comprehensive child development portion of the bill brought to us from conference committee today furnishes a striking example of how all too often we make law in this body without consulting or adequately informing the solid, hard-working, productive citizens whom most of us claim to represent and who, far more than anyone else, pay the taxes that keep our whole topheavy Washington wonderland going. We could hardly get much closer to the most intimate, personal, daily lives of these constituents of ours than by setting up a massive Federal program to take charge of developing their children who are still too young to go to school. Here is legislation potentially affecting every family in the country which has, or expects or hopes to have, a child in it under 6 years of age. Yes outside the professional pressure groups and the gaggle of "women's lib" and "social reform" activists who have pushed it so hard and so fast, you will find very few Americans aware of this bill at all—and of those who have become aware of it since we began so precipitously to act on it, many are fundamentally and vehemently opposed.

We passed the Comprehensive Child Development Act September 30 by the extraordinary device of adding it as an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act extension, despite the fact that its advocates have been the first to point out that it is not to be regarded as a welfare or a relief measure, but as establishing a program for services available to the entire population. Since September 30, I have received numerous inquiries about this act from my District and from all over the country. Most of you have probably received them too. The most frequent request has been simply for a copy of the bill. Surely this should be the very least our constituents have the right to expect from us—that we be able to supply them with a copy of legislation telling how we intend to develop their children for them.

Mr. Speaker, we could not supply the copies they asked. Because of the manner in which the bill was passed, there were no copies. There were only pages of the finest print used in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—difficult to read, almost impossible to copy by machine. There was no committee report. The only committee report this House has ever put out on this landmark legislation, which would establish a program intended to affect the whole future of American children and the American family, is the conference committee report before you today—which, like all conference reports, is confined to explaining how the differences between the House and Senate versions of the bill were adjusted. There is no overall justification for the measure, no explanation of what this body intends to be done with it. We are left with nothing but the floor rhetoric of its advocates when they rammed it through by a three-vote margin September 30.

This is scandalous treatment for a measure of this importance. I for one am at a loss to explain to my constituents and others who ask me for information and help, why this bill was so handled that there has been neither a copy nor a committee report to give them, until today—the day of final action. I have yet to hear an explanation for this procedure from any of the gentlemen who have handled and are handling this legislation. I hope they will provide one. At least, I would like to know what they are telling their own constituents who ask about it.

This is not representative government, but elitist paternalism, displaying exactly the attitude which causes people to fear the longrun consequences of this bill—the attitude that we here in Washington know best what to do about other people's children and that the less they know about our plans, the better.

Government should keep out of the lives of little children! Is not it enough that Government has invaded virtually every other facet of human existence in America? At the age of 5 or 6 most of our children go to a Government school, where they stay for at least 12 years and often 16. Large and increasing numbers, when they leave school, take a Government-paid or a Government-subsidized job. Virtually everyone now retires on at least a partial government pension, in the form of social security if nothing else. Increasingly we are treated for our illnesses under Government-supported or Government-arranged health care plans. The list is endless, but so is the bureaucrats' appetite for enlarging it. Now they want to violate the last sanctuary, by persuading and financially inducing mothers to give up their children barely able to walk and talk, to Government's tender embrace.

Of course they do not yet ask for power to take children by force. That never comes first. But, Mr. Speaker, as surely as twilight follows sunset and darkness follows twilight, it comes last. It is the end to which all such programs logically tend.

The family is the backbone of America, the backbone of any healthy society. Destroy the family and we destroy America. This "child development" legislation aims at providing a substitute for the family, in the form of committees of psychiatrists, psychologists, sociologists and social workers. But there is no substitute for the family. A Nation of orphanages cannot endure, and should not. It is an offense to God and man.

Even the Red Chinese found that they could not destroy the family, hard as they tried in their commune program during "the great leap forward." But the effort cost untold human suffering. How much suffering will we be responsible for by encouraging little children to be raised apart from their mothers?

We are voting on more than a bill today; we are voting on a generation. Shall a rapidly growing number of American children born from this day forward, be pressed by every inducement at Government's command to be developed apart from their parents? Even those genuinely in need of help from outside their families, those who in effect are asking us, in the familiar Biblical phrase, for bread and fish—shall we give them as the quotation continues, a stone and a scorpion? Walk into the halls of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and think of having it in place of a mother—that indeed is giving those little children a stone instead of bread. And read the testimony of Mrs. Dean Barnes of Idaho, which I placed in the RECORD at the time of our last debate on this measure, about the way the present Head-

start program—after which the new "child development" program is to be modeled—is actually operating, to get a very clear picture of the scorpion.

The generation we are trying to develop through the program this bill would set up will one day judge us as each new period in history judges its precedessor. How are we going to answer the next generation if they see in us the men and women who took away their mothers?

This is not just another vote. Gentlemen, you are playing with elemental fires on this issue. Every society known to history has been based on the family. Christians believe that God Himself dwelt—quiet, loving, unknown—in the bosom of a closely knit family in Nazareth for 30 years. We dare not scorn the family or dismiss it as outdated. Vote to keep child development in the home where it belongs! Vote no on this conference report.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Members of this body when the last time was that they heard so much faint praise about any piece of legislation that was before us. I would ask them when the last time was that they had heard so many excuses given for any one given piece of legislation. I would ask them when the last time was they saw so many people come to the well of the House who obviously, on the horns of a moral dilemma and a legislative dilemma, referred to the fact that there probably was more good in the bill than bad; who alluded on so many occasions to the fact that this was not a perfect piece of legislation and who, in effect, gave so much faint praise to an issue that has been brought before us.

I would suggest, as I listened, that in the 11 years I have been in this body I have never heard so much negative talk about any one piece of legislation. What we see is a great uneasiness on this conference report, and I say rightly so.

First of all, we are talking about a budget time bomb. Money has not been discussed here. We are talking about a program that will be several hundreds of millions of dollars at the inception and will clearly pass into the lower billions of dollars within 1 or 2 years. It will be one of the basic budget busters of the future if we adopt this conference report.

So, you are voting right now for a bill which in the next few years will be a budget buster.

Second, I think there is a great cause for concern over the operation of the poverty program, the legal services program, but particularly over the innovative child-development program.

Mr. Speaker, I would only make one point—you cannot make many points in 2 minutes. If there is anything these hearings indicated it is the fact that there is no bona fide body of intelligent thought in the country today as to what direction child development should take.

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

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I would conclude by pointing out that witness after witness before our committee indicated they did not know what direction child development should take. Witness after witness indicated that there was no trained professional group to carry out the functions mandated by this bill.

So, what are you talking about? You are talking about an experimental program and I suggest that there is an invasion of parental rights and responsibility in this experimentation.

I suggest there is an opportunity for bringing about a climate in education that we do not want. The testimony is there. The goal is life adjustment, development of attitudes, and intervention in the domain of parental responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think this is the type of area where we should experiment. I do not think we should mandate the additional billions of dollars called for in this bill.

I respectfully join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in urging the resounding defeat of the conference report.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK).

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, the thrusts of the speakers on the other side of the aisle have been largely in expounding the need—and there is great need in this area—but there is also a clear distinction between need and the proposed methods of fulfilling that need.

This bill, if passed, will once again constitute on the part of the Congress an irresponsible promise. It will create expectations which cannot be fulfilled. It will set up an administrative procedure that cannot be effectively and efficiently administered. It will establish a system of child care that will be most difficult to amend and improve, as it should be improved, in future years.

Mr. Speaker, the adoption of this conference report today would be a serious mistake. We should defeat this conference report and then deal with the three component programs swiftly, but in new legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I know some of you are concerned about the fact that the conference report might be defeated. Well, I am confident that this piece of legislation will not become law. I believe that we do have the time, with what we have learned since this bill came out of the House about child welfare, to write far superior legislation than that which is here now pending before us.

I hope we have gotten through to you what an administrative monstrosity this conference report is. Reference has been made to the cost of its administration. If this conference report is agreed to and the President were to sign it we will just be putting out a tremendous sum of money going into its administration costs. Maybe, it will be a public employment bill like OEO, but the cost of its excessive administration will not be going for the benefit of the children who need the program if we leave it this way. The States cannot effectively be utilized in the administration of this program. State after State now is developing its child development program and they should be utilized and not be treated in the manner which this legislation is drafted.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 9 minutes.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and my purpose for asking him to do so is to ask a specific question.

As I understand it, in the child development section of the bill there is included comprehensive health provision particularly covering visual defects. My question is this: If a child is referred by a counselor or an officer in charge of this program with a visual defect will the parents of that child have the opportunity to have the child referred to an opthalmologist or to an optometrist of their choice?

Mr. PERKINS. That decision would be the same parental decision as if the child were not enrolled in the program.

Mr. FUQUA. The parents would have an opportunity to make their own decision?

Mr. PERKINS. Absolutely.

Mr. FUQUA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am completely surprised to listen to the tenor of this debate today from our minority friends. They would have you believe that this conference report is something that has just been jerked out of the air without thoughtful consideration. The truth about the whole matter, and our minority friends know it, is that we spent some 30 or 40 days in hearings, and spent some 9 days in conference. The thing that makes this debate so surprising to me is because the minority got just what they wanted in conference. They talk about Legal Services. They got everything that they wanted in Legal Services. I went with the minority to uphold the House position on Legal Services, and we upheld the House position 100 percent on Legal Services, and they will not dare deny that.

Let me say to the distinguished minority leader that the American Bar Association so far as I know supported all the way the Legal Services Corporation and in particular the provisions of the conference report dealing with legal services.

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

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

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I think the minority leader a few moments ago asserted that the legal services portion of this conference report was not consistent with the recommendation of the American Bar Association. Every Member of this House received last week a letter from the president of the American Bar Association asking us to support the conference report that is before us today, and stating categorically that the conference report, title IX of this bill, is completely consistent with the recommendations of the American Bar Association.

I do not believe that the minority

leader intentionally intended to mislead the House; I have to believe that he just did not know any better.

Mr. PERKINS. The point is, the House minority got their way. I think the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) and all of the members of the committee received their option if they wanted to go back and simply retain the existing law, and they said that they did not want to do this.

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

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

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I believe what the minority leader was speaking of was that this was not the bill that the American Bar Association and others submitted to the Congress, and of course it is not the bill the administration submitted to the Congress; it is a compromise.

Mr. PERKINS. But the House supported you on the legal services in the House aspect of the bill.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) two very brief and succinct questions.

First, with respect to the child care centers, it is my understanding that no child would be assigned to any such center without the express consent of his parents. Is that correct?

Mr. PERKINS. That is absolutely correct. What we have here is an expansion of the Headstart program.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman.

Second, I further understand that no such center would be forced upon any community unless that community asked for it, and wanted it.

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for approximately 30 seconds?

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say for the benefit of my friends on the minority side that it is really quite extraordinary that this bill is such an administrative monstrosity when the chairman of the Republican National Committee, the Republican leader of the U.S. Senate, and the Republican whip of the U.S. Senate, joined with the overwhelming majority of the other body in voting to approve the conference report.

Mr. PERKINS. Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant features of this legislation is the title added to the Economic Opportunity Act to broaden Headstart into a more comprehensive child development program serving the educational, nutritional and health needs of children of preschool age. We worked hard in committee in developing this legislation. It adds a significant and important component to the other economic opportunity programs already authorized.

I am sure that my colleagues have received many communications urging the adoption of this conference report. While this type of communication far outnumbers the ones that I have received opposing the adoption of the conference report, I am greatly disturbed by the tenor of some of the communications of opposition.

Their opposition is predicated upon complete misconception or perhaps a direct and deliberate misrepresentation of what the child care provisions of this bill really are. Let me read a typical one of these letters which I judge is based upon a common source of information, as the letter resembles others coming from other parts of the country:

> Please do all in your power to stop Senate Bill S. 2007 and House Bill 10351 from coming into law. We sure do not want any more laws to infringe on people's rights to look after their children, laws that would take away more of our constitutional liberty and rights.

This is such a distortion of the whole purpose and thrust of Headstart programs and the Federal funding of locally guided and developed preschool and child care programs that it scarcely needs refutation.

Nevertheless, let me make it clear to my colleagues here today that the programs authorized by the child development provisions of the conference report provide no governmental control over a child, the parents of a child, or family.

Participation of children in these preschool programs is entirely dependent upon the wishes of the parent. This was made even more clear when the House Education and Labor Committee adopted an amendment to the House version of the Child Development Act which is contained in the conference report—page 16, last paragraph, 92–682—which reads that a child development plan must provide "that programs or services under this Act shall be provided only for children whose parents or legal guardians have requested them."

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) was the author of this amendment in committee, as he was of the following provision which is written into the conference report—section 581, page 33:

> Nothing in this Act shall be construed or applied in such a manner as to infringe upon or usurp the moral and legal rights and responsibilities of parents or guardians with respect to moral, mental, emotional, or physical development of their children. Nor shall any section of this Act be construed or applied in such a manner as to permit any invasion of privacy otherwise protected by law, or to abridge any legal remedies for any such invasion which is otherwise provided by law.

In putting to rest once and for all this outrageous and completely deceptive charge that the child development provisions can be called a child control bill, let me say that the program is simply designed to strengthen the educational opportunities of children throughout this Nation and particularly to meet the needs of those children whose parents cannot afford kindergarten or preschool education and those parents who are not in the home because they must work to provide family income. But participation throughout is voluntary and program control remains in the hands of the local community directed by the parents and citizens of the community as has been traditional in our Nation with respect to public education.

Mr. Speaker, authority for programs under the Economic Opportunity Act under the basic law was due to expire on June 30, 1972, unless further extended by the Congress. They are now operating under a continuing resolution. One of the first acts of the House Committee on Education and Labor following the organization of the 92d Congress was to initiate in-depth hearings of the operation of economic opportunity programs and to consider legislation to extend the act. Thirty full days of hearings were conducted by the full committee during the months of March, April, May, and June. In addition, two ad hoc subcommittees conducted additional hearings in the field. Every aspect of the poverty program was probed. Following five legislative meetings of the committee in July and August, the measure was reported to the House.

At this time the bill represented basically a 2-year extension of the Economic Opportunity Act with minor amendments to initiate a demonstration rural home improvement program and to initiate a program of involving the poor in environmental improvement projects.

A major amendment of the committee was to separate from OEO legal services program into a Legal Services Corporation to be governed by a Board of Directors for the most part appointed by the President.

It will be recalled that this provision was further amended on the floor to prohibit any Federal support for representation through legal services in criminal matters.

It will be further recalled that a House floor amendment was adopted which has the ultimate effect of consolidating in one authority the diverse child care provisions now contained in manpower programs and Headstart. It will be recalled that this floor amendment was further modified by the Erlenborn amendment to establish the income criteria for participation without charge in child daycare programs to be $4,200 for a family of four, rather than the $6,900 for a family of four as originally provided in the amendment.

The conference report that we present today carries with it these important House amendments. First, it retains the prohibition against the use of Federal funds in legal services for representation of clients in criminal matters.

Second, it preserves and strengthens the authority of the President to appoint members of the Legal Services Board—totally rejecting the Senate approach.

Third, the conference report retains the House provision with respect to eligibility for participation in child care programs without charge as being $4,200 per annual income for a family of four as against the $6,900 level provided for in the Senate bill.

My colleagues will recall that when the House bill was on the floor an amendment was adopted which reduced the 100,000 population requirement for eligibility for sponsorship of a child day care program

to 10,000. This was compromised in conference to 5,000.

I believe that small communities should be provided the same eligibility standing with States and large cities. The ultimate decisions with respect to policy matters governing the health, education, and the social development of children should rest at the local level.

So much for those matters which were of critical importance in maintaining the House position in conference. The conference has maintained the House position throughout.

The issue before us today does not address itself to these matters that I have just discussed, but rather to whether or not we are to continue programs of vital importance to every community throughout this Nation—Headstart, comprehensive health services, emergency food programs, senior opportunities and services, alcoholic counseling and recovery, drug rehabilitation, rural housing development, Green Thumb, New Careers, Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, and Operation Mainstream.

As I said earlier, the committee has exhaustively studied the administration of these programs. Let me share with my colleagues at this point some of the remarks made by people from various parts of the country who are involved in these programs.

Mayor Robert Burns, of Edens, Tex., accompanied by Charlie Florez and Winton Brown, told us about Operation Mainstream. I was highly impressed with the very positive impact that Operation Mainstream is having throughout the Nation and in central Texas, particularly about which Winton Brown spoke—

The program in the Operation Mainstream in the 3½ years we have operated it we have had 770 people on board under our 132 slots per year. So you can see that we do not keep them on an average of a year at a time. Some of them may be oh, 6 weeks, some may be on 2 years depending on the type of training and the individuals themselves.

Very few go over 1 year.

Of the 770 that we have on board we will have 140 on today which means we have terminated from the program 640 people in the 3½ years we have been operating.

Of that 630, 419 have been placed in for permanent jobs which they have held at least 1 month; 91 percent of them have held them at least 6 months. That, depending on how you want to develop your placement rate, that is 66.5 percent of all of them that have been on the program. And it is about 91 percent of the youth that we are authorized to have, the 132 slots.

This is what Boyd Cassell of the Virginia Department of Highways had to say about Green Thumb—

Project Green Thumb consists of low income people often living in rural poverty stricken areas of the State, who through no fault of their own, cannot continue to farm or find employment.

The men employed in Virginia are from 57 to 94 years of age. The average age of the group is 70.

The average size Green Thumb family is 2.4 with an average annual income of $538 per person and a total income of $1,287 per family.

The average length of unemployment, prior to Green Thumb, was 5½ years. Project Green Thumb has enabled these men to work and earn $1,600 per year to supplement their small incomes.

I have been closely associated with these people and can call many of them by their first name. These elderly men actually work using their skills to improve their environment, to maintain dignity and respect.

This is not a handout program, these people work. They have proven that they are willing and anxious to work for compensation to secure the bare necessities of life for their families.

I asked Dr. O. E. Frank of Emergency Food and Medical as to whether or not that program had been one of the top priority programs of community action agencies. He responded:

Yes, particularly in the rural areas, where the local resources are frequently very scarce and inflexible.

The community action agencies have relied very heavily on the emergency food program. It is usually considered a major part of the total program and a key to the community in general.

With respect to Job Corps, A. B. Templeton, president of the Texas Educational Foundation, Inc., San Marcos, Tex., stated:

To illustrate to you the hard value of the government's investment in Job Corps, I would like to cite a few figures. The 16,058 young people we have already placed on jobs will earn approximately $3,674,070,400 and pay $551,110,560 in federal income taxes during their work-life. This is $2,338,044,800 and $350,706,720 more, respectively, than the same number of untrained people who would be doomed to a life of intermittent work at low wages and periodic reliance on welfare. And yet, to accomplish this, the Job Corps Centers in Texas, since their inception, have cost a total of $84,840,226.

With respect to Headstart, the Director of the Office of Child Development in HEW highlighted the views I think that are shared universally throughout the Nation when he said:

As I am sure you are aware, Headstart is the major Federal program for preschool children of the poor. During the 7 years of its existence, over 4 million children have received comprehensive medical, dental, nutritional, educational, and social services through this program.

In fiscal year 1971, approximately 174,000 children will attend the full-year, part-day program, 89,000 will attend the full-year, full-day program, and 209,900 will attend the summer program.

There can be little doubt that Headstart has met many of the intellectual, social, and health needs of the children it has served; or even more important, however, Headstart enhances the quality of life of the deprived preschool child every day he is in the program.

I would offer the opinion that the Headstart program represents one of the best expressions of our Nation's concern for its children. It is vitally important that the Economic Opportunity Act be renewed so that Headstart may be authorized to continue the task of providing comprehensive preschool service to economically disadvantaged children and their families who would otherwise be deprived of such services.

Dewey Duckett, Midlands Community Action Agency, Columbia, S.C., had several positive views with respect to the importance of the Economic Opportunity Act and programs to the people of his area—

In our State, since 1965, over 3,000 leading citizens have given their time voluntarily to serve on board or commissions. They have approved and monitored the expenditure of over 100 million dollars in federal funds. Some 95,000 different individuals have worked voluntarily in programs operated by Community Action Agencies.

But if the objective is to eradicate poverty, stabilize the economy, maintain domestic tranquility and reduce today's 5½ million unemployed persons significantly, then in light of this, the appropriation for the Office of Economic Opportunity should be increased.

Programs such as Main Stream, Green Thumb, Green Light and special youth programs warrant pump priming at this time. While observing some of these programs in operation in Virginia last week, one of the most impressive programs I have witnessed was the Green Thumb. Here, Senior Citizens were gainfully employed and providing a public service with dignity and pride.

It is good for our servicemen returning from Vietnam who need priority and special attention in the areas of employment, housing, education, and civilian readjustment.

Mrs. Noryleate Downing, director of the poverty program in Newport News, Va., was extremely helpful to the committee. She stressed programs for the elderly, for community action in general, for the significance of summer programs, and for new careers and job training, saying—

And our elderly program, this is something that I would like to mention.

We have estimated that this program has saved the taxpayers of our community more than $50,000 a year because of the amount of services that has been rendered the elderly in our community.

We have had a total number of participants on an accumulated basis of 2,160, and the program has provided services to over 3,000 elderly people in the community.

When community action came into being, there was the one institution, or the one agency that was established, that searched out and brought in the poor to find out what their needs were, and then to devise means by which some of these needs could be met, so I would plead with you today not to eliminate the community action program regardless of what comes or goes.

There has been a tremendous change in the attitudes of the community at large, who in the past have not identified themselves as the hard-core poor, but now they have begun to give support by becoming involved in the affairs which affect the poor.

As a result of that, the chief of police wrote to Congressman Downing a letter and told him the crime rate had dropped, and he attributed it to the work we had been doing that summer, and we did it with this program.

The training is aimed at providing paraprofessionals. We presently have enrollees as library assistants in the Newport News Library, psychiatric aides, and these are at our mental hospital in Williamsburg.

We have some as recreational aides with the Department of Recreation at Hampton and Newport News, and the social service aides, with the Hampton and Newport News Welfare Departments.

Mr. Speaker, what are you doing to solve the dropout problem?

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe a day goes by that I am not asked this question.

Our major national effort to keep young people off the streets and in school or in job training is the Neighborhood Youth Corps program.

Unless this conference report is adopted authority for the Neighborhood Youth Corps will die.

What is the Neighborhood Youth Corps doing?

In 1970 the program had 480,000 first-time enrollments, 46,000 in the out-of-school program and 436,000 in the in-school and summer programs.

These programs emphasize remedial education, skill training and supportive services.

By and large the enrollees are school dropouts about 16 or 17 years of age at the time they enter the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

The projects are designed to prepare enrollees to return to school or admission to a community college for a general education development certificate or for the best semiskilled or entry level job for which the individual can be qualified.

In the President's Second Manpower Report to the Congress this year, the great benefits of this program are evidenced.

We are all concerned that we derive the maximum benefit for the expenditure of Federal dollars for education and training.

Here is what the President's Report says about an evaluation of the Neighborhood Youth Corps program in Indiana:

A 1970 cost benefit study in Indiana, which compared the 1967 earnings of out-of-school participants with those of a control group of young people also eligible for NYC but not enrolled in it. . . .

Indicates—

the earnings gained as a result of NYC participation was shown to be substantial, and the benefits of the program to society were estimated to be much above its cost. . . . Other significant findings were that the increase in post program earnings was directly related to the length of enrollment in the program. . . .

Presentations to the committee by the administration indicated an intention to maintain enrollment levels in the out-of-school program at the same level in fiscal year 1972 as in fiscal year 1971 at 36,800 training opportunities.

In the inschool program almost 100,000 enrollment opportunities are contemplated.

For the summer program the same level will be maintained in fiscal year 1972 as in 1971 at 414,200 enrollment opportunities.

Witnesses before the committee could not speak too highly of the summer program in furnishing not only meaningful work and related training to youngsters but also in enabling them to continue their regular education programs in the academic year financially strengthened by their earnings.

This program has contributed significantly to school dropout rates.

In Arkansas, it was reduced from 37.2 percent to 28.3 percent.

In Illinois, the dropout rate was reduced from 29 percent to 20 percent.

In Missouri, the dropout rate was reduced from 33 percent to 23 percent.

In my home state, the dropout rate was reduced from 28 percent to 22 percent.

So these programs have dramatically improved the futures of thousands of youngsters and should be extended. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I ask that a funding authorization table be placed in the RECORD:

OEO FUNDING

[In thousands of dollars]

Title and program	Final apportionment fiscal year 1971	Budget fiscal year 1972	Conference report fiscal year 1972	Conference report fiscal year 1973
Title I:				
Job Corps	$170,200	$210,287		
Concentrated Employment	116,400	120,800		
Neighborhood Youth Corps	324,800	362,500		
Public Service Careers	91,400	90,400	$900,000	Such sums.
Operation Mainstream	38,800	38,800		
Program Support	18,500	18,779		
Special Neighborhood Youth Corps			500,000	0
Title II:				
Local Initiative	357,199	341,900	328,900	$328,900
Head Start	360,000	376,500	500,000	
Follow Through	69,000	60,000		70,000
Legal Services	61,200	61,000	61,000	109,000
Comprehensive Health Services	99,000	114,000	114,000	114,000
Emergency Food and Medical Services	48,700	3,500	62,500	62,500
Family Services	18,600	25,000	25,000	25,000
Senior Opportunities and Services	8,000	8,000	8,800	8,800
Alcoholic Counsel and Recovery	12,800	2,000	18,000	18,000
Drug Rehabilitation	12,800	18,000	18,000	18,000
Title II—Continued				
Environmental Action	0	0	$5,000	$5,000
Rural Housing Development and Rehabilitation	0	0	10,000	15,000
Training and Technical Assistance	$16,566	$13,500	13,500	13,500
State Economic Opportunity Offices	12,500	13,000	13,000	13,000
Research, Development, Demonstration, and Evaluation	85,953	72,600	65,400	65,400
Special Title II Direction and Administration	20,832	19,700	25,700	25,700
Title III-B: Migrants and Seasonal Farmworkers	35,000	35,000	38,000	38,000
Title V: Child Development (Planning)			100,000	2,000,000
Title VI: Administration	18,350	18,000	18,000	18,000
Title VII: Community Economic Development	36,000	25,000	58,000	62,000
Title VIII: VISTA	36,400	33,000	45,000	45,000
Total	2,044,600	2,056,466	2,927,800	3,054,800

Now you are coming here trying to camouflage the true issues involved in this thing.

Mr. Speaker, I have received communications representing a broad spectrum of individuals and organizations and the public in general across the Nation urging Congress to adopt this conference report. I would like the following list of communications that I have received inserted in the RECORD at this point:

LIST OF COMMUNICATIONS

N. T. MacFarlane, State Chairman of the Academy of Pediatrics in Kentucky.

Reverend Monsignor James T. McHugh, Director of the Family Life Division, United States Catholic Conference.

Stanley J. McFarland, Assistant Executive Secretary, Government Relations and Citizenship National Education Association.

Dr. Jay M. Arena, President of the American Academy of Pediatrics.

Stuart L. Kadison, President of the Los Angeles County Bar Association.

Eileen M. Jacobi, Executive Director of the American Nurses Association.

Ruby Wheatly, President of the Department of School Nurses, National Education Association.

Helen Brion, Chairman of the Department of School Nurses Legislative Council.

Frederick D. Goldberg, President of the Professional Association of Day Care Directors of New York.

Hans G. Tanzler, Jr., Mayor of Jacksonville, Fla.

Wes Uhlman, Mayor of Seattle, Washington.

Henry W. Maier, Mayor of Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

Robert J. Harris, Mayor of Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Joseph L. Alioto, Mayor of San Francisco, Calif.

Norman Chrisman, Jr., Chairman, Government Affairs Committee, Kentucky Society of Architects.

Kenneth A. Gibson, Mayor of Newark, New Jersey.

Patrick J. Lucey, Governor of Wisconsin.

Gary Walls, President of American Personnel Guidance Association.

Patrick J. McDonough, Acting Executive Director, American Personnel Guidance Association.

Sandra Bolin, President of the League of Women Voters of Berea, Kentucky.

Catherine A. Tyler, Day Care Coordinator, Wiconico County Health Department, Salisbury, Md.

Roman S. Gribbs, Mayor of Detroit, Michigan.

Mrs. Theodore Wedel, President of the National Council of the Churches of Christ.

William E. Fowler, Jr., President of D.C. Mental Health Association.

B. J. Chandler, Dean, School of Education, Northwestern University.

Richard Davis, Dean, School of Education, University of Wisconsin.

David Clark, Dean, School of Education, Indiana University.

J. E. Thomas, Associate Dean, School of Education, University of Illinois.

Arthur Wise, Associate Dean, School of Education, University of Chicago.

Luvern Cunningham, Dean, College of Education, Ohio State University.

Jack C. Mervin, Dean, College of Education, University of Minnesota.

Charles R. Hicks, Director, Teacher Education, Purdue University.

Donald J. McCarty, Dean, School of Education, University of Wisconsin.

Van Cleve Morris, Dean, School of Education, University of Illinois.

Wilbur J. Cohen, Dean, School of Education, University of Michigan.

Mrs. M. J. Butler, Jr., Director, Greater Taunton Day Care Center, Taunton, Mass.

[Telegrams]

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
December 5, 1971.

CARL PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

D.C. Mental Health Assn. favors the passage S2007 the Child Development bill as re-

ported by the conference committee and urges your support.

WILLIAM E. FOWLER, Jr.,
President.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,
December 5, 1971.

Representative CARL PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

We strongly urge support for passage of Child Development Program in conference report on Economic Opportunity Amendments. Child Development Programs will help children reach their full potential. As educators we endorse this important legislation. We believe legislation provides adequate safeguards for parental responsibility, voluntary participation and local control.

B. J. CHANDLER,
(and 12 others).
Dean, School Education, Northwestern University.

LEXINGTON, KY.,
December 1, 1971.

Representative CARL D. PERKINS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

The Kentucky Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics strongly endorses the conference report on the economic opportunity amendments. We feel the child development programs in this legislation are important for the proper development of needy children in our State. In our opinion local input and assessment of need can best be determined at the local level.

N. T. MACFARLANE, MD.D.,
State Chairman, Kentucky A.A.P.

OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT LIAISON,
U.S. CATHOLIC CONFERENCE,
Washington, D.C., December 1, 1971.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am enclosing a copy of a letter addressed to Rep. Carl D. Perkins, Chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, from Msgr. James T. McHugh, Director of the Family Life Division of the United States Catholic Conference, in support of the Conference Report on S. 2007, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1971.

In addition to support for continuing the OEO program, the U.S. Catholic Conference is particularly concerned that Title V, the Child Development Programs, be enacted. Msgr. McHugh has carefully examined the provisions of Title V and is satisfied that S. 2007 makes adequate provision to safeguard the rights of children and parents.

I would hope that you could give your support to the Conference Report on S. 2007.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. ROBINSON,
Director.

FAMILY LIFE DIVISION,
U.S. CATHOLIC CONFERENCE,
Washington, D.C., November 30, 1971.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PERKINS: I write to you in support of the Conference Report on S. 2007, a bill continuing the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and establishing Child Development programs to service the needs of children, particularly those with special problems and those from low-income families.

The final version of the Child Development bill, as contained in the report of the Conference, emphasizes the special needs of children in poor families, and establishes a preschool child care program that will support their emotional and educational development. It also provides funds for special programs and services for handicapped children. Achievement of these aims will support the quality of family life, and will provide valuable assistance to poor families and minority group families. The special recognition and assistance for handicapped children will help these children achieve a greater measure of opportunity as they grow and mature.

It is our hope that this legislation will be readily endorsed by the Congress so as to provide the best opportunities to all American children.

I would appreciate your making our views known to the members of the Congress in their consideration of the Conference Report.

Sincerely,

Rev. Msgr. JAMES T. MCHUGH,
Director.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., December 1, 1971.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PERKINS: The National Education Association urges that the Congress approve the conference report on S 2007, the Economic Opportunities Amendments of 1971. As you know, the NEA has been an active supporter of the "War on Poverty" since its inception. While we have been critical of administrative actions of the OEO in recent years, this in no way denotes lack of support for the intent of the law. We believe the 1971 amendments, if properly administered, can improve the operation of the programs.

We are, of course, particularly anxious that the Child Development provisions of S 2007 be enacted. The need for a national program for child care centers, with major emphasis on improving the health, education, and growth of children, is great. We see no reason to delay enactment of such a program. Indeed, it is long overdue. S 2007 provides one year of lead time to "gear up" for the actual funding to begin in 1973. If major problems emerge during this time the Congress can make the necessary adjustments.

The confusion fostered by some opponents who contend that the program interferes with parental rights is regrettable. The program in S 2007 is entirely voluntary. It does not contain the repressive provision suggested by some that parents who refuse to place their children in day care facilities so that they can be trained for work will lose AFDC payments.

We commend you for your effective and consistent leadership in this great cause.

Sincerely,

STANLEY J. MCFARLAND,
Assistant Executive Secretary, Government Relations and Citizenship.

AMERICAN ACADEMY OF PEDIATRICS,
Evanston, Ill., November 24, 1971.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PERKINS: The American Academy of Pediatrics, the national organization of board certified physicians providing care to children, heartily supports the adoption of the conference report on the Economic Opportunity Amendments, S. 2007. We are particularly enthusiastic about the comprehensive child development title of this legislation which provides for the establishment of a national, federally assisted child development program. The Academy supports the concept of child care as a composite of comprehensive and coordinated services designed to offer a sound basis for growth and development of the child while supporting and encouraging the parents in their effort to care for their children. We are of the opinion S. 2007 would provide a sound legislative basis for the establishment of such a program.

The Academy endorses the section of the child development title which provides for local administration of child care programs. We recommended in testimony before Senate and House committees that the major responsibility for planning and delivery of child development programs is most appropriately placed at the community level. We believe the conference report is equitable, and will allow for possible funding of most jurisdictions which apply for prime sponsorship responsibility. Jurisdictions which are able to plan and operate a quality child care program should be given this opportunity.

We are in complete agreement with the concept of funding priority to ongoing Headstart programs. The provision further assuring local review of Headstart programs is an additional strength of the conference report. The extension of the excellent programs like Headstart to all low income families desirous of child development services will be facilitated by the enactment of this legislation.

The level for eligibility for free child care services decided upon by the conferees is reasonable, and will not place an undue financial hardship on poor and near poor families who wish to utilize the child care programs.

In summary, we believe the child development title of the Economic Opportunity Amendments provides a realistic framework in which child development programs can operate that are responsive to the needs of individual children and communities. We sincerely urge your support for the adoption of the conference report on the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1971.

Sincerely yours,

JAY M. ARENA, M.D.,
President.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
BAR ASSOCIATION,
Los Angeles, Calif., November 29, 1971.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, House Education and Labor Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PERKINS: Because of the impending vote on Joint Resolution 2007, I write to you to remind you of our prior correspondence in which we communicated to you that at its May 5, 1971 meeting, the Board of Trustees of the Los Angeles County Bar Association recorded its support of the concept of a National Corporation for Legal Services.

Sincerely,

STUART L. KADISON,
President.

[Telegram]

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
December 2, 1971.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge your support of child care bill as in conference report S. 2007.

EILEEN M. JACOBI,
Executive Director,
American Nurses Association.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
December 1, 1971.

Hon. CARL PERKINS,
Chairman, Education and Labor Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

On behalf of the department of school nurses, we respectfully request your support of child development program as contained in S. 2007. We feel this program would constitute a significant move in the direction of preventing social, education, psychological, and health related problems in children and youth, thereby promoting the mental

health and physical well-being of subsequent generations of adults.

Mrs. RUBY WHEATLY,
President, Department of School Nurses, National Education Association.
Miss HELEN BRION,
Chairman, Department of School Nurses Legislative Council.

THE PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF DAY CARE DIRECTORS OF NEW YORK,
New York, N.Y., November 24, 1971.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT NIXON: At issue here is the fate of the Comprehensive Child Development Bill which forms part of the 1971 Admendments to the Economic Opportunity Act. This bill will be acted upon by the House of Representatives on Thursday, December 2, 1971 as its first item of business.

You speak often about your concerns for the future of this great country. Certainly the future of the United States depends to a major extent upon the kind of education and care our children receive. The kind of support the Federal Government gives to ensure that children throughout this country are being reached is, therefore, of paramount importance. It is not only a matter of enabling the poor citizens of this country to seek employment. This goal is short sighted and economically wasteful if child care is not also seen as a way to instill in our young children educational values and lessons which will in the long run equip them to be more productive citizens.

The Professional Association of Day Care Directors of New York City urges your active support of this bill. We are also urging the support of our elected representatives. However, we feel strongly that you have a great role to play by encouraging nationwide support of a measure that looks to the future well-being of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK D. GOLDBERG,
President.

JACKSONVILLE, FLA.,
November 25, 1971.

Hon. CARL PERKINS,
Chairman, Education and Labor Committee, Rayburn Building, Washington, D.C.:

Have been notified Senate bill S. 2007 out of conference committee. Request support for OEO legislation particularly comprehensive Child Development Act Day Care and related Child Services greatly needed in Jacksonville.

HANS G. TANZLER, Jr., *Mayor.*

SEATTLE, WASH.,
November 25, 1971.

Representative CARL PERKINS,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge your vote to adopt conference report on S. 2007 the Child Care bill. Every child deserves the opportunity for quality child care.

WES UHLMAN,
Mayor, City of Seattle.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
November 25, 1971.

Congressman CARL PERKINS,
Chairman, House Education and Labor Committee, Rayburn Building, Washington, D.C.:

As Mayor of Milwaukee and as president of the United States conference of mayors, I urge you to adopt the conference report on S. 2007 which authorizes funds for antipoverty, manpower and child development programs. I believe that Milwaukee and the other cities of the Nation need the measure as proposed by the conference report to help develop the human resources of these cities and to reduce the high costs of poverty. I urge your support of the conference report.

HENRY W. MAIER,
Mayor of Milwaukee,
President of U.S. Conference of Mayors.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,
November 26, 1971.

Representative CARL D. PERKINS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Urge your support for conference committee report authorizing continued OEO funding (S. 2007).

Mayor ROBERT J. HARRIS,
City Hall.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
November 26, 1971.

Hon. CARL PERKINS,
Chairman, House Education and Labor Committee, Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.

San Francisco strongly supports conference report on S-2007, OEO Child Development bill, and urges immediate approval. Critical manpower and economic opportunity programs depend on enactment of this bill. We also applaud the new program of child development grants contained in S-2007 with the cities as the prime sponsors.

JOSEPH L. ALIOTO, *Mayor.*

FRANKFORT, KY.,
November 30, 1971.

Hon. CARL PERKINS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Please support the conference report on Economic Opportunity Act of 1971.

NORMAN CHRISMAN, Jr.,
Chairman, Government Affairs Committee, Kentucky Society of Architects.

NEWARK, N.J.,
December 1, 1971.

Congressman CARL D. PERKINS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

I strongly urge your support for the OEO authorization/child development act (conference report on S. 2007). The continuation of the antipoverty and manpower program funded under the OEO authorization, as well as the new child development program are vital to the city of Newark. Strong and affirmative action on this bill is desperately needed.

Sincerely,

KENNETH A. GIBSON,
Mayor, City of Newark, City Hall.

MADISON, WIS.,
December 1, 1971.

Representative CARL PERKINS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

It has come to my attention that an effort to defeat H.R. 10351, the extension of the poverty program, is taking place among your colleagues.

I want to inform you that I strongly support the passage of H.R. 10351 and encourage your support. This act would mean the extension of the fine efforts of the community action agencies in Wisconsin and add the important day care program. The passage means much to the citizens of Wisconsin.

Upon favorable action, I urge your prompt support for full funding.

PATRICK J. LUCEY,
State of Wisconsin.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
November 30, 1971.

CARL B. PERKINS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

On behalf of the 28,000 members of the American Personnel Guidance Association throughout the United States we ask your support of the comprehensive child development provision in S. 2007 now in conference. The Association particularly endorses those services to be provided low income children with particular emphasis on appropriate educational, social, and vocational guidance and counseling which can maximize the intellectual and physical growth potential of such children both at the preschool and elementary levels.

GARY WALLS,
American Personnel Guidance Association.

BEREA, KY., *November 29, 1971.*

Hon. CARL PERKINS,
House of Representatives,

We urge your presence and yes vote for the OEO child care authorization conference report.

SANDRA BOLIN,
President, League of Women Voters of Berea.

MORRISTOWN, TENN.,
November 12, 1971.

Representative CARL PERKINS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This letter is in regard to the Child Development Bill which is before your committee.

We the undersigned Head Start parents and registered voters of the State of Tennessee would like to have three (3) points in the compromise bill, they are;

1. adequate money—2 billion dollars
2. guarantee Head Start programs; and
3. local communities should be prime sponsors not the State!

We hope to have your deepest consideration and help upon this matter. Thank You.

Sincerely,

EILINDA L. ABHALTT,
(And 120 others).
Chairman, Headstart Parents and Registered Voters of the State of Tennessee.

SALISBURY, MD.,
November 17, 1971.

Hon. Congressman CARL PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PERKINS: I feel very strongly that our government must support quality child care programs for all children whose parents wish such care. Therefore, I urge you to vote in favor of the Comprehensive Child Development Bill, S. 2007.

We must not turn our backs on our most precious possession, our children.

Thank you for your support.

Sincerely,

CATHARINE A. TYLER,
Day Care Coordinator.

CITY OF DETROIT, EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
November 26, 1971.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PERKINS: I understand that the conference report on S. 2007—providing for a two year extension of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the establishment of Comprehensive Child Development Centers—is scheduled for a House vote on Thursday, December 2, 1971.

This legislation is important to Detroit, particularly in its provisions which would continue Community Action funding, increase youth training slots and aid early childhood development.

I urge you to vote for the conference report on S. 2007.

Sincerely,

ROMAN S. GRIBBS,
Mayor.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN THE U.S.A.,
Washington, D.C., December 1, 1971.
Hon. CARL PERKINS,
Chairman, Education and Labor Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PERKINS: On behalf of the National Council of Churches, I want to express to you our support for the conference report on S. 2007, the child development/Office of Economic Opportunity/Legal Services bill.

The elimination of poverty must remain a primary goal for this nation. This bill moves toward that goal. The Legal Services provision is, we believe, workable and gives credibility to the concept that our legal system strives to serve the ends of justice. The continuation and creation of such programs as Emergency Food and Medical Services and Community Economic Development *within the structure of OEO* assures that the poor will continue to have an advocate within the government, and provides a base for future initiatives. The authorizaiton for day care that is community controlled and that focuses on the development, rather than the custody, of the small child is a welcome recognition of a vital public responsibility.

We appreciate the leadership you have given on this issue, and express our fervent hope that this conference report receives the approval it so obviously deserves.

Sincerely yours,
MRS. THEODORE WEDEL,
President.

THE GREATER TAUNTON DAY CARE CENTER, INC.
Taunton, Mass., November 10, 1971.
Representative CARL PERKINS,
Chairman of Commerce, Education and Labor, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PERKINS: I would like, at this time, to state that our Day Care Center supports your bill. We are in complete agreement with what you are trying to do.

Would you please mail me a copy of this bill to the above address. I would like this at our center.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
MRS. M. M. BUTLER, Jr.,
Director.

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of regret and disappointment that I rise to vote in opposition to the Office of Economic Opportunity conference report.

This decision was reached only after a great deal of thought and with the full realization of the serious effect it may have on the future of OEO. Basically, my vote stems from a strong disagreement with the child care development measure based on a careful study of its provisions since it was added to the OEO extension.

Close scrutiny of this section of the report proves it to be an extremely weak bill, one which is an inefficient vehicle for the goal it seeks. It is designed to encourage duplication of effort and waste of funds.

Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the great need for a means to allow mothers to get off welfare and become gainfully employed. This is a worthy goal but, one which is impossible to achieve under the bill's present construction. The facts prove this proposal, well intentioned as it is, to be both inefficient and unmanageable.

Its major failing is that it contains a faulty delivery system, one which has been haphazardly drawn. The guidelines for receiving a federally financed child care center have been drawn so loosely as to make any community of 5,000 eligible.

I am not proposing, Mr. Speaker, that we should impose arbitrary population figures to discriminate against our smaller communities. On the contrary, I realize that they are often faced with the same needs and requirements of our urban areas.

My point, however, is this: By creating a large number of small centers each vested with the power to interpret and bend national guidelines as they see fit, there will be no semblance of cohesion or central direction to the program. By encouraging vast numbers of independent child care centers, the limited staff of the Office of Child Development will be overwhelmed with the administration of the program. As a matter of fact, it would prove an impossible task.

A quick reading of the procedural requirements to start a child care center bears this statement out. In addition to the necessity of instituting for administrative purposes a community advisory board, there are at least 25 separate requirements which must first be met.

The result is that the Office of Child Development will be bogged down investigating each community program and approving their setup. All this must be done before one child benefits from the program. Rather than having one program to serve a group of surrounding towns, there will be several programs for one region.

All of this, supposedly done in the name of local control, will cause a waste of time and money. Fewer children will be enrolled at a greater cost without any assurance whatsoever that the centers will be more effective because of their smaller size.

Furthermore, the Secretary of HEW is not empowered to make grants but rather must fund all who apply and meet minimum standards of eligibility. This is true even if an existing State or regional plan encompassing the same area would do a better job.

Mr. Speaker, experience has proven the truth of these assertions. We need only look as far as the Headstart program itself. Originally, it too placed an emphasis upon local control and was structured to encourage many small units.

Several years ago there were more than 900 different programs. Headstart proved too large to administer. Consequently, in the last 2 years no new Headstart programs have been initiated.

Mr. Speaker, the fears which I am expressing today are felt by those who are in the field trying to administer OEO projects. They are the ones who must work within the guidelines which we develop here in Washington. We can make their jobs even more difficult if we neglect their advice.

For example, in Oakland County, Mich., a portion of which I represent, the local OEO has started a child care center corporation. It has been established to give technical advice and assistance on a regional level to the entire county.

The local OEO learned a valuable lesson from the difficulty of coordinating and administrating the many localized plans which Headstart encouraged. Thus, this corporation was envisioned as a natural vehicle through which child care funds could be funneled. This vehicle has the potential to serve more than a million people.

If we pass this legislation in its present form, that corporation and all of its preparatory work will go down the drain. Each of the municipalities, 63 in Oakland County, Mich. alone, would be eligible for its own center. Just think of the duplication of effort and administrative funds.

Of course, there could never be enough money for each of these towns to be served individually. It is sad but true that by emphasizing local control fewer communities will receive benefits.

Mr. Speaker, we must demand a better means to deliver this program to the people. We need look no farther than the Oakland County OEO and the example that they have provided. I would prefer giving the Secretary of HEW the discretion to make the final decision on awarding prime sponsorship grants. In this way, smaller communities can be consolidated into one overall plan.

More children would be served with the same money and with less redtape and time. We are dealing with limited funds in the first place. Inefficiency is a luxury that we can ill afford.

There are many children and parents who have desperate need of these services. It is absolutely inexcusable that because of poorly devised legislation they will be denied them.

It is for these reasons that I cast my vote against the conference report. I do so reluctantly because at the same time this represents a vote against the entire OEO program. I would hope that we can pass a continuing resolution to keep this worthy Agency afloat.

In the meantime, we should send the child care development measure back to committee for further work. It must be restructured if it is to be a success.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the House and Senate conferees who have worked long and hard to bring before the Congress a version of the 1971 Office of Economic Opportunity amendments that will truly serve the national interest and will be acceptable to both bodies. I sincerely hope that the amendments will receive the overwhelming support of Congress in order that the much-needed programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity may be assured of continuance.

There are several "firsts" among these amendments on which I would like to comment.

To begin with, I am very happy to see that the powers of the Director have been so amended as to prevent the further spinoff of programs presently operated under titles II, III, VI, and VII of the Economic Opportunity Act. This restriction, added to section 19, is an extremely important one—it in fact as-

sures the continuance of the functions of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

I also heartily approve the mandate given the Director under section 222 to undertake special programs aimed at promoting employment opportunities for rehabilitated addicts, or addicts enrolled and participating in methadone maintenance treatment or therapeutic programs. Drug addiction is exacting a fearful price from our Nation and so far, we are making all too little progress in coping with it. The most successful rehabilitation efforts seem to be those made by groups rooted in the community in which the addict and his family live. I am confident, therefore, that the type of programs authorized under this section will prove very beneficial to our communities throughout the Nation. The stipulation that the Director must make provisions that will allow participants to complete a full course of rehabilitation, even though they become non-low-income by virtue of becoming employed as part of the rehabilitation process, gives added assurance concerning the success and impact we can expect from such programs.

The environmental action program, authorized under the same section, is another welcome innovation. It provides payment to low-income persons who work on projects designed to combat pollution or to improve the environment. Since our poor are most directly exposed to the menace of our deteriorating environment, such projects will not only bring welcome job opportunities and income but shall, hopefully, improve the texture of living for those dwelling in blighted areas.

Although not of such direct impact to my district, I shall welcome the establishment of the rural housing development and rehabilitation program. The shortage of available housing units is creating an unprecedented crisis in our Nation. Every effort to improve and maintain existing units and assist in the development of new housing is very welcome. A program such as this will, I am sure, be very welcomed by those of my colleagues who have emphasized frequently in the past the need for the stabilization of our urban areas.

When hearings were held on the OEO amendments this past summer, I was disturbed at the indications that higher levels of non-Federal contribution may be required. I thought then and I think now that our localities are not in a position to contribute more to these programs, however much needed they may be. In the context of our present and deteriorating economic situation, an increase in non-Federal contributions would merely aggravate local crises as city and county governments fight to make ends meet on incomes from a steadily shrinking economic base. I am very pleased, therefore, with the language incorporated into section 225 prohibiting the Director from requiring a non-Federal contribution in excess of 20 percent of the approved cost of the program.

The programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity were designed to benefit all those in need of them. The language added to section 224, mandating the distribution of funds in such a fashion that all significant segments of the low-income population served will be benefited can only add to the success of the programs.

I regard somewhat in the same context the new provisions that will apply to Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands under section 225, the authorization under which community action programs operate. Funds reserved for their use will be increased from 2 to 4 percent for fiscal year 1972. In addition, beginning with fiscal year 1973, Puerto Rico will be treated as a State for purposes of this section. As I have repeatedly stated in committee, such status accorded to Puerto Rico will not only benefit that island but will also substantially assist our large cities on the mainland to which the poor from Puerto Rico presently flock, seeking livelihood and job opportunities.

Titles V and IX, Child Development and Legal Services, have, of course, been receiving well-deserved national attention. The Child Development section of this measure is the product of much labor and thought on the part of the Select Subcommittee on Education and the conferees.

Comprehensive child development programs are of the utmost importance to our Nation. Children of working parents and of parents on public assistance must not be singled out to receive custodial care only. The early development of a child's talents and resources unalterably shape the course of his life. Full opportunity must not be, in our Nation, the privilege of the well-to-do; it must be the right of all.

But child development must not be purchased at the cost of the abdication or rescinding of parental responsibility and control. There are in this measure provisions for parental participation in the design and development as well as the carrying out of the program. A State, any combination of localities having a total population of 5,000 or more persons, Indian tribal organization, or public or private nonprofit agency or organization may serve as prime sponsor for an area's child development plan. However, at the time of application, the prime sponsor must show that it has made satisfactory provisions for the establishment and maintaining of a child development council which meets with the requirements of section 514. One of the requirements of that section specifically states that 50 percent of the child development council members must be parents of children who will be receiving services. The council will be responsible for developing and preparing a comprehensive child development plan. The plan must include the provision, where available, of child-related family, social, and rehabilitative services; educational services; health and mental health services; as well as nutrition services. It must also provide for the training of professional and paraprofessional personnel. Provisions must also be made for employment opportunities, under the plan, for older people, parents, young persons. Volunteers must also be involved in the program.

I would have been happier had a higher income ceiling for free services been established—a family income of $4,320 a year is very meager indeed. Also, I believe that unless extreme care is exercised in establishing the level of charges to be levied against the income of families immediately above the $4,320 bracket, such charges will prove difficult to meet. On the plus side, however, is the fact that the services will be available to all children whose parents or legal guardians request them on their behalf; that 10 percent of the sum to be spent is earmarked specifically for the needs of handicapped children who have, unfortunately, been getting short shrift under most of our programs; and that through the operation of such type of programs we may be in a position to end the social, economic, and cultural isolation of the children in our Nation.

I am also very pleased that under this title Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, will be treated as States. The exclusion of children from these areas for economic or other reasons would be inexcusable.

And while we are on the subject of economics, I want to state that the $2 billion appropriated for this title is enough only for a beginning. In order to reach our goal of meaningful child development, much larger sums will have to be committed for this purpose as soon as the programs get underway.

Title IX, the Legal Services Corporation, has been the object of much controversy and painful negotiations. Again, I would have been happier if at least a portion of the 17-member board, which will be responsible for the operation of this nonprofit corporation, had not been Presidential appointees. However, the incorporating trusteeship, which is to function for the first 6-month period of transsition, is composed of the members of prestigious organizations: the president of the American Bar Association, the president of the National Legal Aid and Defender Association, the president of the Assciation of American Law Schools, the president of the American Trial Lawyers' Association, and the president of the National Bar Association. Six members of the 17-member board that will be responsible for the operation of the corporation after the period of transition is over, will be chosen from among members of the general public, two from among nominees submitted by the Judicial Conference of the United States; two from individuals who are eligible for assistance under the provisions of title IX, two from among former legal service project attorneys, with the five remaining members to be selected from the nominess of the incorporating trusteeship.

The declaration of policy that enumerates the reasons for establishing the corporation states, among other things, that an access to legal services and appropriate institutions for all citizens of the United States is not only a matter of private and local concern, but is also of ap-

propriate and important concern to the Federal Government; that the integrity of the attorney-client relationship and the adversary system of justice in the United States require that there be no political interference with the provisions and performance of legal services; that existing legal services programs have provided economical, effective, and comprehensive legal services to the client community so as to bring about a peaceful resolution of grievances through resort to orderly means of change; and that a private nonprofit corporation should be created to encourage the availability of legal services and legal institutions to all citizens of the United States, free from extraneous interference and control.

Again, under this title, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, et cetera will be treated as "States" and their residents will be eligible for the same level of services as will be rendered to residents of the 50 States.

There will be, I am sure, many difficulties to surmount in the operation of this program. However, the conferees have worked long and conscientiously, keeping in mind the overwhelming need to make the term "equality before the law" a reality in our country. Consequently, I hope that the concept of the Legal Services Corporation will receive broad-based support—from Members of Congress, the general public, and the administration.

In closing, I would like to comment on the provisions of title VII which establish a coordinated community economic development program. Title I D special impact programs and title III A, the rural loan program, have been combined under this new approach and have received a level of funding, $60 million for fiscal year 1972 and $120 million for fiscal year 1973, which represents, for the first year of operation, an increase of almost 30 percent allocated to these programs of economic development. Assistance will be given to private locally initiated community development corporations and related nonprofit agencies or organizations in conducting activities which are directed to the solution of the critical problems existing in particular communities and neighborhoods; within those urban and rural areas having concentrations or substantial numbers of low-income persons. The activities of programs will have to be of sufficient size, scope, and duration to have an appreciable impact in such communities, neighborhoods, and rural areas in arresting "tendencies toward dependency, chronic unemployment, and community deterioration." They must also hold forth the prospect of continuing to have such impact after the termination of financial assistance under this title.

This, of course, is the type of planned attack we need to make on our economic ills. A coordinated program of this type, designed by community-rooted organizations will serve to prime the economic pump. Moreover, to assure the effectiveness of this approach, design and planning assistance grants will be available under title II. These grant moneys are to be used by the Director to pay community-based design and planning organizations to provide technical assistance and professional services to community organizations in the planning of the programs.

The types of programs specified include economic and business development programs which provide financial and other assistance, including equity capital to start, expand, or locate businesses in or near the area to be served so as to provide employment and ownership opportunities for residents of the area involved. Small businesses are eligible for assistance.

Community development and housing activities which can lead to the creation of new training, employment, and ownership opportunities are also authorized. Manpower training programs for unemployed and underemployed low-income persons will be included.

The above are the most significant of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1971. I believe that the measure, on the whole, is well deserving of support. I again thank the conferees and urge my colleagues to support the measure.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the adoption of this conference report for a variety of reasons. The measure is so bad that, if approved here today, I would hope the President will veto it.

Much of the debate today has related to the child development provision. Under the terms of that provision a brand new program would be inaugurated which for the first time would involve Federal functionaries in the rearing of children, influencing their minds and thoughts, and casting the mold for their future lives. While it is true no parent is compelled to submit to this technique, the concept and its inducements would be expected to gradually wear down resistence to its application—which reminds us:

Evil is of such a frightful mien,
As to be hated needs but to be seen;
But seen too oft—familiar with its face,
We first despise, then pity, then embrace.

However laudable is the idea of proper child care, which we all support, we are dealing here with a revolutionary concept in the area of having the State enter American homes, to coddle and influence the minds of small children, and at least to some extent replace the normal development of parental influence over the minds and lives of children. The scope of this proposal is a far cry from ordinary day care for the children of working mothers.

Mr. Speaker, I recently received a telegram from Mrs. Jean Harris, State president, Texas Congress of Parents and Teachers, which stated that during the 62d annual State convention of that organization in November, attended by 2,693 voting delegates from across the State, a resolution was adopted expressing strong opposition to this child development program.

In addition, I have received scores of other messages from parents expressing similar convictions. I cannot believe proponents can be fully aware of the extent of this concern and opposition.

Moreover, the cost of this comprehensive child development program will be prohibitive. The figure of $2 billion is given. But that is for early stages of it. A realistic figure is $10 billion in the foreseeable future. It is indeed a budget buster, and therefore highly inflationary.

Aside from the child development feature, the OEO needs to be vastly reduced or eliminated, and any good programs transferred to other agencies. Taking advantage of open ended authority, delegated by the Congress, that Agency has expended vast amounts of money which has been wasted or unaccounted for. OEO's blank check authority has been abused time and again, and this can be documented in scores of instances.

Mr. Speaker, again I hope this conference report will be voted down. If approved, I hope the President will exercise the right of veto.

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition of S. 2007, the conference report on the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1971. This legislation authorized $900 million a year for continuation of OEO-administered programs, $950 million for manpower programs, and $500 million for 1 year to the Neighborhood Youth Corps program. In addition it creates a Legal Services Corporation to replace the present OEO legal service programs and forbids the President from transferring any program from OEO to another Government agency without legislative approval and also offers a compromise version of the day-care bill. I voted against the House version which passed the House on September 30, 1971. I will do so today.

My colleagues will recall that the so-called child-development part of this legislation was added to H.R. 10351 by Congressman BRADEMAS' lengthy amendment, an amendment that contained more than 11,000 words and occupied 22 columns of fine type in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Most people had expected that as a part of plans for welfare reform a bill would be enacted that would provide modest Federal subsidies for needed day-care centers in some cities. It was envisioned there would be places where welfare mothers desiring to work could leave their children while they went to work. Instead the House approved a full-blown socialistic plan for the "comprehensive" development of all children to the age of 14. To my way of thinking it is the boldest and most far-reaching scheme ever advanced for the socialization of our American young.

The advocates of this legislation argue that "millions of American children are suffering unnecessary harm from the present lack of adequate child development services, particularly during their early childhood years." To remedy this, the bill directs the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to foster programs that will provide "comprehensive physical and mental health, social and cognitive development services necessary for children participating in the program to profit fully from their educational opportunities and to attain their maxi-

mum potential." The programs may include food and nutritional services; medical, psychological, and educational services, appropriate treatment to overcome emotional barriers; and "dissemination of information in the functional language of those to be served to assure that parents are well informed." Religious guidance, however, plays no part in the program.

The House on June 22, 1971, passed H.R. 1 which should aid the Nixon administration toward its proposed goal of consolidating and improving child-care programs with priority going to the children of working parents who are receiving welfare assistance and, regardless of the work status of the parents, to children of economically disadvantaged families. The Nixon administration hoped to create an integrated system of child care utilizing all Federal authorities, including Project Headstart child care under title IV of the Social Security Act, and welfare reform provisions of H.R. 1, thereby providing free child care to the poorest of our citizens while at the same time providing for a socio-economic mix in child-care facilities with children from families above the minimum-income level.

The conference report to the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1971 provides free care for all children of families earning not more than $4,320 a year. Families with between $4,300 annual income would pay 10 percent of their income over $4,320. Families with between $5,916 and $6,960 income would pay the 10 percent, plus 15 percent of income over $5,916. A family of four with $6,960 income would pay a total of $317 a year. The HEW Secretary would set a fee schedule for families with more than $6,960 income.

The bill authorizes $100 million to plan the program in fiscal 1972 and $2 billion to develop it in 1973. The program might cost $350 million in fiscal 1973, but the House authorization is open ended. The bill contemplates, ultimately, Federal support of the entire range of services that have to do with the development of a child.

The method of administering this program is grotesque. Much of the problem revolves, not around who may operate individual projects, but who is eligible to be a prime sponsor.

The distinction between the two is important. A prime sponsor is the mechanism through which a child development council—the overall mechanism—is established, and an overall comprehensive plan for services is developed. Under the prime sponsor there would be a number of individual operating programs—each following the same rules and regulations promulgated by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—but each individual program operator would not deal directly with HEW. There are few restrictions on who may operate a program since they deal only with the prime sponsor.

The confusion seems to be about who is eligible to submit an application as a prime sponsor. As the conference report presently stands, if both a city—with a population of 5,000 or more—and a combination of localities or a State submit simultaneous applications for prime sponsorship to serve the same geographical area, the Secretary is mandated to approve the city's application if it meets minimum requirements. This results regardless of which is better equipped or has a greater capacity to administer programs which serve the needs of the particular area. The Secretary must approve the city as the prime sponsor.

Governor Askew of my State of Florida has expressed concern as the chief executive of the State of Florida that the scheme advocated in this legislation would create a pattern of participation based primarily on the availability of funds rather than the presence of need. He feels that the requirement to put up 20 percent in matching funds for the program while bypassing State governments in the designation, funding, and administration of day-care centers precludes poor local groups from participating.

The Governor wrote me as follows:

STATE OF FLORIDA,
OFFICE OF GOVERNOR
REUBIN O'D. ASKEW,
October 22, 1971.

Hon. J. HERBERT BURKE,
Tenth Florida District
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HERBERT: It has come to my attention that the Senate and the House of Representatives have approved S2007 and similar legislation which would completely bypass state governments in the designation, funding, and administration of day care centers and other child development programs.

While local involvement and local commitment are needed, I am sure you agree that the states should play a major role in supervising these programs to assure the best use of every available dollar.

Bypassing the states would require each local group to put up the necessary 20 percent matching funds for the program. It is my opinion that this would create a pattern of participation based primarily on the availability of funds rather than the presence of need. This problem could be solved, of course, by channeling the funds through the state administrative organizations on a priority basis so funds could be provided to the communities that have the greatest need. In addition, state participation would allow use of these funds to be coordinated with other state and local programs, thereby promoting maximum efficiency.

While I recognize that there is not much time left in the consideration of this particular change, I am sure that each of you will keep in mind the need for a meaningful state role in consideration of this and any similar legislation affecting federal-state-local programs.

Sincerely,

REUBIN, *Governor.*

The contrivers of this legislation following the do-gooder theory must be aware of the socialistic aspects of the same. The honest fact is that it is social legislation of monumental proportions. It promises to alleviate the problems of millions of American women who must work but who have no suitable arrangements for the care of their children. It promises a national commitment to comprehensive early childhood education. It estimated that there are 6 million preschoolers whose mothers work, and in light of the estimate, that it will cost at least $1,600 per child for adequate full-time care, it is easy to see that the total price tag of such a program will cost billions of dollars annually. But our socialistic planners care not. The problem has not been approached with caution, instead a helter-skelter mechanism for administering the program has been thrown together and hence we are asked shall we be socialist or shall we not?

Let us not forget that, in the context of a Communist society, in which children are regarded as wards of the state and raised in state-controlled communes, this scheme might be sensible. However, in America where our people cherish the values of home, family, church and parental control the passage of this bill is an insult to our founding fathers and to the majority of the American people. I hope this legislation will be defeated.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, as you have appropriately observed, the vote on this conference report represents the "paramount moral vote of this session of Congress." The omnibus OEO bill which is now before us would do much more than merely extend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; it would, for the first time provide a permanent structure for the highly successful neighbor legal services program by the creation of the National Legal Services Corporation, thus providing poor and low income people assurance that they will not be deprived of legal services in civil matters because of their economic misfortune.

Most important, however, this bill incorporates the Child Development Act, the only new piece of social legislation to emerge from this session of Congress. For the first time, we have an opportunity to clearly articulate a national policy in favor of low-cost, federally subsidized child care. Let there be no mistake, a vote in favor of the conference report is a vote in favor of the children and women of this country and a vote against it is a vote against them.

The Child Development Act will permit all communities of 5,000 and over to set up 24-hour child care facilities. These will be local programs—programs over which local educators, professionals, and parents will have ultimate control. The act recognizes the desperate need of low-income families for child care they can afford. Those with incomes below the poverty level, $4,320, will be provided with free child care; those with incomes of up to $6,960, the Bureau of Labor Statistics figure for a minimum adequate standard of living for an urban family, will be provided with day care at fees within their limited means.

This Child Development Act is a first step in a direction we must go: the establishment of universal child care. Low-cost, broad-based child care must be as prevalent and acceptable as public education. This bill is only a first step, but it is a vital first step.

The Child Development Act is a children's bill, but it is more than that. It is a women's bill, too. Women's rights is definitely an issue here, even though not many speakers here have mentioned it. If a woman must stay at home to mind the kids, she won't be able to go to school—take a job—or work harder for promotion. Without adequate, low-cost

day care facilities, women are doomed to occupy low-paying, low-prestige jobs; without day care, women must remain economic serfs.

Believe me. The women of this country are no longer willing to be the involuntary source of cheap labor that the absence of adequate day care facilities has dictated. I am sure that most of you have already heard this from the women in their districts. I can assure you that you will hear from them again if the Child Development Act is sacrificed to some misguided notion of "economy" or "priority." I can also assure you that their message will not be favorable. This is not a politically partisan question—it is a human question.

Critics of the Child Development Act have hinted darkly that all kinds of evil will follow the establishment of low-cost, broad-based child care, but all they have really said is that it is too expensive. Too expensive—what an insult to the women and children of America. We spend some $75 billion for war and killing and Members of this Congress and administration have the audacity to say that a bill authorizing $2 billion for child development is too expensive. Their message is clear—unlimited funds for war and technological needs but nothing for human needs.

I cannot believe that this is the message of the majority of this House. I urge the adoption of S. 2007, the OEO conference report.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2007, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1971. I would like to direct my remarks to the bill's provisions on legal services.

Created in 1964, the Legal Services program has been one of the most effective aspects of the Economic Opportunity Act. For the poor it has helped make the system responsive. Legal services attorneys have won landmark cases, including decisions on migrant labor, welfare regulations, housing codes, and police-community relations.

In 1971 over 1 million poor Americans will be represented by approximately 2,000 attorneys. Just 2 years ago the caseload was only half as large.

Recently I helped obtain a $150,000 grant to fund a legal services program for citizens in Snohomish, Skagit, and Whatcom Counties in my State of Washington. Located centrally in Everett, Wash., the program will hire five lawyers to help clients with a host of civil problems, among which are the mounting cases of repossessed homes, cars, and other personal property.

With success has come controversy, and this year I have helped write the legislation before us today which reshapes the entire legal services program.

Our bill creates a private, nonprofit corporation to fund local projects and expand legal services and opportunities. The corporation will be run by a board of directors, and 11 of the 17 members will be chosen by the President from lists submitted by groups representing clients of and members of the legal profession. Except in a very, very narrow instance, no attorney can take criminal cases. There are appropriate guidelines to restrict political activity.

Mr. Speaker, the Legal Services Corporation will continue to help more and more low-income Americans deal with the system. President Nixon stated recently that perhaps four out of five of the legal problems of the poor go unattended. I find this shocking and believe that the legal services program must be expanded. Former Chief Justice Earl Warren put it best when he said that:

> A right without an advocate is as useless as a blueprint without a builder or materials.

Mr. Speaker, only 30 years have elapsed since the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that Congress could legally pass a national child labor law. Only 30 years. Prior to the *Darby* case it was not unusual for small children to be working long days in factories, in textile mills, and even in the coal mines.

Brutal exploitation of child labor was perhaps the worst aspect of our industrial revolution. For a lot of American youngsters childhood offered only suffering, toil, misery. I am reminded of the child labor horrors today as we consider legislation designed to enrich the early years. I am reminded further of what Lord Avebury wrote in 1887:

> It is customary, but I think it is a mistake to speak of happy childhood. Children are often overanxious and acutely sensitive. Man ought to be man and master of his own fate; but children are at the mercy of those around them.

There is a vast middle ground between the childhood of the sweatshops and the childhood of affection, attention, and happy growth. Doctors and scientists tell us that a child's environment in his first 5 years is crucial to the way he matures and to his adulthood. In a more romantic age William Wordsworth penned the definitive statement on infancy: "The child is the father of the man."

FIRST AND LAST

We Americans were the first industrial country to embark on mass public education. Even today there are many, many nations where education is available only to the elite. Not so in the United States where adults have taxed themselves to aid the next generation. Peoples in other parts of the globe would be astounded if you told them that the average Washington State resident has an educational achievement of more than 12 years.

But we Americans are the last industrial country without available, adequate, and inexpensive child care services. That we are lagging in this area is not surprising, for our country has always been far behind other nations in establishing industrial reforms. For example, when Congress passed the Social Security Act in 1935, there were 27 nations that already had similar programs. Germany, under the leadership of that radical Otto von Bismarck, established sickness and maternity insurance in 1883. The Government of England created unemployment, disability, and health insurance in 1911. France set up unemployment compensation in 1905. Perhaps the ultimate example of our lagging behind was a Federal law to protect health and safety in employment. Congress didn't pass this bill until 1970.

Government-supported child care services are common throughout the major countries of the world except America. In Japan the Government helps support more than 12,000 day-care centers and more than 9,000 kindergartens. The Scandinavian nations have advanced facilities that furnish three types of supervision: day nurseries, kindergartens, and afternoon recreational centers for young students.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND S. 2007

S. 2007, the bill to continue and improve the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, was passed in September in different versions by the House and Senate. Before us today is the final version written by the House-Senate conference committee. I strongly urge passage of this essential legislation.

The current phase of congressional activity on day care and child development began with the introduction of a bill on August 19, 1969. Since then the Select Education Subcommittee of which I am a member has held lengthy hearings on the various proposals and has studied the entire issue in great detail. Testimony produced 166 statements and witnesses who favored the comprehensive approach to child development.

It has been my pleasure to cosponsor child care legislation in the 91st and 92d Congresses. I have helped write the bill before us today and am proud of its provisions.

Support for the comprehensive child development legislation has been expressed by a broad range of groups including the League of Women Voters, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the U.S. Catholic Conference, the National Association for Catholic Women, the National Education Association, the National League of Cities, the AFL-CIO, Common Cause, and the American Bar Association.

NORMAN ROCKWELL NO MORE

My colleague from Idaho, Republican Representative ORVAL HANSEN, had this to say when the House debated the child development legislation on September 30:

> This is truly an idea whose time has come. Indeed, as we look across the country, we might very well conclude that it is long overdue. Quietly, without much notice, some very basic changes in the American family have been taking place. The American family today is not any longer—if it ever was—the Norman Rockwell-Saturday Evening Post stereotype complete with a mother waiting at the door with hot apple pie for the children after school.

Today there are 32 million working women. The number of mothers in the work force has increased sevenfold since 1940 and has doubled since 1950. Many women are the heads of families.

Among the children of working mothers are 6 million youngsters under the age of 6. What happens to them is the reason for the bill before the House this afternoon.

America has for these children only 641,000 certified day-care slots. Headstart serves only 263,000 children in full-year programs and 208,000 in summer projects.

The working mother is often forced into makeshift child care arrangements that are haphazard, inadequate, and even harmful.

Relatives are pressed into service; children are left alone with a key and a sandwich; a bored child decides to play with matches or explore the medicine cabinet.

The child development legislation will be costly if funded adequately. But consider the costs we are already paying. We are paying when 10 to 25 percent of our children are not prepared to meet the new challenges when they first enter school. We are paying when statistics show that the majority of crimes in this country are committed by persons under 25. We are paying when welfare costs continue to skyrocket.

We are paying when mothers suffer emotional and financial anxiety over finding proper care during the working day. We are paying when welfare mothers want to work but cannot surmount the obstacles related to child care.

We are paying when lack of child care facilities prevents the women of this Nation from making the contribution of which they are capable. Our country needs and must have the skills, talents, and abilities of its women.

We are paying dearest when the children do not get a fair chance.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT—IF SIGNED AND FUNDED

Mrs. Bruce B. Benson, president of the League of Women Voters of the United States, had this to say in a November 30 letter to the Congress:

> The League believes it absolutely essential for this nation to provide comprehensive care for children. Every year of delay is a year's opportunity denied to millions of children. Even though S. 2007 will not satisfy even the existing needs, it is a big step in the right direction.

S. 2007 authorizes $2 billion through June 30, 1973. Five hundred million dollars is earmarked for Headstart. It should be stressed that the legislation we are considering today does not appropriate any funds. Actual appropriations will come later when the House and Senate Appropriations Committees begin working in January on the new budget.

There has been some talk that President Nixon may veto this bill. I hope not. To veto the measure would run counter to the statement he made in a February 1969 message to Congress. Said the President:

> So crucial is the matter of early growth that we must make a national commitment to providing all American children an opportunity for healthful and stimulating development during the first five years of life.

Funds contained in the measure can be used for a host of child development services, including construction, rental, and remodeling of facilities. For the child the bill offers services that are educational, medical, nutritional, recreational, and social. Funds will also be used in the training of professionals and paraprofessionals to work with the children.

The bill specifies that free services are to be provided for low-income families. A family of four whose annual income is $4,320 would pay nothing, and families with larger incomes would pay fees on a sliding scale.

THE HALLOWEEN CAMPAIGN

During the past several weeks Congress has been receiving a good deal of mail against the child development legislation. While there has been considerable misunderstanding about the measure, right-wing extremists have engaged in a deliberate Halloween campaign to portray the bill as being full of demons, devils, and other scary figures.

Some of these people are saying that the Federal Government is going to take children from their homes and control them. Nonsense. Section 515(a)(24) states that:

> Programs or services under this title shall be provided only for children whose parents or legal guardians have requested them.

Section 578 of the measure is pretty much the standard clause Congress inserts in all aid to education bills:

> No department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall, under authority of this Title, exercise any direction, supervision or control over, or impose any requirements or conditions with respect to the personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction, or administration of any educational institution.

To protect the legal and moral sanctity of the family, section 581(a) of S. 2007 specifies that:

> Nothing in this title shall be construed or applied in such a manner as to infringe upon or usurp the moral and legal rights and responsibilities of parents or guardians with respect to the moral, mental, emotional or physical development of their children. Nor shall any section of this title be construed or applied in such a manner to permit any invasion of privacy otherwise protected by law, or to abridge any legal remedies for any such invasion which are otherwise provided by law.

Furthermore, the bill requires each sponsor of a child development program to establish a child development council to approve the basic policy decisions on the program. At least half of the council must be composed of parents whose children are served by the project.

HELPING THE CHILDREN

In her 1843 poem, "The Cry of the Children," Elizabeth Barrett Browning struck a blow against the agony of child labor:

> The young, young children, O my brothers,
> They are weeping bitterly;
> They are weeping in the playtime of the others
> In the country of the free.

What the industrial revolution did to children was finally brought under control. Protecting children has been evolving gradually into helping them become healthy, educated, adjusted adults. No child care program can ever replace a loving and constructive family environment. But love and concern are not always present. Even when these qualities are shared in the family unit, we still face the problem of the child whose mother is gone during the working hours.

We can bicker among ourselves about the details of this or that bill. But no matter how long we debate, one question remains supreme: What are we going to do about the children? Ignore them? Pay attention to them only in school and only when they begin having problems? Let them sit silently and alone in an empty house? Pretend that they do not need stimulation, like so many figures in a wax museum? Our Government has not done very well so far for the millions of children of working mothers and mothers who want to work. With S. 2007 we can do better.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I earnestly urge and hope that this conference report on the continuation and expansion of the wholesome programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity will be overwhelmingly accepted by the House.

The basic legislation provides for a 2-year continuation of programs that have already proved their effectiveness in carrying out our national commitment to perseveringly eliminate poverty in this country, such as community action projections, neighborhood health centers, emergency food and medical services, drug and alcoholic rehabilitation, migrant workers aid and senior citizen assistance.

The legislation further provides new and expanded activities to help meet the desperate needs of our Nation's cities and rural areas; to enlarge the Neighborhood Youth Corps unit for the establishment, because of the existing grave unemployment situation in this age group, of 100,000 new jobs for young men and women; to institute the National Legal Services Corporation to strengthen legal services for the poor and, perhaps more fundamentally important than anything else, to create a comprehensive child development opportunities and quality day-care service program designed to give our Nation's children, especially the disadvantaged and handicapped children, the best life start a concerned country can provide.

I would like to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, since there has been much misunderstanding about this particular provision, that this measure has been endorsed by the National Education Association, League of Women Voters, National Association for Retarded Children, National Council of Churches, U.S. Catholic Conference of Bishops, League of Cities and the National Conference of Mayors. May I also emphasize that no services may be offered to children under the provisions of the bill without the full consent and involvement of parents or legal guardians and all the activities will be completely designed, operated and controlled at the community level with the parents of the enrolled children holding the principal responsibility. Obviously, then, any fears, however well meant, that Federal Government intervention will tend to eliminate parental authority are unfounded.

Mr. Speaker, the programs contained in this legislation constitute the essence of our continuing war on poverty, that we initiated several years ago to extend help and hope to the discouraged millions of young, old and middle-aged poor people in this country. Our current national economic situation makes it unfortunately too clear that these programs are needed today more than ever before. They are not intended to establish any institutions of perpetual care but only to enable our poor citizens and families to increasingly better their economic status so that the programs can be gradually reduced and eventually eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, the substance of this

measure truly represents a prudent investment in the present and future welfare and progress of this Nation and I believe it merits the resounding approval of this House.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with great reluctance that I must oppose this conference report. I say that because I have been a strong supporter of both the major new features in this bill—the Legal Services Corporation and the comprehensive child development program—and I have, in fact, cosponsored legislation in both of these areas. And let me say parenthetically that I have no quarrel with the conference version of the Legal Services Corporation program. I am especially proud of the fact that the Education and Training Task Force of the House Republican Conference has devoted considerable attention to the need for child development programs and has worked diligently in developing a bipartisan approach to this problem. I think it is most regrettable that this bipartisan spirit has collapsed. And without pointing the finger at anyone in particular, I think we should recognize that several factors involved in this collapse include the lack, to date, of any committee report on this major new program, the fact that few members had even seen the text of this 62-page amendment before it was tacked onto the EOA bill, and the fact that it was altered substantially both on the floor and in conference. This is just no way to win friends and influence people in launching a major new program of this kind, no matter how desirable the program and how well intentioned its authors.

I know there are those who would argue that the child development concept is such an overriding good in and of itself that we should overlook the imperfections and flaws which mar this title and pass it regardless. I just can't accept that thesis. If there was one outstanding lesson we should have learned from our domestic program efforts of the last decade, it is that good intentions do not necessarily make for good legislation, and we have had plenty of bad programs come back to haunt us because we operated on that mistaken assumption. And yet today, there will still be those who will argue that we should not allow ourselves to become hung up on the administrative arrangements contained in this bill because this is basically a sound and urgently needed program. Well, I would submit to my colleagues here today that it is precisely because this program is so urgently needed, especially by the working mothers of America, that we cannot afford to build a faulty foundation or it will fall flat on its face and we will once again open ourselves to the charge that we have allowed promises to outstrip performance—that we have raised a lot of false expectations because we will not be able to deliver on the promises made in this legislation.

And the key word here is "delivery." The crucial component of this comprehensive child development program is the delivery system, and I defy anyone to lightly dismiss the importance of this component. That would be like dismissing the importance of propulsion technology in putting a satellite into orbit. And yet in the conference version of the child development program we have an administrative monstrosity—burdensome, unmanageable, uneconomical, inefficient and chaotic. For in requiring that the Secretary of HEW must choose the smallest unit as the prime sponsor for a given area, we are in effect guaranteeing a proliferation of prime sponsors each having the least available expertise and resources and the most unfavorable cost/benefit ratio. It would, as the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) has so aptly put it, be analogous to going back to the day when each one-room schoolhouse would also be one school district. For obvious reasons of necessity we have gotten away from that concept; whereas in 1900 there were 100,000 school districts in this country, today there are 17,000, and this figure is dropping at the rate of 1,000 per year.

Or, to get back to my space analogy, the requirement in this bill would be like telling the administrator of NASA to use his weakest booster rocket and lowest quality fuel to put a satellite into orbit, even if a more substantial booster and higher quality fuel were available.

I would hope that we are genuinely interested in developing a program which will provide the maximum number of people with the best possible services at the lowest possible costs. That is why it is so important that we reject this conference report and go back to work on a bill which will give the Secretary the flexibility to choose those prime sponsors which are most competent and capable of serving a given area.

In light of the twin aims of the bill to provide: first, "child development programs for all children whose parents or legal guardians shall request them regardless of economic, social and family backgrounds," and second, high quality, comprehensive care including health, educational, psychological, nutritional, and so forth, services. The 2-billion authorization may be adequate for the initial year, but it is thoroughly misleading as to the eventual costs. The following are some cost figures based on differing assumptions about participation rates and cost per child:

[In billions]

Participation	$1,200/ child	$1,600/ child	$200/ child
1. Below poverty line only ($3,721, family of 4)	$3,165	$4,220	$5,276
50 percent participation of children below poverty line	1.582	2.110	2.638
2. Children in families eligible under H.R. 1, Jan. 1, 1973	3.3	4.4	5.5
50 percent participation	1.652	2.203	2.754
3. Children in female-headed families eligible under H.R., 1 Jan 1, 1973	1.7	2.3	2.8
50 percent participation rate	.853	1.137	1,422
4. Cost of bill under consideration, including only children in families eligible for free services (under $4,320) and partial subsidization (under $6,900)	6.190	8.475	10.761
50 percent participation rate	3.097	4.240	5.380
5. Free services for all children under 5	20.599	27.465	34.332
50 percent participation rate	10,299	13,732	17.166

SOME IMPLICATIONS OF THE ABOVE FIGURES

First. All of the above estimates are based on 1970 census figures for children under 5. However, child development advocates are also talking about after-school services for children 5 and above, so the real costs would be much greater if these children were included in the calculations.

Second. To provide quality care for just the children in families below the poverty line—3,721 for family of four—would cost twice the amount of the $2-billion authorization. Moreover, to provide care for just half of the children promised free care—in families with incomes under $4,230—and almost completely subsidized care—in families between $4,320 and $6,900 would cost two times the authorization.

Third. In light of the figures in the above paragraph and in light of the bill's promise to provide at least partially subsidized care for children in families above $6,900, it seems to me that we have in the making one more huge credibility gap, and one more social welfare promise largely unfilled. Congress will never appropriate even a fraction of the amounts needed to provide even the minimum free care and partially subsidized care promised by this bill.

The history of medicaid and medicare is instructive here because it promised wide availability of skilled nursing home care for the first time—that is, financed demand—when there were not adequate facilities and personnel available. As a result of the pressure of this new demand, administrators gave temporary licenses to substandard facilities and in time you got the whole series of scandals uncovered by Nader, Congressman PRYOR, Senator PERCY in Chicago, and so forth. I see no reason why this same syndrome would not operate in the day field, when you remember that there were only 600,000 licensed day care slots in the entire country in 1969, yet we are here proposing services for 2 million to 10 million kids. I think this danger is especially great because under the bill any group representing more than 5,000 persons can qualify as a prime sponsor. Obviously, many prime sponsors of this type will be in no position to provide quality care, and there will, as a result, be strong and probably successful pressure to loosen standards for a transitional period that may never end if the skilled nursing home experience is any guide. Yet many child psychologists advise that substandard care may be worse than no care at all, especially for children from nonpoor families. Therefore, before we start financing a massive surge of new demand we better make sure that enough resources, personnel and facilties are available to absorb it.

The problem with this bill is that it completely melds together funds for first, facilities, planning, demonstration projects, personnel training and "start-up costs," and second, subsidies to allow children to participate, that is, fuses funds for supply and demand. I think any funds we do make available should be targeted to:

First, welfare children, especially in

female-headed families. This is the area where funds are desperately needed if we are to begin to break the cycle of poverty, crime, and dependency. Once they get in elementary school it is usually too late.

Second, the development and expansion of a child care delivery system. There is already plenty of demand for services from nonwelfare families, as witness the huge waiting list for most current programs. The implication is that the startup costs for facilities, personnel, and so forth, is too great for any significant expansion of day care supply given the current ad hoc system. Therefore, if we are going to make funds available other than to welfare families they should be in the form of grants, loans, loan guarantees, technical assistance, model project funds and the like to spur the development of a supply system that at present cannot respond to even current demand. Specifically, this would be in the form of development assistance to prime sponsors serving areas of from 200,000 to 500,000 persons, they would become the central administrative units in a nationwide system. Over time, if we got our budgetary problems worke out, we could institute a tax credit to help finance demand for families in the working-class range just above the welfare level. But as a general principle, if nonwelfare families want day care they should finance the main portion of the cost themselves. The underlying principle of this bill is just the opposite and should be rejected on that ground alone.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I thoroughly reject the notion that this bill is somehow designed to destroy the family and nationalize or "Sovietize" our children. This is sheer nonsense. This bill makes abundantly clear in unequivocal terms that the program is entirely voluntary—nobody is suggesting a legalized Federal kidnaping program. The program would simply be available to those families who need such a service. In addition, the governing bodies of both the prime sponsors and the individual projects are to have 50 percent representation by parents having children in these programs, and these governing bodies are responsible for the programs, politics, personnel, and other administrative details. In short, this program is oriented toward the type of programs and services desired by the parents involved and gives those parents sufficient administrative powers and representation to insure it. Contrary to popular misconception, this would not be run by a group of bureaucrats or a computer in Washington, D.C. It is local, it is voluntary, and it is parent-oriented. I hope we will defeat this conference report and bring back a bill that will best meet the needs of those parents who want this program.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this conference report, now under consideration, in order to continue and expand the Economic Opportunity Act which has been so highly beneficial in the past to millions of needy folks throughout the country and to families of low income. I supported the legislation when it was before the Rules Committee early this year and later when it successfully passed the House. The other body made some changes in the legislation and the conference between the House and Senate has returned a satisfactory bill and the conference report should be adopted by a large majority.

This legislation will carry out the highly successful and much-needed Neighborhood Youth Corps programs and authorizes $500 million for the fiscal year ending June 1972, for the highly successful Headstart program and also provides for the Follow Through program of $70 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973.

This legislation also provides money for the carrying out of the Comprehensive Health Services program and the Emergency Fund Medical Services program along with the Family Planning program which projects are set out and described in the pending bill. There are also provisions for the Senior Citizens Opportunities and Services program as well as carrying out the additional cost of Environmental Action programs.

Thirty-eight million dollars set out in the bill will be for the purposes of carrying out part (b) of title III for migratory and seasonal farmworkers as well as money relating to the community economic development and the housing development and rehabilitation program described in section 222 of the bill. Provisions are also provided for the drug rehabilitation program and for community action boards.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Millions of American children are suffering unnecessary harm from the lack of adequate child development services.

Comprehensive child development programs, including a full range of health, education, and social services, are essential to the achievement of the full potential of the Nation's children and should be available to children whose parents or legal guardians request them regardless of economic, social, and family backgrounds. Children with special needs must receive full and special consideration in planning any child development programs. Priority should be given to preschool children with the greatest economic and social needs. While no mother may be forced to work outside the home as a condition for using child development programs, such programs are essential to allow many parents to undertake or continue full- or part-time employment, training or education. Comprehensive child development programs not only provide a means of delivering a full range of essential services to children, but can also furnish meaningful employment opportunities for many individuals, including older persons, parents, young persons, and volunteers from the community.

This legislation is a comprehensive and cover-all program pertaining to the needs of many low-income and poverty-stricken families throughout the Nation. If passed today and signed by the President, it will contribute greatly to the recovery of our economy, increase employment and give necessary and needed education and training to the younger generation so that they will not become dependents on relief by reason of lack of training and preparation during their youth.

Ninety percent of the crime today can be traced to the negligence of our government—loca, State, and national—in not providing aid and help to young folks in preparing for practical employment in later years.

In recognition of parental responsibility for children, the conference report states that:

> Nothing in this title shall be construed or applied in such a manner as to infringe upon or usurp the moral and legal rights and responsibilities of parents or guardians with respect to the full development of their children. Nor shall any section of this title be construed or applied in such a manner as to permit any invasion of privacy otherwise protected by law, or to abridge any legal remedies for any such invasion which are otherwise provided by law (Sec. 581).

In this bill there is no compulsion and no government control of children. I would hate for all these other good programs to be jeopardized because of a misunderstanding.

I do hope this conference report is passed by a large majority vote.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, my opposition to the conference report on S. 2007 is not to be equated as being in opposition to all child care programs. On the contrary, Headstart has proven to be successful.

Our opposition to S. 2007 and our own H.R. 10351 is not predicated solely and only upon this novel, untried and unbelievably expensive child development section. There are several parts of the overall poverty program that have not been either economically administered or effective in results. The gentlelady from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) today on the floor of the House once again called the attention of the membership to the indisputable facts that hundreds of millions of dollars have been wasted on the poverty program. In her remarks she indicated that a considerable portion of the money has never been accounted for in what appeared to be at the time, worthwhile community action programs. She pointed to the present large payments being made to consulting firms whose main interest is to increase the income of their organization. Then she pointed to the poor record of placement of Job Corps graduates. If I recall her remarks correctly, she said that a total of $42 billion had already been spent on the poverty program, and asked in the light of such large expenditures, why has there been so little progress?

During the debate, the most telling argument advanced against the comprehensive child development program was that it amounts to a kind of reverse incentive. The earlier effort of the Ways and Means Committee provided child care only for working mothers. Now, as I read this conference report, it no longer contains the priority of the House which limited care to working mothers and single parents. Instead, our conferees extended care to all preschool children. In other words, under the conference report mothers could stay home, do nothing and yet still receive day care for their children.

Mr. Speaker, I can support reasonable day care costs for those working mothers who need it. As long as mothers are proving they want to get off the welfare rolls and are willing to accept work to do that then child care is justified. But this bill is not merely day care for working mothers. Its thrust goes far beyond that. Instead it is a broad, comprehensive custodial program with provisions for nutrition, and education which leaves the door ajar for indoctrination at the tender preschool age. Most of this kind of care parents ought to do for themselves.

I am no authority on child care but I think I do know enough to understand that there is no substitute for parental care of children. There is no substitute for the family. Nothing can take the place of a family atmosphere. This leads us to consideration of the question whether our children would in fact be hurt or harmed by this kind of a development program. What we are surely talking about is institutionalized child care. This daily care matter means that for the greater portion of each day, the child is separated from both parents. Personalization, is replaced by depersonalization which is all that is possible with so many to be cared for. Before we approve the conference report we should consider the potential risk and possible emotional damage which can happen during the time from birth and during the preschool period until a child is 3 or 4 years old.

Even if we could disregard all of the other objections to this novel program it carries an impossible price tag. According to my arithmetic, when our bill went over to the other body, it authorized approximately $5 billion for 2 years. There was no sum certain contained for the child program. As a matter of fact, the House version was kind of open-ended because H.R. 10351 authorized such sums as should be required. Now, I suppose it could be said a fixed or specific limitation on authorization is better than none at all. But on page 62 of the report I see the Senate authorized $2 billion for just fiscal 1973 for this new comprehensive child development program. Once again it should not be too difficult to conclude that with the $5 billion for all of the other OEO programs, by adding the $2 billion for child development programs for fiscal 1973 alone, we are voting on a conference report that authorizes $7 billion.

How many times have we heard it said we should never worry about any amount that is authorized? What we should really be concerned about is the amount that is finally appropriated. Yet again and again the Congress subjects itself to criticism, in my judgment justifiably so, when we strike out and authorize programs which we can never afford to fund. Such a course of action is misleading. The adoption of an authorization bill creates an implied covenant to match that authorization with appropriations.

Now comes the question: What is so wrong with fully funding an authorization of this amount? The answer is it would not only be a budget buster for fiscal 1973 but will blow the budget to pieces year after year. It is bad enough to have the $2 billion added for fiscal year 1973, but it is worse to realize that when H.R. 10351 was debated earlier on the House floor, the minimum figure to fund the child development program when it becomes fully operational was thought to be $7 billion a year with a maximum of $20 billion a year.

A major argument advanced by proponents of these comprehensive child development services is that no services will be rendered free or gratis to those with an income over $4,320. But the fee schedule for those with income greater than this figure is graduated to a point where those who have a family income of $6,960 a year pay only $6.30 a week for a total annual cost of $315.

Obviously, this is only a small sharing of the cost and the greater part of the burden must be paid for by Federal appropriations. According to the conference report, this child development service is available to even those with incomes over $6,960. In such cases the personal contribution is to be set by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. Speaker, day care for working mothers trying to get off the welfare rolls is justified. Even reasonable tax credits for working mothers in lower middle-class income brackets should be approved by our Ways and Means Committee. But we are embarking upon an innovation which has never before been tried in America. When all else has been said the facts are, that at this time, we simply cannot afford to authorize the $7 billion called for by S. 2007.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, we will soon be voting on the conference report to S. 2007, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1971. I am pleased to support this legislation which includes two very important provisions essential for social progress, namely, the Legal Services Corporation and the child development programs.

The Legal Services Corporation is the new independent nonprofit corporation which would replace the present legal services program now under the Office of Economic Opportunity. This provision is very important in that it will remove legal services from the political arena and give it the independence so necessary for a program such as this. To assure adequate services for the poor it is most necessary to have unhampered legal advocacy.

The comprehensive child development program is another very important provision which authorizes $2 billion for fiscal year 1973 for child development programs and $100 million for fiscal year 1972 for planning of these programs. The bill envisions a comprehensive program for the care, nutrition, health, and educational enrichment of the child recognizing that the early years set and determine what a person will be later in life. Under the provisions of this bill, the disadvantaged and working mothers receive priority, which is only fitting since more women are working now than ever before.

I will vote "aye" on final passage.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I consider the comprehensive child development programs of the conference report of the bill S. 2007, the Economic Opportunities Amendments of 1971, to be among the most oppressive legislation and the greatest threat to individual freedom to come before this body during my 5 years as a Member. If enacted into law and implemented, these programs would undermine and lead to the deterioration and ultimate destruction of the family, locally controlled public school systems, and religious morals. It appears to me that the projected goal of these programs is a planned collectivist society similar to that of Soviet Russia, Red China, and the kibbutzim of Israel, and consequently the demise of individual freedoms secured to our people by the Bill of Rights.

If this Congress or the HEW bureaucrats were to come right out and proclaim that they were going to take America's children away from parents and home and put them all under Federal control, custody, and ownership, the parents of America would rise up in protest and indignation. So, what is bad must be disguised to appear good or at least economically beneficial in order to be sold to an unsuspecting citizenry.

President Nixon in his state of the Union address remarked that he desired to return power to the people at the local level to make those decisions which so greatly affect their lives. I concur with this view of our President and also agree with him when he stated:

> The idea that a bureaucratic elite in Washington knows best what is best for people everywhere and that you cannot trust local government is really a contention that you cannot trust people to govern themselves. This notion is completely foreign to the American experience. Local Government is the government closest to the people and it is most responsive to the individual person; it is people's government in a far more intimate way than the government in Washington can ever be.

Yet, the comprehensive child development programs would centralize power and control over the rearing and education of children in the hands of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In the conference report, section 578, stipulates that:

> No department, agency, officer, or employer of the United States shall, under authority of this title, exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or impose any requirements or conditions with respect to the personnel, curriculum, methods, of instruction, or administration of any educational institution.

Other sections of the act direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish standards and guidelines and authorize the Secretary to grant or withhold funds to local agencies on the basis of their compliance with such standards and guidelines.

Section 534(a) directs the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to "promulgate a common set of program standards which shall be applicable to all programs providing child development services with Federal assistance."

The many programs set forth in section 512 for which the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would authorize funding as well as prescribe standards and guidelines and empower the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to become a virtual czar over the lives of America's children. He would

set standards for specially designed health, social, and educational programs—including after school, summer, weekend, vacation, and overnight. The times indicated include 24 hours of every day in the year. Since some of the proponents of comprehensive child development programs have openly boasted that communal forms of child upbringing in Russia and the kibbutzim of Israel are superior to the traditional family way of this country, parents might expect—should this legislation be enacted and implemented—to visit their children occasionally on weekends.

Under the provisions of section 512, government bureaucrats would decide what food children will eat, what is to go into their minds, the psychological tests and experiments, sensitivity training, and even the drug treatment they should undergo.

The Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary would have the final determination as to the morals to be instilled in children. A study made by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare points out that a day-care center which ministers to a child from 6 months to 6 years of age has more than 8,000 hours to instill in the child values, beliefs, fears, behavior patterns, and can so mold the child as to affect his mind, personality and future potential.

The imparting of moral, spiritual, and social values to children should take place in the home assisted by the church and is the prime responsibility of parents, not politicians. The Constitution does not give the Federal Government such power, duty, or right. What moral, spiritual, and social values could the Federal Government espouse except political training to perpetuate the policies of its leaders?

The American government was established by and for the people, not the people by and for the government. I have been notified by several of my constituents and other Americans that they plan to protect their children from the bureaucrats of government—peacefully if possible, or by such other means as are necessary. They have informed me that the "Nation's" children really belong to their parents; that the government has no children; that the people own the government and not vice versa; and that the government is to work for the people and not the people for the government.

Jefferson stated it well when he said:

> The government is best which governs least.

So long as America adhered to the U.S. Constitution and the Holy Bible, America prospered. There was a minimum of government and a maximum of individual responsibility, free enterprise and freedom. Because people were free to lead their lives with a minimum of government interference, they were a creative and dynamic force, and their vitality made for a more just and orderly society. This is the system under which America prospered and became the leading nation in the world. Strong nations make weak people. Strong people make a great nation.

The child development programs would merge the political order with the social order, and the one order resulting would be the political. When the State totally controls society, we have a totalitarian form of government, which prescribes the standards society is expected to follow. The strength and energy of a nation flow from society to the state and not vice versa. The provisions of the child development programs as contained in S. 2007 if fully implemented would, I fear, eventually lead to a faceless robot society—it would foster a state humanistic secularistic religion thereby abrogating the traditional separation of church and state which has served to preserve freedom of religion.

The "child developers" who would diminish freedom, talk of the kind of citizens the state wants; whereas, if they desired to enhance freedom, they should be concerned with the kind of state the citizens want.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude my remarks with analytical comments on several other sections of the conference report of the bill S. 2007.

TITLE V—CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS, STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

Section 501(a) states that Congress finds that—

> Millions of children in the nation are suffering harm from the lack of adequate child development services.

As just one Member of the Congress, I have not found this to be true nor have I seen any evidence to support such wild irrationalization. Congress is not yet a court.

While section 501(a)(2) stipulates that the child development programs should be available to the children whose parents or legal guardians request them "regardless of economic, social, and family backgrounds," section 501(a)(3) indicates that priority must be given to economic and social need "pending the availability of such programs for all children." This leaves no doubt that the legislation intends that the programs include all children in the future. We can be sure that the Federal courts and HEW bureaucrats will find coercive measures to force participation so as to get the "correct" racial balance, socioeconomic mixture, and whatever other balance or mixture they deem necessary in changing diverse individualities into one uniform conglomeration.

Section 501(b) purports that it is the purpose of child development programs to "provide that decisions on the nature and funding of such programs be made at the community level with the full involvement of parents" when, in reality, the decision to fund and the authority to set standards and guidelines are given to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare by sections 511 and 512, respectively.

Section 501(b) states that:

> It is the purpose of the child development programs to recognize and build upon the success gained through the Headstart program.

There is abundant evidence to show that Headstart has been a failure, not a success. President Nixon stated on March 3, 1970:

> In our Headstart program where so much hope is invested, we find that youngsters enrolled only for the summer achieve almost no gains, and the gains of those in the program for a full year are soon matched by their non-Headstart classmates from similarly poor backgrounds. If Headstart were a success, why then the necessity for this radical new child development program?

PART A—COMPREHENSIVE CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Section 512(2)(G) provides that activities of a child development program may include activities such as, diagnosis and identification of mental and emotional barriers with appropriate treatment to overcome such barriers. What are mental and emotional barriers? Who decides, and how is it decided? What is "appropriate treatment" as applied to an emotional or mental barrier? A statement entitled "Mental Health and World Citizenship" which emanated from the International Conference on Mental Health held in London in 1948 stated that the family imposes their imprint early in the personality development of the children who then perpetuate the traditional pattern to which they have been molded, and it is these people "who present the immediate resistance to social, economic, and political changes". Are the mental and emotional barriers to overcome the traditional beliefs and religious teachings of the parents?

Section 512(2)(I) provides for activities to ameliorate identified handicaps. What kind of handicaps? Mental? Emotional? Physical? A statement prepared by the Wisconsin Association for Mental Health, "A Progress Report for the State of Wisconsin" states that an "emotionally disturbed child" cannot be isolated from the definition of the "retarded" or "physically handicapped" because all children at times appear to be disturbed. Thus, all children at some time are "emotionally handicapped." A recent article in the National Enquirer stated that an abnormally high ratio of emotionally handicapped children in Quebec was traceable to poverty, poor health standards and lack of child support programs. Welfare statistics showed that 360,000 children or 24 percent of the total needed special care for their handicaps, and of those, more than 41,000 children have been removed from their families and placed in institutions and foster homes.

Since a purpose of the legislation as stated in section 501(b) is to "provide every child with a fair and full opportunity to reach his full potential by establishing and expanding comprehensive child development programs" and since section 512(2)(O) authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide for "such other services and activities as the Secretary may deem appropriate in furtherance of the purposes," it is logical to conclude that children with "identified handicaps" could be taken from parents and placed in child development facilities designated by some bureaucrat. Or, perhaps, the parent is the "identified handicap" constituting the barrier to the child's emotion and mental well-being as determined by Federal standards.

Section 512(2)(L) provides for "in-home services and training in fundamentals of child development for parents. . . ." An article in Moscow News of

August 14–21, 1971, on preschool education in Russia states that nursery teachers "keep in contact with the parents and help them to bring up the children in a correct manner." The report of the Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children, page 75 states that in educational programs for children under 3 "Mothers would be taught the preferred ways of handling infants." In the report of the Education Commission of the States, June 1971, page 42, the value of home visits is given: "These children and parents needing special help because of physical and mental handicaps could be identified and provided the additional help required." Are parents to be trained as agents of the State? Dr. Edward Zigler, head of the Office of Child Development was quoted in the San Francisco Examiner February 10, 1971, as being "very apprehensive" about a nationwide network of child care centers as they were "a concept quite alien to the American ethos." That government controlled child care is indeed an alien concept apparently is no considered a deterrent, but a concept to be emulated.

CHILD ADVOCATE

Section 512(2)(M) calls for the use of child advocates.

At the White House Conference on Youth of 1970, which made numerous recommendations, some of which are reflected in the legislative proposals for child development programs, a forum chaired by Judge James J. Delaney of the Colorado Juvenile and Family Court provided these dates regarding a child advocate: First, the child advocate would be the day-to-day protector of children's rights in nearly all areas of child concern; second, the advocate would intervene when a child's "liberty or health are jeopardized, whenever he is deprived at home, schooling, medical care, property rights, entitlements or benefits, or is subjected to involuntary treatment." For example, if a child is severely beaten by parents, the advocate might step in to get medical attention. If a child is suspended or expelled from school, the advocate might negotiate with the school on his behalf. The child advocate would also secure legal services for children who are arrested. In short, the child advocate would supposedly protect the rights of children against those whom he considers to be abusive and unjust parents, teachers, and police officers.

The child advocate would "reach aggressively into the community, send workers out to children's homes, recreational facilities and schools, develop new services, contract for others and modify existing services agencies so that the range of needs discovered is matched by the range of services available. They would assume full responsibility for all education in the community as opposed to schooling—including pre-primary education, parent education, and community education."

The child advocates in reaching aggressively into the communities and sending social workers into children's homes to advise them of their needs should be aided by the recently issued Census Department "Block Statistics" which provide on every block of our major cities such data as age, number of negroes, number of occupants, number of homes, number of rooms, average number of persons per room, and the average cost of houses.

Section 512(2)(O) allows "such other services and activities as the Secretary deems appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of this part." This is a wide open, blank check grant of power—a Pandora's box. Anything goes.

PRIME SPONSORS OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT COUNCILS

Sections 513 and 514 establish that any State or local unit of government of a given size may be a "prime sponsor" of a child development program and that an application from a prime sponsor is required to be submitted to the Secretary and establish what the application must include. Among other requirements, an application must provide for the establishment of Child Development Councils. Members of CDC's are required to have a membership of at least one-third parents of children who are economically disadvantaged.

Section 514(b)(3) states that CDC's are responsible for planning, coordination, and monitoring child development programs. In general, language of the bill would lead one to believe that in any case, the CDC's have authority and control over child development plans and programs. Section 534(a) clarifies any misunderstanding. It clearly states that the Secretary shall "promulgate a common set of program standards which shall be applicable to all programs providing child development services with Federal assistance." This section puts to rest the belief that child development programs will be of local determination. To further the myth of local control, section 534(c) establishes a special committee on Federal standards for child development services. "Such committee shall participate in the development of Federal standards for child development services. Note that the Secretary will promulgate the standards—the special committee merely "participates."

COMPREHENSIVE CHILD DEVELOPMENT PLANS

Section 515 establishes the requirements for a comprehensive child development program which must include a career development plan and advancement on a career ladder; jobs for persons residing in communities served by such projects; enrollment to the extent feasible for children from a wide range of socioeconomic backgrounds. That establishment of child care facilities will bolster the economy by providing jobs for low income persons is often cited as one of the benefits of creating child care programs. Requiring a socioeconomic mix will assure busing.

Section 515(a)(16) requires the assurance that mechanisms have been developed "to provide continuity between programs for preschool and elementary school children." This requirement effectuates a statement in the Report of the Education Commission of the States, under a chapter titled "Objectives of a Public Early Childhood Program." Objective No. 5 states:

> One of the objectives of education before the age of six should be to foster changes in the public schools . . .

And on page 21:

> The public schools need broader definition of objectives. Intellectual objectives need to be expanded to include more emphasis on problem solving and general objectives need to be expanded beyond intellectual development to include the physical and mental health of children.

Here it would be appropriate to consider what is meant by "mental health." It should be realized that the concept of mental health as now used has little relationship to insanity; that mental health according to the United Nations definition is a "state of complete physical, mental and social well being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity." (World Health Organization Report, March 1948). A statement from "Mental Health and World Citizenship" cited above stated: "Principles of mental health cannot be successfully furthered in any society unless there is a progressive acceptance of the concept of world citizenship. World Citizenship can be widely extended among all peoples through the application of the principles of mental health.

PROJECT APPLICATIONS

Section 516(a)(11) provides that "no person will be denied employment in any program solely on the ground that he fails to meet State or local teacher certification standards." This constitutes an encroachment on the long-recognized right of the sovereign States to establish and require teacher certification standards.

PART B—TRAINING, TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, PLANNING, AND EVALUATION PRESERVICE AND INSERVICE TRAINING

Section 531 authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide financial assistance to enable individuals employed or preparing for employment in child development programs "including volunteers, to participate in programs of preservice or inservice training for professional and nonprofessional personnel, to be conducted by any agency carrying out a child development program, or any institution of higher education, including a community college, or by any combination thereof." Will it be the purpose of "inservice training" to change attitudes, values and beliefs utilizing sensitivity training techniques, by whatever name? Will the participants be advised of the nature of the training?

Section 532 directs the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to "make technical assistance available to prime sponsors and to project applicants participating or seeking to participate in programs assisted under this title on a continuing basis to assist them in planning, developing, and carrying out child development programs." This means, in effect, in cases where the local sponsors do not have the "know-how" to draft an application for a Federal grant the way the HEW bureaucrats want the application drafted, that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare can have some of his planners draw up the appli-

cation or can contract this task out to some other agency. This is just another assurance that HEW—not the people at the local level—will control the program.

DEVELOPMENT OF UNIFORM MINIMUM CODE FOR FACILITIES

Section 535 directs the Secretary to appoint a special committee to consist of parents and children in development programs, State and local licensing agencies, public health officials, fire prevention officials, construction unions, etc., to develop a uniform minimum code for child development facilities, to which all child development facilities, both public and private, new and old, shall conform. This section neatly provides a scheme for political maneuvers—something for everybody, not just the children.

Section 535(d) provides that the Secretary must approve the code and such standards shall be applicable to all facilities receiving Federal assistance. "The Secretary shall urge their adoption by States and local governments." What is the necessity for the States and local governments to go through the formality of adopting the standards when Federal dictates have decreed they shall be applicable to all facilities using Federal assistance? This is a perfect example of the sham of "participatory democracy" at work, or the theory of "citizen participation," better known as "decentralized administration of centralized authority."

PART C—FACILITIES FOR CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR CHILD DEVELOPMENT FACILITIES

This title, under section 541(g)(1) establishes that "The Secretary shall have the same function powers and duties . . . as the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development", thereby creating yet another expensive bureaucracy. Section 541(h)(1) creates a Child Development Facility Insurance Fund, and section 541(h)(5) authorizes initial capital for the fund and "to assure the soundness of such fund thereafter, such sums may be necessary." This is an assurance that the fund need not pay its own way, or in any way, shall accountability be required.

PART D—FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Section 546 authorizes the Secretary to make grants for child development programs for children of employees of the Federal Government. Section 547(a) provides that not more than 80 percent of the total cost of programs shall be paid from Federal funds. Section 547(b) provides that the non-Federal share may be provided through public or private funds "and employer contributions." Remember, this part pertains to children of employees of the Federal Government.

PART E—RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION COORDINATION OF RESEARCH

Section 553 assures the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare total control of all research and training efforts. And as assurance of dissemination of Federal directives, section 553(c) establishes a Child Development Research Council represented by Federal educational and health agencies, "to assure coordination of child development and related activities under their respective jurisdictions and to carry out the provisions of this part."

PART F—GENERAL PROVISIONS DEFINITIONS

Section 571(9) and (10) respectively define "parent" as "any person who has day-to-day parental responsibility for any child and "single parent" as "any person who has sole day-to-day responsibility for any child." Is the parent the worker in the child development facility? These definitions are intended to include adults in the so-called communal and homosexual families as stated in the White House Conference on Children Report.

SPECIAL PROVISIONS

Section 574(d) stipulates that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall not provide financial assistance for any program under this title which involves political activities. There is a similar provision with respect to the OEO, yet the OEO in repeated flagrant violations of the provision engages in political activities, and no action is taken by the executive branch of the Government to stop such practices or to castigate the irresponsible OEO officials.

FEDERAL CONTROL NOT AUTHORIZED

It should be noted that this part does not say "Federal control prohibited." It says: "Federal control not authorized." There is a difference. Section 578 states that no department, agency, and so forth, of the United States shall "exercise any direction, supervision or control over or impose any requirements or conditions with respect to the personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction or administration of any educational institution." How does this statement apply to child development facilities? While education is a part of early childhood programs, the supposed goal is total development of the child. Since this section applies to "educational institutions" and not to "child development facilities," what is the scope of Federal control over child development facilities? Section 571(7) differentiates in designating "schools" and "child development facilities," so it must be assumed that the Federal Government does recognize a difference.

Mr. Speaker, the child development programs constitute a serious threat to the liberties of our people. No provision of the Constitution authorizes the Federal Government to undertake the functions of parent replacement by providing child advocates, establishing child development facilities and carrying on the many other related functions. If the people at the State or local level decide they want the Government to act as parent and the taxpayers want to pay the bill, then let it be done in accordance with the wishes of the people as provided in their State and local constitutions and laws.

The child development programs would involve a fantastic cost which this country is in no financial condition to bear. For the purpose of carrying out the programs, $100,000,000 is required for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972 with $2 billion for the ensuing fiscal year. It has been conservatively estimated that the amount would soar to $20 billion within a few years.

The child development programs would weaken individual liberty, pride, and responsibility by denying that precious feeling of accomplishment and well-being which results from achieving something on one's own against odds—the basis of true mental health. The end result of such threatened programs can only be more regimentation of our lives by bureaucratic planners.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the acceptance of this conference report on S. 2007.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on S. 2007 contains three separate provisions, the OEO bill for 1971, the Early Childhood Development Act, and the Legal Services Corporation Act. I have been a strong supporter of the first provision, and an author of the latter two. Therefore it is with great regret that I feel obliged to vote against S. 2007.

The OEO section is flawed by provisions restricting local determination on how funds should be spent, and by restrictions on transfers of functions. We have been phony in insisting that community action groups be given autonomy in their own operations. We have given "lipservice" to "neighborhood control."

But what the right hand giveth the left taketh away. In the final analysis, Congress has not trusted the community action groups. The programs must be administered in exactly the proportions Congress determines, no matter what the local needs. If your area wants day care and the day-care money is gone, forget it. Let them have a nice drug program, even if they do not want it.

But even after these "Papa knows best" restrictions had been demanded by the Senate, and acceded to by our House managers, I still support the OEO portion of this bill.

This Legal Services Corporation bill, which I was proud to sponsor, has, miraculously, been improved in the conference committee. It will be an enormous improvement over the present scattered systems of legal services to the poor.

It will provide controlled, uniform legal services where needed and will answer valid criticisms concerning previous lack of controls, and uneven distribution of services.

The final portion of S. 2007 is the Early Childhood Development Act—or the day care bill, as many have described it. I was a proud sponsor of legislation similar to that which passed the House and supported the House version.

However, in reading the conference report, I found that in the over 100 differences between the House and Senate versions, our House managers have conceded to the Senate in two out of three. Many of the differences were minor. But with a success ratio of only one-third, our managers can hardly describe S. 2007 as the same kind of animal on which we voted earlier this fall.

My original bill contemplated uniform national implementation of childhood

development programs through stimulation of State planning. States are not exactly ignored in this version, but I do believe that they have been assigned a minor role. Under this bill, it is evident that the planning districts in my own State will be ignored and that any State coordination is, at best, unlikely and, at worst, impossible.

On this point, and others, I would like to say for the RECORD that no one can put words into a bill that are not there. Colloquies on the floor of this House, or the other body, have been merchandized as establishing "Legislative History" or "Legislative Intent." The colloquies I have seen, or heard, with respect to the role of the States, the authority of the Secretary, the coordination of programs, are merely wishful thinking. I urge my colleagues to look to the bill, itself, rather than the approving managers' descriptions thereof.

The fatal flaws in the childhood development section stem from Senate amendments which reduce size of population level for prime sponsorship to 5,000 people. This, of course, means that literally hundreds of uncoordinated programs are possible in each State. Small prime sponsor units will have to look to HEW for advice, counsel, and expertise. Coordination will be national only, and will, based on the HEW trade record be disastrous.

The worst of it is that to give local people control of programs did not require giving them prime sponsorship. Prime sponsorship could have been retained by larger units; States, planning areas; counties; large cities; or metropolitan areas. Smaller local units could still have operated and managed programs. Now we can expect a proliferation of competitive programs—a situation analogous to the proliferation of political subdivisions around a central city core.

The 5,000 population limitation gives us a sorry kind of federalism—a weird combination of typical Washington centralism and law of the jungle. The middle level coordination was, sadly, eliminated.

The Secretary's powers of approval of prime sponsors are clear, but his discretion is clearly limited. The "shall's" and "may's" in the bill are clear signals that he cannot disapprove localities—or combinations or others—applications if they fit the criteria, even if they may not be the best plans for the total area. In my area for instance, qualified groups could be designated—would have to be designated—even though our county has a proper vehicle for prime sponsorship for the area and has done the preliminary planning for it.

This provision means that a competitive race between prime sponsors is a likely result, rather than a careful, coordinated plan for development of day care.

After careful reading of the bill, I am convinced that, while some childhood development and day care will occur under it, it pretty well assures that reasonable development and care cannot occur. This area is too important to waste our money and, more significantly, our human resources on a poor plan.

My own brief experience in Washington reveals an unvarying pattern of congressional inability to correct or replace Federal programs once they have been started. These programs create their own constituencies with insatiable demands for services. Parallel programs can be created, but old ones never die.

I have received many letters in support of this bill, and very few opposed to it. Nevertheless, almost all of the supporters do so in concept, rather than detail. I, too, support the concept, but someone has to look at the detail, or the result will be the repeat of a false promise. If, indeed, the program can work at all, it will likely suffer in appropriations, because of the lack of confidence in it.

On balance, Mr. Speaker, I find this area of need too important for me to vote for a program which will not work well, if at all. Therefore, I must oppose despite my liking for other portions of S. 2007 and my support of the childhood development concept. With my negative vote goes my pledge for assistance in the search for reasonable workable programs as soon as possible.

Mr. McKAY. Mr. Speaker, I support the conference report on the OEO amendments, but I do so with some misgivings. I share the concern of many of you about the administration of the child development program, particularly the provision allowing any community with a population above 5,000 to be a prime sponsor. By thus bypassing the State government we not only weaken further the capacity of the State to respond to social problems, we also leave responsibility with agencies of local government which—at least in Utah—do not have the administrative machinery to deal with them.

I recognize that some States have failed to respond when given the primary role in various programs, but that is not an adequate reason to penalize those States which have and will act responsibly. As Governor Rampton points out in his letter to me—which I am including for publication with this statement—it would be a simple matter to write legislation which would provide for alternate administrative action if any State failed adequately to respond.

Additionally, I am concerned that the child development program not become a State subsidized nursery school program.

I am delighted to think that some families, under the provisions of this act, may be able to earn their own way more adequately while having assurance that their young children are receiving the basic medical, nutritional, and psychological care. On the other hand, early parental relationships are extremely critical and must be tampered with only with the greatest of caution.

I am merely suggesting that when this aspect of the bill is funded and administered, all involved must do all they can to see that American families are strengthened—not weakened—by this legislation.

I also share certain misgivings about the political purposes for which some funds may have been used by groups in a few States. We are pleased in Utah that the money which has come in through the OEO has in large measure reached the people for whom it was intended without causing the political problems which have developed elsewhere. I believe the same results could be obtained throughout the program by instituting administrative controls. Killing the program would be, in my opinion, unnecessarily drastic action, and would cause hardship for the people of my State who are finding the various OEO programs valuable in their lives.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I am also satisfied that the OEO programs will receive critical scrutiny during the appropriations process, and any expenditures which are not in the national interest will be curtailed. I have great confidence in Mr. FLOOD and his subcommittee and in the appropriations process generally.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that my reservations and those others stated here today will be heeded in future OEO amendments. Under the circumstances we face today in considering this conference report I cannot, on balance, vote to kill programs on which so many depend because of my dissatisfaction with certain portions of the report.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that a letter from the Honorable Calvin L. Rampton, Governor of Utah, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Salt Lake City, Utah, October 5, 1971.

Representative K. GUNN MCKAY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GUNN: I am concerned about two bills currently pending before the Congress having to do with comprehensive child development. Each of these bills would make substantial grants available for the general purpose of the act. I am in concurrence with the objective, but greatly disturbed about the administration proposals contained in the act.

These bills are HR 6748 and S 2007. The House bill provides for partially by-passing the states by giving cities over 100,000 in population priority over the states as prime sponsor to administer child development programs for that city, while the Senate bill would make a similar provision for cities over 25,000 population.

Under the laws of the state of Utah the cities have no facilities, and in fact no authority, to carry on programs of this type. It is true that cities of first and second class have their own school districts, but these school districts have no connection with city government but rather have their liaison with the State Department of Education. Various school districts in the state, under the general supervision of the state office of education have been doing substantial work on pilot projects for early childhood education and development. To circumvent the state school office and go directly to the cities would lead to confusion and great waste of public monies.

I would, therefore, like to ask that you support proposals to make the state the prime sponsor of the project, providing for cities to be secondary sponsors if the state did not act within a reasonable time, say 90 days. If this is done, it would be my intention to designate the state Office of Education which, as you know, is under the juris-

diction of an elected school board, as the single state agency to administer the project.

I will deeply appreciate your help on this matter.

Sincerely,

CALVIN L. RAMPTON, *Governor*.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, as one who believes deeply in the need for early child development legislation, it is with regret that I must vote against the conference report on S. 2007, the Economic Opportunity Amendment of 1971. For a number of reasons, however, I find unacceptable both the child development legislation and certain changes in the basic concept of the Economic Opportunity Act.

The child development legislation before the House in my judgment provides an unworkable distribution system. Our States are bypassed by this legislation despite the fact that many States today are developing comprehensive plans which should be coordinated with any Federal effort. As prime sponsors, the need is for cities large enough to have the capacity to adequately plan to implement the program. Communities without the needed resources are made prime sponsors which can only raise expectations that are bound to be frustrated.

The thousands of potential program grantees present an administrative nightmare. Proper administration as well as oversight by the Congress is as important in such a serious piece of legislation as child development as in any area I can think of. As structured, however, it would be nearly impossible for Congress to oversee.

The measure also contains changes which I cannot accept in the concept of our basic poverty law concerning the prohibition against delegation and the earmarking of program funds. The prohibition against delegation was not in the House passed version and violates the concept of OEO as an innovating, experimenting agency, an incubator, if you will. Programs responding to a social need that are proven worthwhile become structured in more permanent line agencies leaving OEO free to break new ground. To prohibit delegation clearly tends to make OEO a permanent line agency itself.

The earmarking of program funds, also a Senate contribution, can only effectively limit local authority to establish its own priorities. Earmarking funds and not permitting discretion according to local needs moves decisions away from localities where needs are best known.

The need particularly for early child development legislation is clear but the vehicle of fulfillment is a different matter. The legislation before us has too many faults. We have had ample historic experience with the difficulties in changing a program once it is enacted to know the problems of embarking on the wrong course.

The Congress has the obligation and the opportunity to develop legislation which will provide a sound workable administrative system of child development and should give it a high priority.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 211, nays 187, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 438]

YEAS—211

Abourezk
Abzug
Adams
Addabbo
Alexander
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashley
Aspin
Aspinall
Badillo
Barrett
Begich
Bell
Bergland
Biaggi
Biester
Bingham
Blanton
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brasco
Brooks
Burke, Mass.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Byron
Carey, N.Y.
Carney
Celler
Chisholm
Clark
Clay
Conte
Conyers
Corman
Cotter
Coughlin
Culver
Curlin
Daniels, N.J.
Danielson
Davis, S.C.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellums
Denholm
Dent
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Drinan
Dulski
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Esch
Evans, Colo.
Fascell
Flood
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gaydos
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Grasso
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gude
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Harrington
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Heinz
Helstoski
Hicks, Mass.
Hicks, Wash.
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Hungate
Jacobs
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Koch
Kyros
Leggett
Link
Long, Md.
McCloskey
McCormack
McCulloch
McDade
McFall
McKay
McKinney
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
Madden
Mathis, Ga.
Matsunaga
Mazzoli
Meeds
Melcher
Mikva
Miller, Calif.
Minish
Mink
Mitchell
Mollohan
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
O'Konski
O'Neill
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Peyser
Pickle
Podell
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Pryor, Ark.
Rangel
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Riegle
Rodino
Roe
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roush
Roy
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
Sarbanes
Scheuer
Seiberling
Shipley
Shriver
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Staggers
Stanton, James V.
Steed
Steele
Stephens
Stokes
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waldie
Wampler
Whalen
Widnall
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Yates
Yatron
Young, Tex.
Zablocki

NAYS—187

Abernethy
Anderson, Ill.
Archer
Arends
Ashbrook
Baker
Baring
Bennett
Betts
Bevill
Blackburn
Bow
Bray
Brinkley
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burleson, Tex.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Caffery
Camp
Carter
Casey, Tex.
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chappell
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Collins, Tex.
Colmer
Conable
Crane
Daniel, Va.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dellenback
Dennis
Devine
Dickinson
Downing
Duncan
du Pont
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Eshleman
Findley
Fish
Fisher
Flowers
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Forsythe
Frelinghuysen
Frenzel
Frey
Gettys
Giaimo
Goldwater
Goodling
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Hammerschmidt
Hansen, Idaho
Harsha
Harvey
Hastings
Hébert
Henderson
Hillis
Hogan
Hull
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Tenn.
Keating
Kee
Keith
Kemp
King
Kuykendall
Kyl
Landgrebe
Latta
Lennon
Lent
Lloyd
Long, La.
Lujan
McCollister
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
Mahon
Mailliard
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mayne
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Mills, Md.
Minshall
Mizell
Montgomery
Myers
Nelsen
Nichols
Passman
Pelly
Pettis
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Price, Tex.
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Rarick
Rhodes
Roberts
Robinson, Va.
Robison, N.Y.
Rogers
Rousselot
Runnels
Ruppe
Ruth
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Scherle
Schmitz
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Scott
Sebelius
Shoup
Sikes
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Snyder
Stanton, J. William
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Symington
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Terry
Thompson, Ga.
Thone
Vander Jagt
Veysey
Waggonner
Ware
Whalley
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Williams
Winn
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Young, Fla.
Zion
Zwach

NOT VOTING—33

Abbitt
Andrews, Ala.
Annunzio
Belcher
Blatnik
Broyhill, N.C.
Collins, Ill.
Derwinski
Dowdy
Edwards, La.
Evins, Tenn.
Fountain
Galifianakis
Howard
Kluczynski
Landrum
McClory
McClure
McKevitt
Mann
Metcalfe
Mills, Ark.
Murphy, Ill.
Powell
Pucinski
Purcell
Rostenkowski
Sisk
Spence
Springer
Sullivan
Wiggins
Wilson, Bob

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Annunzio for, with Mr. Mann against.

Mr. Blatnik for, with Mr. Dowdy against.

Mr. Howard for, with Mr. Abbitt against.

Mr. Rostenkowski for, with Mr. Andrews of Alabama against.

Mrs. Sullivan for, with Mr. Landrum against.

Mr. Sisk for, with Mr. McClory against.

Mr. Kluczynski for, with Mr. McKevitt against.

Mr. Murphy of Illinois for, with Mr. Spence against.

Mr. Collins of Illinois for, with Mr. McClure against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Metcalfe with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Belcher.

Mr. Purcell with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Springer.

Mr. Wiggins with Mr. Bob Wilson.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington and Mr. HICKS of Washington changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. SYMINGTON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks in the body of the RECORD on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on December 2, 1971, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1836. An act for the relief of Ruth V. Hawley, Marvin E. Krell, Alaine E. Benic, and Gerald L. Thayer;

H.R. 1867. An act for the relief of Bernadette Han Brundage;

H.R. 1899. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria G. Orsini (nee Mari);

H.R. 1931. An act for the relief of Jesus Manuel Cabral;

H.R. 1962. An act for the relief of Dah Mi Kim;

H.R. 1970. An act for the relief of Mrs. Andree Simone Van Moppes and her son, Alain Van Moppes;

H.R. 2087. An act for the relief of Park Ok Soo and Noh Mi Ok;

H.R. 2107. An act for the relief of Jose Bettencourt de Simas;

H.R. 2108. An act for the relief of Nemesio Gomez-Sanchez;

H.R. 2408. An act for the relief of Louis A. Gerbert;

H.R. 2706. An act for the relief of Miguelito Ybut Benedicto;

H.R. 2803. An act for the relief of In Kyong Yi;

H.R. 2814. An act for the relief of Rea Republica Ramos;

H.R. 3041. An act for the relief of Mary James Kates, owner of the Gladewater Daily Mirror;

H.R. 3082. An act for the relief of Ronnie B. (Malit) Morris and Henry B. (Malit) Morris;

H.R. 3383. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mauricia A. Buensalido and her minor children, Raymond A. Buensalido and Jacqueline A. Buensalido;

H.R. 3425. An act for the relief of Helen Tziminadis;

H.R. 3475. An act for the relief of Paul Anthony Kelly;

H.R. 5422. An act for the relief of The American Journal of Nursing;

H.R. 7085. An act for the relief of Eugene M. Sims, Sr.;

H.R. 8356. An act to make permanent the authority to pay special allowances to dependents of members of the uniformed services to offset expenses incident to their evacuation;

H.R. 10203. An act to amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1964, to increase the authorization for water resources research institutes, and for other purposes.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 29, CAPITOL REEF NATIONAL PARK, UTAH

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 29) to establish the Capitol Reef National Park in the State of Utah, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do so because this is a conference report which may be agreed to without any particular discussion.

Are all amendments germane to the bill?

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

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to assure my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, that all amendments are germane. Agreement on the conference report was arrived at in conference. We changed the language in some instances, but there is germaneness all the way through the conference report.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I merely wanted to go on record as saying that I am afraid that in adopting this conference report and the action that has been taken by the committee, we are setting a very bad precedent. You will notice the following language in section 5(b) of the report:

> (b) The Secretary shall grant easements and rights-of-way on a nondiscriminatory basis upon, over, under, across, or along any component of the park area unless he finds that the route of such easements and rights-of-way would have significant adverse effects on the administration of the park.

This is the first time since 1916 we have put that kind of reservation into a national park bill. We have put such reservations into bills relating to national monuments and recreation area bills, but we have never before put that language in a national park bill.

In 1916, when the National Park Act was established, one of the very purposes of the act was stated to be that we would—

> Provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.

This is the first time our committee has violated that rule since 1916. For that reason I did not sign the conference report. If the people of Utah want to have power lines run across the park, then they should not have asked for a national park in their State; instead, they should have asked for a national monument. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 11955 UNTIL MIDNIGHT TOMORROW

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 11955, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the distinguished gentleman from Texas if the conferees from the two bodies of the Congress have completed their work and are indeed ready to file a report.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will yield, the conferees met earlier today and plan to meet again later in the afternoon. We think there is a good possibility that we may conclude consideration today and thus be able to file a report tonight. I have asked unanimous consent that we may have until midnight tomorrow to file a conference report in view of the desire to expedite the conclusion of the appropriations business.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, there is no indication that this body will not be in session tomorrow, is there?

Mr. MAHON. No.

Mr. HALL. Then, unless the committee has completed its work, I am constrained to object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read the statement of the managers.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of November 30, 1971.)

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker the report recommended by the conference committee on S. 29—a bill establishing the Capitol Reef National Park in the State of Utah—differs in only two respects from the legislation which the House approved.

First, both houses had approved provisions dealing with the trailing of cattle and sheep through the park. The conferees accepted compromise language. The House language permitted the Secretary to designate the trailways and establish reasonable regulations for their use. The Senate language provided for the trailing of cattle and sheep through the park. The conference committee recommends a modification of the House language to assure the recognition of "traditional trailways," but it still permits the Secretary to establish reasonable regulations for their use.

Second, both bills included provisions dealing with easements across this elongated park. The compromise language recommended provided that easement shall be granted by the Secretary unless he finds that the routes of such easements would have significant adverse effects on the administration of the park.

There is no question about the importance of making some allowance for easements because this park area stretches as a narrow strip running

about 90 miles through two counties. It would be unwarranted to prohibit crossings altogether, but the Secretary should have some control over where they shall be made. The compromise language protects that authority.

Mr. Speaker, there were five other areas of difference between the House bill and the bill approved by the other body. These differences dealt with: limitations on the continuation of grazing within the park; development of the park; wilderness study; and limitations on the amount authorized to be appropriated for land acquisition and development.

In each of these five cases, the Senate conferees accepted the House language.

This briefly explains the conference report on this legislation. I support it and recommend its approval.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Conference report on this legislation establishing a new national park in the State of Utah. While this is not my legislation and it is sponsored by my colleague, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. McKAY) I was a member of the conference committee, and I would like to direct my remarks to the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) who suggested that we would be establishing a precedent in this national park legislation by granting a possible easement, for carrying electric power across the park. I know too the great Chairman of the full committee has expressed his own apprehensions regarding the precedent, if it is such, that we may be setting.

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

Mr. LLOYD. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, this, in fact, does not establish a precedent. We have two other precedents, one which has to do with the C. & O. in a parkway, and the other having to do with the Gulf Islands National Park and Seashore. The only reason for taking this procedure was to make possible the service of the area concerned, to transfer the power from the rather sparsely populated areas—in fact, there is very little population—to places of population or centers of population in the State of Utah. This is the only way it could be done, and I wish to assure my colleagues in the House that whatever facilities are used for this purpose, they will be used in conformity with the area which is concerned, and that there will be no ugliness whatsoever.

Mr. LLOYD. I thank my chairman for that explanation of the proposition which was presented by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR).

May I also explain to my colleagues of the House that this new national park, which is the fifth national park to be established in Utah, has been supported not only by the people of Utah—actually, there has been considerable controversy over the years—but perhaps even more by people throughout the continental United States who wish to preserve this particular area as a national park.

It extends along a unique geologic formation some 75 miles, from 2 to 12 miles wide, a very narrow corridor running from north to south until it reaches Glen Canyon Recreation Area, which surrounds Lake Powell on the Colorado River. As a consequence, the wheeling of power or other types of utilities across our State will be rendered impossible unless this easement is granted. Otherwise it would be required that these lines go northward for some 75 miles and then back southward for another 75 miles, for a 150-mile round trip.

That is not the only problem involved. This particular park includes great expanses of desert land, whereas any alternative route around the park would mean the power would have to be transported through beautiful forest lands in the Fish Lake National Forest.

So, from the standpoint of environmental impact it would be much more harmful to direct this route through the mountains and forests of the Fish Lake National Forest, than to use a desert area of this long, narrow park as a crossing point.

Since this particular park, the boundaries of which are designed to surround the geologic formation, encompass great expanses of desert land it would appear more protective of the environment to transport power over a desert area rather than through the beautiful areas of forest land, particularly inasmuch as the chairman of the full committee has pointed out that this does not in fact establish the new precedent, feared by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. It is certainly in the public interest and in the interests of environmental quality to accept this reasonable and practical compromise language which was adopted by the conferees.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation now comes as the culmination of efforts and negotiations over many years. It represents the consensus and best judgment of all those who have worked closest to the issue.

I am happy to recommend this new proposed national park to my colleagues in this House.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. McKAY).

Mr. McKAY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues on the committee, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR), and also the remarks of my associate from Utah (Mr. LLOYD). I concur in all he has had to say.

It has taken a long time to bring this agreement about. I commend the gentlemen for their efforts not only on this bill but also on the conference report, which I urge the adoption of.

I have advocated the creation of a national park from Capitol Reef National Monument for a long time. A substantial majority of the people of Utah share this view. I have explained to the Interior Committee and on the floor of the House the reasons why our people advocate this measure. Our desire for a national park in this area springs from our deep affection for the land and our sincere and continuing desire for the preservation of the natural beauty and archeological significance of the area. I know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania and his friends share our love for this land, and I know that they are interested as we are in avoiding any efforts to despoil or exploit this area. I should like to point out, however, that people of Utah must continue to live in the areas adjoining this park. To do that, they will need access to utilities. I should like to point out that Capitol Reef National Monument, together with the Glen Canyon Recreation Area which it adjoins, together extend lengthwise for over 120 miles from the southern boundary of the State of Utah, thus dividing the southern half of our State in two parts. Under these circumstances, it is imperative, for the livelihood of the people in southern Utah that utilities cross Capitol Reef.

Certainly it is possible to grant utility easements which will not detract from the scenic beauty and the value of Capitol Reef as a national park. Indeed, although 120 miles long, the park would be only 1 mile wide in some areas. The conference report provides adequate machinery for the Secretary of the Interior to assure the locations of easements in places consistent with the act. For the conference report to be defeated because of a disagreement over technical language would be a serious disservice to the Capitol Reef area for it would leave this land, which all of us agree is so valuable for scenic and historic purposes, without the protection afforded by national park status. I would hope that those who are as fond of this area as are the people of Utah would vote for the conference report. I also assure this House that I am reporting accurately the view of the Utahans who must live within the proximity of this park. I hope the conference report will be adopted so that after 10 years of effort this park might be a reality.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 12067, FOREIGN ASSISTANCE APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 727 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 727

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution, notwithstanding any rule of the House to the contrary, it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12067) making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks I will yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, House Resolution 727, provides for the waiving

of points of order against the consideration of H.R. 12067 and the waiving of points of order against the provisions of the bill. The 3-day rule is also waived, because the bill was not reported until December 6 and a general waiver of points of order was provided because the authorization bill has not been enacted. Title II and practically every item in Title I of the bill would be subject to a point of order because of the lack of authorization.

Appropriations provided in this bill are less than those that would be provided in a continuing appropriation. The Appropriations Committee in its wisdom has reported this bill. I urge adoption of the bill.

I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the remarks made by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL).

I did not anticipate we would take this rule up today, but the bill will not be up until tomorrow.

There is a 35 percent cut in the request. This is probably the lowest foreign aid bill we have had in years, and although I do not intend to support it, I think the Members have a right to hear the measure and decide whether they will vote for or against it.

Accordingly, I approve of the rule and urge its adoption.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I suppose the Rules Committee has no alternative but to approve this rule, if it is to make any progress toward adjournment, and what I have to say has been said before. But it seems to me that this session of the House has resulted in more travesties on the normal and regular process of legislating than any session I have been in for a long, long time. Here again is a travesty upon the regular procedures of the House.

All points of order against the bill are waived. I do not know what is in the bill precisely, but whatever may be in the bill it will be impossible to get at it with a point of order.

I do not know how to protest any more vigorously than I have this sort of procedure. I do not attribute the blame to the Committee on Rules, because apparently there is no other way to handle it in order to get the legislation out of the way, but it is certainly an indictment of foot-dragging and the programing of legislation.

I hope to live long enough to see orderly procedure restored and adopted as a way of life in the House of Representatives. We used to have with at least some degree of regular procedure, but apparently that has gone where the woodbine twineth.

Mr. SMITH of California. I do not know, frankly, what else we can do in this instance. The continuing resolution would actually cost more money than this particular bill.

I think the gentleman from Louisiana has done very well. I think the House is entitled to hear the matter, and accordingly I am supporting House Joint Resolution 727, although, as I say, I do not intend to support the legislation.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA).

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to comment on the rule. I know there was great urgency about this matter, but it seems to me to be the better practice to do what the Rules Committee has done in the recent past; that is when it grants waivers of points of order against a bill it specifies the provisions of the rules upon which points of order are waived rather than granting a general waiver of all points of order.

I would like to ask the gentleman from California to comment on that.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SMITH of California. That is the procedure which we have tried to follow for many, many months, but I will say to the gentleman that in all honesty there are some 12 different sections of this bill which in my opinion are subject to a point of order.

The gentleman knows what happened in the other body. The other body passed out two bills and this body passed out one authorization bill which presented a unique problem in going to conference. The Committee on Rules did not have the time to sit down and write a long, lengthy rule waiving specific points of order.

However, there is one little section in this bill which is very interesting and I am sure the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN) can explain it far more in detail than I can. The gentleman from Louisiana did a very fine job in his presentation before the Rules Committee. Under the circumstances I do not know how we could have done otherwise in this instance in granting a rule.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. The House is not in order.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the House is still not in order.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I still insist on the point of order that the House is not in order.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Michigan please stand at the mike and take the floor.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Iowa's insistence upon orderly procedure, the subject to which I have been addressing my remarks. I am glad the gentleman agrees.

The situation of the gentleman from California and his colleagues is an understandable one. However, I wish to express my interest in seeing that these extraordinary proceedings, when they are resorted to, are limited as much as possible. I am sure that the Rules Committee would have preferred it that way if there had been more time.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN).

ALLOCATION OF TIME FOR GENERAL DEBATE ON H.R. 12067, FOREIGN ASSISTANCE APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill (H.R. 12067) making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes, be limited to not to exceed 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SHRIVER) and myself.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate the fact that I believe the explanation given by the gentleman from California was the correct one. We appreciate the criticism of the gentleman from Michigan, but under the circumstances we believe this is the best rule we could have brought out.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE 1970 ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92–181)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I herewith transmit the 1970 Annual Report of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation. This report has been prepared in accordance with Section 10(a) of Public Law 83–358, as amended, and covers the period January 1, 1970 through December 31, 1970.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 7, 1971.*

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. tomorrow.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I presume that inasmuch as the unanimous-consent requests have been entertained, that apparently we are not going to bring up the economic stabilization bill or the agricultural strategic reserve bill today, as scheduled; and that we are about ready to adjourn, before 3:30 this afternoon. What would be the purpose of adjourning on such short notice today and coming in early tomorrow morning?

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'NEILL. We have not as yet received a rule on the economic stabilization bill. We anticipate that there will be a rule tomorrow.

We have remaining at the present time the farm bill which we expect to bring up tomorrow and take up the rule and bring it up under general debate.

For the rest of the week there will be the tax conference report which the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) will bring up.

There will be the economic stabilization bill which we hope to bring up Thursday and finish it either on Thursday or Friday. There will be various conference committee reports.

There is still a glimmer of hope that we can finally get out of here and we are in a final drive, and this would help to expedite matters if we could get in this week for the remaining days at 11 o'clock. I think the Speaker feels it is the will of the entire body to continue that drive and that is why we have made the request.

Mr. HALL. I have the highest respect for the gentleman's request and I am not wanting to treat it in an obstructive manner or anything like it, if I could be assured that we are in a true drive on the part of the leadership even to the point where if it is necessary we would pass an adjournment resolution, and leave it with the other body and go on off about our business, including Christmas, as we have done historically in the past, upon completion of our business.

I would certainly never think of objecting to a unanimous-consent request like this, if I could even be reasonably assured that we would bring the economic stabilization bill up, or the one we had the colloquy with the gentleman from Texas earlier today—supplemental appropriation—on Thursday and complete it by Thursday night.

Then, if these conference reports are in and we are ready for action—and complete action—on them and adjourn sine die, even by Saturday night, I would do everything in my power to aid and abet the leadership in their efforts to adjourn.

Is there any assurance that the gentleman can give us?

Mr. O'NEILL. With regard to the question of a continuing resolution, I do not know what the situation on the other side is at the present time. But I can, I believe, give you the assurance that the Economic Stabilization Act will be up Thursday and, if we do not complete it on Thursday, we will complete it on Friday.

I can say truthfully that there is a drive on to get the Members back to their districts.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As I understand the program, if we come in at 11 o'clock tomorrow, the first order of business will be the foreign aid appropriation bill.

The second order of business will be the agricultural bill.

On Thursday, we would have the tax bill conference report and then we would start on Thursday, following that, on the Economic Expansion Act. If we do not finish it on Thursday, we would then conclude it on Friday by 4 o'clock. In the interim, there will be several conference reports.

Is that a fair summary of what the anticipated program is?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I will simply say under the reservation of objection, I see no earthly reason why we could not, and in the interest of the citizens should not, adjourn this Congress sine die by Friday evening even if we have to come in early and work late hours on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday in order to accomplish that.

I understand there is a tendency in this direction on the part of the other body, at least some of the "Representatives of the States" in that body, are holding their feet to the fire in order to try to accomplish this. Perhaps one or two dangle us all on the thin thread of their pets or foibles. Certainly with a little interface and with a little bit of cooperation and under the direction of dynamic and inspired leadership. I believe we could force the first session of the 92d Congress into adjournment. I am prone to agree with the unanimous-consent request, if I could just get more of a blessed assurance—would you give me more assurance on behalf of the leadership including the Speaker himself and the distinguished majority leader toward this end? Is there anything wrong with this program, I will ask the distnguished gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. BOGGS. I might say to the gentleman, the Speaker and I and the majority whip have been attempting to expedite this program this week. We would like very much, more than the gentleman in the well, to have a sine die adjournment this week.

Mr. HALL. I question that, but I accept your good faith.

Mr. BOGGS. I will say to the gentleman the degree is just about as strong as his. But there is this problem which the majority whip has pointed out about the foreign aid bill. It is our plan to call up the bills remaining on the calendar this week. Those bills are the reform bill, the foreign aid bill, the foreign aid appropriation, and the economic bill. In addition to that, we look forward to consideration of conference reports on several appropriation bills, the economic bill, and the foreign aid bill.

The gentleman has undoubtedly told you that the foreign aid bill is causing this difficulty in the other body.

Mr. HALL. I will say to the gentleman that I am very familiar with the foible of one individual in that other body who insists on voting repetitively on his same authored amendment. I am very familiar and fed up with that inasmuch as we've voted and rejected the same on four occasions.

I think it is not reasonable nor is it in the interest of the good people of the country, for us to delay the adjournment of Congress sine die on that basis or on the foibles or penchants, if you please, of any individual who does not want to call up a bill even after it has been voted out by the committee.

Finally, I will say the Nation would be better off if some of these bills would be allowed to die right now. Be that as it may, I still seek "blessed assurance."

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. If we are able to get unanimous consent to come in at 11 o'clock tomorrow, would it also be the objective of the leadership on the other side of the aisle, if it would help to achieve getting the program out of the way, to make a similar unanimous consent request for Thursday and Friday, if necessary?

Mr. BOGGS. I think it might very well be——

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, let me say at this point, your request for unanimous consent is going pretty well your way. Do not press your luck too far. That can be asked from day to day.

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

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I second that motion.

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

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

There was no objection.

BRADEN INSULTS NEW HAMPSHIRE

(Mr. WYMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, New Hampshire—the beautiful State is also New Hampshire the Granite State. It is a citadel of rugged independence. Nowhere in the entire United States of America is there to be found a more self-reliant, courageous, humble, reverent, and independent citizenry than in New Hampshire the Granite State whose State motto is "Live Free or Die."

It is too bad that encountering such discerning thoughtful and conscientious voters disturbs certain columnists. It also discourages left-leaning candidates for President in either party. But frustrated columnists should refrain from resorting to anti-New Hampshire distortion and misrepresentation in what they put out across the Nation, if for no other reason than its reflection against their favored candidates.

In his today's syndicated column in the Washington Post entitled "MUSKIE Finds Granite State Quiet," Tom Braden describes New Hampshire as about the least most logical folkway in America for a test of presidential candidates. He writes that:

> New Hampshire is so small that anybody who can claim to influence the votes of ten people is a power-broker. It does not have a major city.

Mr. Braden owes the people of New Hampshire an apology, for almost nowhere else in the Nation can there be found a more representative cross section of concerned Americans of varying ethnic backgrounds and political persuasion. Most New Hampshire voters are not extremists of either stripe and they are demonstratedly quite capable of thoughtfully discerning what is needed in America in terms of policies and candidates.

Put another way—New Hampshire folk know a man when they see one and they can also spot a phony, a mile away.

Mr. Braden's statement that New Hampshire "does not have a major city" should deeply offend every resident of Manchester, the Queen City of New Hampshire, that by almost any standard is a major city of nearly 100,000 residents. Braden owes the residents of our largest city a retraction.

New Hampshire voters are not likely to forget Mr. Braden's nationally distributed insults. After such slander of New Hampshire his support of a particular candidate will almost certainly prove to be a liability.

The balanced judgment of a majority of New Hampshire voters will support President Nixon's struggle to achieve a generation of peace and a stable economy. This is certain to distress the Bradens of the media who apparently favor tossing the Nation to the hyenas of the urban jungle, but it does not justify maligning New Hampshire by poison pen.

Would to God this Nation had 50 States a majority of whose residents possessed the balanced judgment of New Hampshire people. The United States of America would be the gainer.

So the extent of Mr. Braden's disaffection may be seen in context I include his column at this point in the RECORD:

MUSKIE FINDS GRANITE STATE QUIET

(By Tom Braden)

DOVER, N.H.—There are a great many more spruce trees than there are people in New Hampshire, but both stand silent before Edmund Muskie. The front-runner tramps through the snow from one small meeting to another and is greeted with a politeness so granite-faced that it is impossible to mistake it for enthusiasm.

Maybe this is the way New Hampshire is. Having one of everything already, as Robert Frost pointed out in his famous poem: One mountain worth the name, one college, one statesman to be proud of, one president, "pronounce him Purse and make the most of it for better or worse," New Hampshire isn't about to cross the street to shake hands with something there's more than one of—like a presidential candidate.

Maybe it's that neighbor Muskie understands the sufficiency of New Hampshire. At any rate, he does not offend its people by crossing the street to shake hands with them.

Or maybe it's that Muskie's campaign is only now getting under way, and we are witnessing the silence, which, it is said, invariably precedes the storm. A headquarters in Manchester, this state's largest city, is just opening; an in-state staff is only now being assembled. Muskie's organization seems to have taken New Hampshire almost as much for granted as New Hampshire seems to take Muskie.

"It's restful just to think about New Hampshire," Frost wrote, and Muskie seems to have caught the mood. If he is right, his neighbors, three months from now, will give him the vote to which a neighbor may feel entitled, and all will be well.

But even of this early date, it is impossible to down the suspicion that he may be wrong. Is it a warning of trouble ahead to watch Muskie walking through a crowded college cafeteria on his way to a meeting while the diners hardly bother to look up from their coffee?

Is it a warning of trouble that he can speak for 20 minutes without worrying about being interrupted by applause?

Or that a man waiting for a haircut in a barber shop, asked if he would like the candidate to autograph a picture, murmers a polite "No thanks"?

Would these things happen to a Lindsay? A Kennedy? One feels an almost irresistable impulse to speak crossly to New Hampshire: "Look, this man you're not even bothering to look at is one of the best and most intelligent leaders of your country. He's worked hard for you; he cares about you. Can't you do something to show you are about him?"

Of all the illogical folkways which govern American politics, the least logical is the folkway which makes New Hampshire a major test for the presidency. The state is so small that anybody who can claim to influence the votes of 10 people is a power-broker. It is unrepresentative. It does not have a major city. It has only one newspaper of any size and that one can be counted to deliver 15 to 20 per cent of the vote to an odd-ball named Sam Yorty who is not seeking an office, but maintaining a career.

But the folkway exists and Muskie has to exist with it, though it may destroy him and the chances for victory of a Democratic Party which has made him its favorite son.

If Muskie is offended by the lack of attention here, he doesn't show it. But he ought to know New Hampshire, and if he does, he must know that the Muskie name and the easy Muskie style are creating about as much excitement here as though somebody came in from the woodpile to remark that it's snowing again.

REHNQUIST AND CRITICS: WHO IS EXTREME?

(Mr. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I notice that according to published reports over the weekend, the American Civil Liberties Union, the nonprofit conscience of America which has been seeking in recent years to remold America's basic institutions and laws through court proceedings, has now extended its area of operation into that of selecting Supreme Court Justices. I would request that the Internal Revenue Service look into the question of their tax-exempt status now that they are actively engaged in lobbying.

Aside from the ACLU's excursion into areas previously considered beyond their scope, an interesting question was posed to me yesterday. The question was asked: "Upon assuming his seat on the Supreme Court, would Mr. Rehnquist not now be expected to disqualify himself from any cases in which the American Civil Liberties Union was involved?"

In my own opinion, it would be a serious error in judgment on the part of Mr. Rehnquist or any judge to disqualify himself from hearing a case simply because a participant in the lawsuit had voiced disapproval of the judge. If such a precedent were established, a litigant or a lawyer could make it impossible for a case to be tried by simply saying scandalous things about every judge who tried the case.

The fact that the American Civil Liberties Union is seeking to slander a man's name and reputation is evidence of bad judgment on the part of the ACLU. The judge being slandered is expected to be above the pettiness of petty people and exercise judicial temperament far removed from the squabbling which might be associated with his original appointment.

For myself, if I ever felt any reservations about Mr. Rehnquist's qualifications to sit on the Supreme Court, those reservations were dissipated upon the announcement from the ACLU.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I am inserting at this point an editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of yesterday, December 6, 1971:

REHNQUIST AND CRITICS; WHO'S EXTREME?

(By Robert L. Bartley)

WASHINGTON.—The most powerful impression to emerge from the microscopic public analysis of the life and works of Supreme Court nominee William H. Rehnquist is that his critics are pretty desperate. At one point the arguments and innuendos offered by critical witnesses proved too much even for the most critical Senators, and Sen. Edward Kennedy upbraided the witnesses for creating "an atmosphere which I think is rather poisonous."

Now the critical members on the Senate Judiciary Committee—Sens. Bayh, Hart, Kennedy and Tunney—have filed their minority report setting out the responsible case against the nomination. As Sen. Kennedy's remark suggests, it judiciously avoids the less substantial allegations that have appeared in the press in recent weeks. There is for example, no suggestion that Mr. Rehnquist is guilty until proven innocent of membership in extremist organizations because his name appears on a list compiled by a little old lady and willed to someone else.

OUTSIDE THE MAINSTREAM

The minority report, rather, focuses mostly on Mr. Rehnquist's views on certain issues, and as such is an intriguing document. It volunteers that there is no question about Mr. Rehnquist's qualifications in terms of legal standing or personal integrity. On the widely debated question of whether the Senate should consider a nominee's judicial philosophy, it makes the case that indeed the Senate should.

The minority, of course, argues that on this third test Mr. Rehnquist flunks. It says he "has failed to show a demonstrated commitment to the fundamental human rights of the Bill of Rights, and to the guarantees of equality under the law." While not every detail of a nominee's philosophy ought to bear on his Senate confirmation, it suggests, so extreme a deviation should. At one point the text puts it simply: The nominee "is outside the mainstream of American thought and should not be confirmed."

A fascinating proposition, this. How can someone with legal standing and personal integrity fit to grace the Supreme Court be that far out of the mainstream? What would be the opinions of a man who is such a pillar of the bar and still fails to understand the Bill of Rights?

So it is with no little anticipation that one turns to the issues discussed in the minority report to find just which of Mr.

Rehnquist's opinions bar him from the Court service. One expects not merely that he will have debatable opinions on debatable topics. Certainly the four Senators disagree on many things with Lewis F. Powell Jr., the other Supreme Court nominee before the Senate, but they voted to approve him. So in Mr. Rehnquist's case one expects more extreme opinions, those further out of the mainstream on the right, say, than Justice William O. Douglas is on the left.

As sort of a benchmark, recall Justice Douglas' popular book arguing, "We must realize that today's establishment is the new George III. Whether it will continue to adhere to his tactics, we do not know. If it does, the redress, honored in tradition, is also revolution." What right-wing outrages has Mr. Rehnquist uttered, one wonders, that are further from the mainstream than *that?*

As the confirmation hearings started, the best bet for that sort of outrage seemed to lie in the Justice Department position on wiretapping. As the department's chief legal adviser, Mr. Rehnquist must bear no small responsibility for that position, and the department has argued that the Executive Branch has an "inherent right" to wiretap without court order in national security cases. This is tantamount to an assertion that neither Congress nor the courts can control executive wiretapping, and certainly does suggest an insensitivity to the spirit of the Bill of Rights.

Alas for Mr. Rehnquist's critics, though, it turns out that on his advice the Justice Department has dropped the "inherent right" argument in current briefs before the Supreme Court. It now merely argues that in the particular instances of the case, the tap in question was not an "unreasonable" search barred by the Fourth Amendment. He says that the effect of the change is "to recognize that the courts would decide whether or not this practice amounted to an unreasonable search."

Mr. Rehnquist declined to give his personal views, as opposed to the Justice Department position, but he did defend the department's current arguments on the grounds that there are substantial legal questions unresolved, and the Executive is obligated to make its side of the case. "Five preceding administrations have all taken the position that the national security type of surveillance is permissible . . . one Justice of the Supreme Court has expressed the view that the power does exist, two have expressed the view that it does not exist . . . one has expressed the view that it is an open question . . . the government is entirely justified in presenting the matter to the court for its determination."

WIRETAPPING OF RADICALS

This did not satisfy the four critical senators. They noted that the current issues are somewhat different from those of preceding administrations, not least because the current argument is about wiretapping not of foreign agents but of domestic radicals. The change in the department's position is "more cosmetic than real," they argued, because it is still defending wiretapping rules that would not "provide an adequate restraining effect on the Executive Branch, an adequate deterrent to protect the right of privacy."

For those who may find this particular dispute a matter not of extremist opinions but of reasonable men differing, the minority also delves into Mr. Rehnquist's widely quoted opinion on government surveillance of individuals, that is, not wiretapping but the recording of their activities in public places. In warning against overly restricting such surveillance, he once said, "I think it quite likely that self-restraint on the part of the Executive Branch will provide an answer to virtually all of the legitimate complaints against excesses of information gathering."

During the hearings, Mr. Rehnquist noted that in his remark he was addressing the question of whether new legislation is needed in addition to the Bill of Rights and laws already on the books, and that the remark must be understood in that context. In colloquy at the time, he conceded that widespread surveillance should be "condemned," and that an individual might already have legal recourse against a government tail. But in considering the argument that surveillance is unconstitutional because it has a "chilling effect" on freedom of expression, he said any such effect is a question not of constitutional law but of fact. And, "those activities didn't prevent, you know, two hundred, two hundred fifty thousand people from coming to Washington on at least one of two occasions to, you know, exercise their First Amendment rights, to protest the war policies of the President. . . ."

The minority report argues that even if 250,000 appeared, others may have been deterred by surveillance. It agrees that the committee's majority report correctly describes Mr. Rehnquist's attitude: "Information-gathering activity may raise first amendment questions if it is proven that citizens are *actually* deferred from speaking out." The minority argues that this is precisely the problem, "the difficulty of proving a specific chilling effect is obvious, and the notion that a First Amendment question isn't even *raised* until it is 'proven that citizens are *actually* deterred from speaking out' (emphasis in original) is alarming."

But if Mr. Rehnquist's opinions here are outrageously extreme, it would seem, so are the opinions of the majority of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Similarly if his defense of the constitutionality of such laws as "no-knock" raids and "preventive detention" in the District of Columbia are out of the mainstream, the mainstream does not include the majority of both houses of Congress. So what mostly remains is the question of Mr. Rehnquist's attitudes on the racial issue.

The minority report does not make too much of allegations that Mr. Rehnquist harassed black voters when he was involved in Republican voter challenging teams in Phoenix, but it also does not dismiss them as the majority did. Some of his black opponents have come up with affidavits charging he was personally involved in harassment, and his supporters have come up with a defense of his challenging activities and attitude by a sometime counterpart on the Phoenix Democratic challenging team. The minority report says, "Each Senator will have to decide for himself what weight—if any—to give either the charges or the blanket denial."

On the nominee's general racial attitudes, the majority report also came up with a letter from the principal of the elementary school Mr. Rehnquist's children attended in Phoenix. "Mr. Rehnquist became known to me when I was a teacher here at Kenilworth School. He had moved his family into Phoenix Elementary School District from one of the outlying suburban, and predominantly middle socio-economic, school districts. He wanted his children to have experience and associations with children from minority groups, as well as with the different socio-economic groups."

The minority report argue that "Mr. Rehnquist's record fails to demonstrate any strong affirmative commitment to civil rights, to equal justice for all citizens, let alone a level of commitment which would rebut the strong evidence of insensitivity to such rights." The evidence the report discusses at greatest length is a letter Mr. Rehnquist wrote to The Arizona Republic in 1967, responding to remarks on school integration by Phoenix School Superintendent Howard Seymour.

The minority report says, "The truly alarming aspect of the 1967 letter, however, is Mr. Rehnquist's statement, 13 years after Brown v. Board of Education that 'We are no more dedicated to an "integrated" society than we are to a "segregated" society' . . . Yet at least since the Supreme Court declared that 'separate is inherently unequal,' this nation has not been neutral as between integration and segregation; it stands squarely in favor of the former. And if Mr. Rehnquist does not agree, he is outside the mainstream of American thought and should not be confirmed."

A FREE SOCIETY

The statement in the original letter that must be located with respect to the mainstream runs, "Mr. Seymour declares that we 'are and must be concerned with achieving an integrated society.' . . . But I think many would take issue with his statement on the merits, and would feel that we are no more dedicated to an 'integrated' society than we are to a 'segregated' society; that we are instead dedicated to a free society, in which each man is equal before the law, but in which each man is accorded a maximum amount of freedom of choice in his individual activities."

Mr. Rehnquist's extremist position on civil rights, then, turns out to be nothing more than the familiar proposition that the Constitution is color-blind. On surveillance he believes that at this moment the scales are not tipped in such a way that dissent is "chilled." On wiretapping he believes the government side of the national security question deserves its day in court. These opinions, the minority report suggests, are so outrageous the nominee should be defeated.

As the Senate debates the nomination, it seems, it will have to decide more than whether it's proper to weigh a nominee's philosophy. It also needs to weigh whether words like "extreme" and "out of the mainstream" better describe Mr. Rehnquist's philosophy, or the position his critics have been forced to take to oppose him.

SIR ALAN P. HERBERT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HUNGATE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this special order today so that my colleagues and I can pay well-deserved tribute to a great man—Sir Alan P. Herbert, British poet, playwright, barrister, former Member of Parliament and rare humorist—who died at the age of 81 on November 11.

Sir Alan, writing under the name A. P. Herbert, was the mainstay of Britain's humor weekly, Punch, for 60 years. Herbert, who could make the best possible use of a good sense of humor and wit, is a legend in Parliament and was a gifted author—The Secret Battle, Uncommon Law, The Ayes Have It, and so forth—and musical playwright and lyricist—"Paganini," "Helen," and "Bless the Bride."

It seems appropriate to recall some of his incisive wit. Sir Alan P. Herbert, the man, is gone, but his legacy to mankind lives on. His style, his humor will continue to give us the tremendous opportunity to look at ourselves, our laws, and our civilization, and not be afraid to laugh at ourselves.

In "Fardell against Potts" Sir Alan developed the concept of the reasonable man:

Mrs. Fardell, while motorboating on the river Thames, collided with and overturned Mr. Potts' rowboat, causing damage to the rowboat and injury to Mr. Potts who was riding in it.

Mr. Potts sued Mrs. Fardell and the court asked the jury to decide if the defendant was using reasonable care in the circumstances. The jury found the defendant was not using reasonable care and awarded Mr. Potts damages. Mrs. Fardell, the defendant, has appealed.

Our common law has been built about the reasonable man. He is the judicial ideal of a good citizen. No matter what problem comes before the courts they are able to solve it by putting the question: "Was this or was this not the conduct of a reasonable man?" and leaving that question to be answered by the jury.

Reasonable man always thinks of others. Prudence is his guide, safety his watchword. Although any given example of his behavior must command admiration, when taken together his acts create a very different impression.

He looks before he leaps. He never daydreams when approaching the edge of a dock. He substitutes order for bearer on checks and then marks them to account of payee only and registers the letter in which they are sent. He never mounts a moving vehicle, nor alights a train in motion. He investigates exhaustively the good faith of every beggar before giving alms and informs himself of the history and habits of a dog before administering a caress. Never, from one year's end to the next, does he make excessive demands on his wife, his servants, his ox or his ass.

In business he looks only for that narrow margin of profit 12 men like himself would deem fair. He regards his fellow merchants and their goods with that degree of suspicion which the law deems admirable. He never swears, gambles or loses his temper. He uses nothing, except in moderation, and even when flogging his child is meditating only on the golden rule. Devoid of any human weakness, without one single saving vice, this excellent, but odious, character stands like a monument in our courts, vainly appealing to his fellow citizens to order their lives after his example.

Hateful as he must be when privately considered, it is a curious paradox that whenever 12 people gather in a jury box they are easily persuaded that they themselves are each and generally reasonable men—not stopping to realize how odd it is that fate has placed 12 members of a species in one room at one time on one jury.

To return, as every judge must ultimately return, to the case before us, it has been urged for Mrs. Fardell that in all the law there is no single mention of a reasonable woman. Such an omission extending over centuries must be more than coincidence. Among the innumerable references to the reasonable man, one might expect at least a passing reference to a reasonable person of the opposite sex. No such reference is found for the reasons that no such being is contemplated by the law. Legally, at least, there is no such thing as a reasonable woman. Therefore, the judge below should have directed the jury that while they might find the defendant's conduct was not that required of a reasonable man, her conduct was only to be expected of a woman, as such. It is no bad thing if here and there the law conforms with the known facts of everyday experience.

The view that there exists a class of beings illogical, impulsive, careless, irresponsible, extravagant, prejudiced and vain, free for the most part from those worthy and repellant virtues which distinguish the reasonable man, and devoted to the irrational arts of pleasure is a view which should be as welcome and well accepted in our courts as it is in our drawing rooms. Judgment for Mrs. Fardell.

Having demolished the reasonable man, he next proceeded to dissemble the institution of marriage in the tender tale of "Marrowfat against Marrowfat":

Mr. Marrowfat petitioned this court for a divorce alleging his wife deserted him. Mr. Marrowfat's counsel, Sir Humphrey Codd, has indefatigibly argued a novel part of law. A cynical writer has somewhere said that marriage is a lottery. Sir Humphrey suggests this observation has some significance in law.

Sir Humphery says the essence of a gambling transaction is that a person makes a sacrifice in hopes of receiving a benefit, but that receipt of the benefit depends on chance and not on his skill and judgment. Sir Humphrey argues this is exactly the characteristic of this marriage contract and that this court should no more assist in enforcing it than we would assist a gambler to recover his losses, or even his winnings.

Mr. Marrowfat, while sailing to Columbo, met Mrs. Marrowfat, then Gladys Willow, for the first time at a fancy dress ball on ship where he drew her, by lot, as his partner for dinner. Gladys was dressed as a Columbine and Mr. Marrowfat as an Oriental prince. After dinner and dancing they went to the top deck to seek relief from the tropical heat. Up there the unexpected beauty of the Southern Cross excited in Mr. Marrowfat a warm affection for Gladys, and he made such protestations and caresses as are commonly the preliminaries of a matrimonial entanglement. In fact, an offer of marriage was made and accepted a few days later in a Hertz rent-a-car in Columbo.

Sir Humphrey says Mr. Marrowfat was governed throughout by chance and not by judgment and skill. Chance embarked them on the same boat. Chance threw them together at the fancy dress dinner. Chance directed at that meeting Gladys should be dressed as a Columbine, a costume she never wore before or after.

It is common ground she is not a good wife, but never before making the contract, says Sir Humphrey, did Mr. Marrowfat have an opportunity to determine if she was apt to be a good wife, for those attributes most in evidence and most desirable on ocean trips are not the same as those of a good wife in the home. Mr. Marrowfat, therefore, staked his liberty and fortune without knowing the return, if any, he would receive. He selected his wife as many select racehorses. With no stronger reason for believing it to be the fastest runner than that it has an attractive mane or an elegant tail. I am satisfied this contract was in the nature of a gambling transaction and therefore Mr. Marrowfat is not entitled to the aid of this court and his suit for divorce is dismissed.

"So much for this case, but doesn't this decision have a wider meaning than the particular affairs of the Marrowfats. Can it be said that any matrimonial transaction is different in essence from wagers. But if I may believe the evidence of numerous newspaper placards and headlines, there are men who are able with almost infallible accuracy to predict the future behavior of racehorses in given circumstances. But can the same be said of him who selects from the numerous women about some particular female to be his partner in life. The prophet of the racehorse has in nearly every case definite material on which to found his predictions: Such and such a foal has run faster than such and such a filly over such and such a course in wet weather or in dry weather, with a cough, with glanders, with enthusiasm, etc., and therefore may be expected to do this, that or the other thing in the same or similar circumstances. But the case of the prospective husband is ex hypothesi completely opposite. He is backing a horse which has never run before. Or if his fancy be a widow, has never run the same course in the same company. The form of a racehorse is public property, but the form of a bride is of necessity concealed.

It is commonplace in literature that women are unpredictable. Women complain that all men are alike, but men complain that no two women are the same and no woman is the same for many days or even minutes together. Thus, experience, however extensive, is not a certain guide and no man's judgment is in this department valuable.

In all matrimonial transactions, therefore, the element of skill is negligible and the element of chance predominates. This brings all marriages into the category of gaming and, therefore, I hold the court cannot, according to the law, relieve the victims of these arrangements.

Therefore, it will be idle for married persons to bring their grievances to us and this divorce court shall not sit again. It is not without a pang that I pronounce the death sentence of divorce for it has meant so much to so many in the courtroom. To those learned counsel who have made a good thing out of it, I offer my condolences and particularly to Sir Humphrey Codd, who by his own argument, has destroyed his own livelihood. A person wanting a divorce must in the future divorce themselves.

While I do not have at hand Sir Alan's first amendment views on freedom of religion which would have no doubt helped us on the prayer amendment, he did shed considerable light on our heritage of free speech. This was done in the case of Engheim, Muckovitch, Kettelburg, Weinbaum & Oski against The King:

A group was formed in London calling themselves "Hands Off Russia" group. They met every Sunday PM in Trafalgar Square in front of Lord Nelson's Monument. They would sing songs, wave banners, make speeches, the general tenor of which was to invite compassion for those in bondage and expressing determination to better materially the conditions of the human race. These, at first sight unobjectionable aims, aroused another group to form, called "Hands Off England" group. They held meetings, sang songs, waved banners and made speeches the general tenor of which was to express concern for those in bondage and a desire to better the conditions of the human race.

It would appear that two groups with so much in common might well hold joint meetings, but when it was announced that both groups planned to meet in Trafalgar Square on the same day at the same time, an injunction was obtained and a police order forbade both meetings. The "Hands Off England" people obeyed, but the "Hands Off Russia" people did not and were arrested. They appealed their conviction asserting their rights of free speech had been violated.

Now there is a popular delusion that a citizen has a number of rights which entitle him to behave as he likes so long as he does no specific harm.

There are few, if any, such rights, and in a public street there are none.

There is no conduct in a street which cannot be brought into some unlawful category, however vague. If you stand still, you are loitering. If you run, you are likely to disturb the peace. If your glance is affectionate, it is annoying. If it is hard, you are threatening. If you keep to yourself, you are a suspicious character. If you are with others you may be part of a conspiracy. If you beg without singing, you are a vagrant. If you sing without begging, you are a nuisance. But nothing is more obnoxious to the law than a crowd, for whatever purpose collected, which is proven by the fact that in law a crowd consists of 3 persons or more. If these 3 have an unlawful purpose, they are an unlawful assembly, while if their proceedings are calculated to arouse fears or excitement, they are a riot.

It is thus easily seen, that a political meeting in a public place must always be illegal, and there is certainly no right of public meeting as postulated by appellants.

It was held long ago, that the only right a citizen has in a public street is to pass

at an even pace from one end to the other breathing unobtrusively through the nose and attracting no attention.

If you are not allowed to do what you like, how much less likely are you to be allowed to say what you like. It is generally agreed that speech is several degrees inferior to action. Words are good. Deeds are better. Do more, say less. Silence is golden. The strong silent man is much admired by all of us, not because of his strength, but because of his silence.

Appellants contend a Briton may speak as freely as he breathes. However, there is no reference to free speech in the Magna Carta, our ancestors knew better. As a legal notion free speech has no more existence than free love.

Nothing is more difficult than to make a statement that does more good than harm and many great men die in old age without ever having done so. It may well be argued that if all public men could be persuaded to remain silent for six months, the nation would enter upon an era of prosperity such that not even their subsequent utterances could damage it.

Every public speaker is a public peril no matter what his opinions. And far from believing in indiscriminate freedom of speech, I think public speech should be classed as a dangerous instrumentality such as a car or a firearm which no man may employ without a special license from the state. These licenses should be renewable annually and be endorsed with particulars of indiscretions or excesses, and speaking to the public danger would in time be regarded with as much disgust as careless and imprudent driving. I find there is no right of free speech, and a good thing too.

Sir Alan P. Herbert knew well man and his fears, his inconsistencies. He learned even better how to live with them and get on with the greater tasks of living. He enjoyed a long and vigorous life and the world is a better place for having known him.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to quote the remarks of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER) who is—as was A. P. Herbert—both author and legislator. I herewith read his remarks into the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY HON. KEN HECHLER OF WEST VIRGINIA

I am pleased to join my colleague from Missouri (Mr. HUNGATE) in expressing our great admiration for the late Sir Alan P. Herbert. His 81 years were utilized to the fullest. He was in every sense the complete man—probably even more.

As a fellow legislator and author I offer for your enlightenment and enjoyment a sampling of Sir Alan's great humorous masterpieces, the case of "Haddock v. The King":

"Laughter was heard at the courthouse today when the negotiable cow case was concluded.

"The defendant, Mr. Albert Haddock, has for many months, in spite of earnest endeavors on both sides, been unable to establish harmonious relations between himself and the Director of the Internal Revenue Service. The Director maintains that Mr. Haddock should make over a large part of his earnings to the government. Mr. Haddock replies that the proportion demanded is excessive in view of the inadequate services, or consideration which he himself has received from that government. After an exchange of endearing letters, phone calls, IBM cards, and even checks, the amount demanded was reduced to $228, and about this sum an exchange of opinions continued.

"On January 31st, the Collector was diverted from his responsible labors by the apparition of a noisy crowd outside his windows. The crowd had been attracted by Mr. Haddock who was leading a large white cow of malevolent aspect. On the back and sides of the cow were clearly stencilled in red ink the following words:

"'JANUARY 31, 1964.

"'To the MONTGOMERY COUNTY BANK:

"'Pay to the Director of the Internal Revenue Service who is no gentleman, on order the sum of $228, and may he rot.

"'ALBERT HADDOCK'.

"Mr. Haddock conducted the cow in the Director's office and tendered it to him in payment of income tax and demanded a receipt. The Director declined to accept the cow, objecting that it would be difficult or impossible to pay the cow into the bank. Mr. Haddock throughout the interview maintained the friendliest demeanor, and he now remarked that the Director could endorse the cow to any third party to whom he owed money, adding that there must be many persons in that position.

"The Director then endeavored to endorse the check. (Where?) On the back of the check, that is to say the abdomen of the cow. The cow, however, appeared to resent endorsement and adopted a menacing posture. The Director, abandoning the attempt, declined finally to take the check.

"Mr. Haddock lead the cow away and was arrested on Main Street for causing an obstruction. He has also been cited by the Internal Revenue Service for non-payment of income tax.

"Mr. Haddock, on the witness stand, said that he had tendered a check in payment of income tax and if the Director, Internal Revenue Service, did not like his check, he could do the other thing. A check was only an order to a bank to pay money to the person in possession of the check or a person named on the check. There was nothing in the statute or customary law to say that the order must be written on a piece of paper of specified dimensions. It is well known that a check can be drawn on a piece of note paper. Haddock himself had drawn checks on the backs of napkins, on handkerchiefs, on the labels of wine bottles: all these checks had been duly honored by his bank and passed through the bankers clearing house. He could see no distinction in law between a check written on a napkin and a check written on a cow. The essence of each instrument was a written order to pay money, made in the customary form and in accordance with the statutory requirements A check was admittedly not legal tender in the sense it could not be lawfully refused, but it was accepted by custom as a legitimate form of payment. There was funds in his bank sufficient to meet the cow. The Director might not like the cow, but the cow having been tendered, he was estopped from charging him with failing to pay. (Mr. Haddock here cited Lucas v. Fink):

"As to the action of the police Mr. Haddock said it was a nice thing if in the heart of the leading commercial country of the world a man could not convey a negotiable instrument down the street without being arrested. He has instituted proceedings against Constable Boot for false arrest.

"Cross-examined as to motive, Haddock said he had no check forms available and being anxious to meet his obligations promptly, had made use of the only material at hand. Later he admitted there may have been present in his mind a desire to make the Director, Internal Revenue Service, look ridiculous, but why not? There was surely no law against deriding the income tax.

"This case has at least brought to the notice of the court a citizen who is unusual both in his clarity of mind and integrity of behavior. No thinking man can regard those parts of the Internal Revenue acts which govern the income tax with anything but contempt. There may be something to be said, not much, for taking from those who have inherited wealth a certain proportion of that wealth for the service of the state and the benefit of the poor and needy; and those who by their own ability, brains and industry have earned money may reasonably be invited to surrender a small portion of it towards the maintenance of those public services by which they benefit, to wit: the police, the Army, the Navy, the public sewers, etc. But to compel such individuals to bestow a large part of their earnings on other individuals, whether by way of pensions, unemployment benefits or education allowances, is manifestly barbarous and indefensible. Yet this is the law. The origin and only official basis of taxation was that the individual citizens in return for their money received collectively some services from the state: the defense of their property and persons, the care of their health or the education of their children.

"All that has now gone. Citizen A, who has earned money, is simply commanded to give it to citizens B, C, and D who have not and by force of habit this has come to be regarded as a normal and proper procedure, whatever the comparative industry or merits of citizens A, B, C and D. To be alive has become a virtue, and the mere capacity to inflate the lungs entitles citizen B to a substantial share in the laborious earnings of citizen A. The defendant, Mr. Haddock, repels and resents this doctrine, but since it has received the sanction of the legislature, he dutifully complies with it.

"Hampered by practical difficulties, he took the first step he could to discharge his legal obligations to the state. Paper was not available so he employed instead a favorite cow. Now there can be nothing obscene, offensive or derogatory in the presentation of a cow by one man to another. Indeed, in certain countries (India) the cow is venerated as a sacred animal. Payment in kind is the oldest form of payment. Payment and payment in kind more often than not meant payment in cattle. Indeed, during the Saxon period in England, Mr. Haddock tells us cattle were described as 'Viva Pecunia' or living money from their being received as payment on most occasions, at certain regulated prices. So that whether the check was valid or not it was impossible to doubt the validity of the cow. Whatever the Director, Internal Revenue Service, distrust of the former, it was at least his duty to accept the latter and credit Mr. Haddock's account with its value.

"But as Mr. Haddock protested in his able argument, an order to pay is an order to pay, whether it is made on the back of an envelope or the back of a cow. The evidence of the bank is that Mr. Haddock's account was in funds. From every point of view, therefore, the Director, Internal Revenue Service, did wrong, by custom, if not by law, in refusing to take the proffered animal, and the citation issued at his insistence will be discharged.

"As for the second charge, the court holds that Constable Boot did wrong. It cannot be unlawful to conduct a cow down main street. The horse, at present a much less useful animal, is not infrequently seen on that street without protest, and the automobile, more unnatural and unattractive still, is more numerous than either animal. Much less can the cow be regarded as an improper or unlawful companion when it is invested (as I have shown) with all the dignity of a Bill of Exchange.

"If people choose to congregate in one place upon the apparition of Mr. Haddock with a promissory cow, then Constable Boot should arrest the pepole, not Mr. Haddock. Possibly if Mr. Haddock had paraded main street with a paper check for one million dollars made payable to bearer, the crowd would have been as great, but that is not to say Mr. Haddock would have broken the law. In my judgment Mr. Haddock has behaved throughout in the manner of a perfect

knight, citizen and taxpayer. The charge brought by the state is dismissed and I hope with all my heart that in his action against Constable Boot, Mr. Haddock will be successful. What is the next case please?"

People were a great source of material for Sir Alan; their laws an even better source.

During his 15 years in Parliament, Sir Alan P. Herbert distinguished himself by devising and carrying through a new divorce act, the first fundamental change in British divorce law for 81 years. People wondered that a man so happily married and surrounded by a devoted family should fight so desperately for easier divorce. But of course the reason why he was so resolute was just because of the happiness of his own marriage.

His argument was that marriage, in its happiness, is grand and simple; nothing should impair its dignity. Therefore, divorce in its unhappiness should be simple and grand. Everything should be done to support its dignity. It was an extraordinary feat for a Private Member to put such an important law on the statute book. Many look upon it as Herbert's chief success.

In closing I quote a description of Sir Alan P. Herbert that explains why he so well deserved this tribute today:

"He is a sight of London, like St. Paul's, though he wears his dome at the side. He has written verse not equaled since Praed. He has graved his name into English law. He wanted only a Sullivan and a bad temper to beat Gilbert at his own game. He can navigate the Thames and work out his position from the stars, without one glance at the bank. But his real forte is for friendship. He is a remarkably good friend, even to his enemies—excepting himself."

Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) has also asked to be included in this tribute to Sir Alan. I herewith read his prepared remarks into the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF HON. HENRY S. REUSS

The occupational ailment of taking themselves too seriously afflicts many legislators. A. P. Herbert never suffered from that malady.

A Member of Parliament for 14 years, until his Oxford University seat was abolished in 1950, Herbert combined a unique gift for making people laugh with deeply held convictions on a diverse array of issues.

He conceived and fought for passage of some far-reaching legislative measures. Perhaps his most notable achievement in the House of Commons was his radical revision of Britain's outmoded divorce laws. Herbert's bill added such grounds as mental cruelty, desertion and insanity to a law which, until that time, recognized only adultery and "unnatural offenses" as grounds for dissolving a marriage.

The causes he espoused ran the gamut from tax reform to revised betting laws to conservation. His love for the Thames River led to a thirty-year membership on the Thames Conservancy. In these fights, he enjoyed more than his share of victories.

Indeed, when Herbert died last month, at the age of 80, his obituary in the London Times chronicled many of his sober interests and accomplishments. But, appropriately, it identified him, first and foremost, as the man who "did more than any man of his day to add to the gaiety of the nation."

His wit was unrestricted by subject or form; it shone through just as brightly in prose, in verse, in musical comedy. Much of his best material appeared in the humor magazine, Punch, to which he contributed for more than 60 years, beginning in 1910.

Always he stood in defense of clear, direct English. Complaining of the corruption creeping into military language, he lamented that a modern Lord Nelson would never have said, "England expects every man to do his duty." Instead, said Herbert, it might have come out: "England anticipates that as regards the current emergency, personnel will face up to the issues and exercise appropriately the functions allocated to their respective occupation groups."

His output was a prodigious as his interests were varied. He wrote more than 60 books, 17 plays and hundreds of poems and song lyrics.

With singular effect, he combined the roles of crusading reformer, conservationist, novelist, barrister (though he never practiced law), Member of Parliament, writer of musical comedies and humorist.

One of the characters in Herbert's 1947 musical, "Bless the Bride," is provoked to exclaim in song:

"If I'd only done the things I thought of doing,

"What a lot of splendid things I should have done."

No such qualms for A. P. Herbert.

He did the things he thought of doing.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the ability to effect social change through humor is a rare gift indeed. To be critical while eliciting a smile, and to achieve progress by demonstrating the absurdity of the present, takes a great deal of knowledge and skill. Such capability in an individual evokes admiration and respect. And an individual for whom the world developed such admiration and respect was Sir Alan P. Herbert, known more generally as A. P. Herbert, the British writer, who died on November 11.

On the surface, it appeared that many of the causes which Sir Herbert fostered were supported in jest. Although a member of the bar, he never practiced law. He was a champion of divorce law reform, while he himself had a happy married life for 57 years. At a time when England was being bombed by Hitler, Sir Herbert was critical of church bells being used as air raid sirens, and helped bring about a resumption of their ringing for all occasions. He wrote:

The old inventive British brain
Had better, surely, think again
Bring back the bells; and use a drum
To let us know that Hitler's come.

He became a Member of Parliament, representing Oxford University, in 1935. On his second day in the House of Commons, he launched into his maiden speech, which brought this reaction from the late Sir Winston Churchill:

Call that a maiden speech? It was a brazen hussy of a speech. Never did such a painted lady of a speech parade itself before a modest Parliament.

His championship of the cause of divorce reform was inspired and effective. In effect, he ridiculed the existing divorce law—then limited to adultery—out of court. By graphically portraying in the cleverly titled "Holy Deadlock" the ridiculous stratagems to which the parties to a suit were required to resort and the silly positions which the courts were compelled to take, he brought home to the British public the need for liberalization and was the principal causative force in bringing about this major legislative change.

To me the gayest and most memorable of his pieces were his parodies of legal opinions which appeared over the years in "Punch" and were collected in the appropriately titled "Uncommon Law." The names of the cases were suggestive: Pratt, G. K., v. Pratt, P., and Mugg; Carrot & Co. v. The Guano Association; British Phosphates & Beef Extract Ltd. v. The Alkali Guano Simplex Association. The subtitles were noteworthy too—"Is Magna Carta Law?", "Is Marriage Lawful?", "The Negotiable Cow", "Why is the Coroner"?, "Are Suicides Insane?"

My favorite, Rumpelheimer v. Haddock, involved a case where an automobile and a boat collided at a point where a highway was covered with two feet of water from a navigable river and wherein the President of the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division gave his notable judgment which excluded the rules of the road applied the law of Admiralty to the collision.

One of Sir Alan's worthiest crusades sought to bring to reality the probably impossible goal of persuading his fellowmen to write in clear language and he alleged that if Lord Nelson had lived during World War II, he would not have said, "England expects every man to do his duty," but would have declaimed "England anticipates that as regards the current emergency personnel will face up to the issues and exercise appropriately the functions allocated to their respective occupation groups."

His legacy of humor, reform, journalism and legislative accomplishment is substantial and noteworthy: 70 books, including 19 collections of verse, 13 novels, 17 plays, and 14 general books. In addition, he contributed to Punch magazine for more than 60 years.

A. P. Herbert has left us after brightening our lives for far longer than the span allotted to the average man. We shall not read his pieces any more but he passes on leaving behind a notable record of legal, political, legislative, and literary achievement.

CRISIS AT SEA

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I called the attention of the House to a magnificently done photo report which appeared in the December 3 issue of Life magazine. It was entitled, "Crisis at Sea: The Threat of No More Fish." It pointed up the desperate need for enforceable international conservation measures if the world's fisheries resources are to be saved.

Today, I would like to call the attention of the House to an article on the same subject by New York Times columnist C. L. Sulzberger. It appeared in that newspaper last Sunday, December 5, as well as in other newspapers subscribing to the New York Times service.

Writing from Oslo, Norway, Mr. Sulzberger warns of what he properly describes as:

The rapidly approaching death of that king of all game fish, the Atlantic salmon.

He notes that:

The salmon is not being murdered solely by pollution, but that the worst offender is

the greedy commercial fisherman aided by modern electronic devices.

He calls attention to the fact that:

Two organizations exist which could in theory end this tragic situation—the International Commission for Northwest Atlantic Fisheries and the Northeast Atlantic Fisheries Commission.

But, as Mr. Sulzberger adds:

No country opposing any proposal favored by either commission is obliged to observe it—and the Danes don't.

He goes on to suggest, however, that:

Denmark's application for membership in the European Common Market can be shelved until Copenhagen agrees to cease deep-sea salmon netting.

I must certainly agree with the Sulzberger thesis that, with the world rapidly running out of such fish as the Atlantic salmon, economic sanctions against those responsible for it could be an effective means of combating the trend.

Even if such sanctions were imposed against offending nations, however, it would not resolve the total problem of finding a positive, enforceable and lasting means of preserving the rich resources of the world's oceans. That total problem can, and must, be solved at the Law of the Sea Conference to be held in Geneva in 1973.

As I said yesterday, this vital conference is our last chance to end that threat of no more fish—and we must make the most of it.

Here is Mr. C. L. Sulzberger's article in its entirety.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 7, 1971]

MUST THE FISH-KING DIE?

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

OSLO, NORWAY.—One of the sadder ecological tragedies that menace our age is the rapidly approaching death of that king of all game fish, the Atlantic salmon (salmo salar, to distinguish him from his inferior Pacific cousin).

The salmon is not being murdered solely by pollution, factories and motorized ship traffic along the inland rivers where he breeds. The worst offender is the greedy commercial fisherman aided by modern electronic devices. Dozens of rivers on both sides of the Atlantic had previously seen the end of traditional salmon runs: the Hudson, Thames, Rhine and Seine among them.

But enough streams remained for millions of salmon to spawn and then return as small fish or smolt to secret caverns in the ocean. There they hide, fed on Arctic shrimp, grew to maturity and finally swam back to the rivers of their birth still flowing through Canada, the United Kingdom, Ireland, Iceland and Norway.

Until World War II nobody knew where the salmon went once the young fish fled into the ocean. The salmo salar was a lovely creature caught only at the mouths of the rivers on his way to spawn. It is possible to control and regulate such an offshore catch; also the catch by sportsmen angling upstream as the salmon leaps and swirls to the spawning area where he re-creates his cycle.

But this natural process has now been upset and the salmon is threatened with the extinction of the dinosaur or dodo bird. During the mid-nineteen-fifties his principal saltwater feeding ground was discovered off the west coast of Greenland in the Davis Strait. Later, a subsidiary ground was located north of this country's Lofoten Islands.

Once it was proved that large shoals of salmon matured in these waters, professional ocean-going boats started to hunt them down. The task was made easy by such inventions as sonar. It became simple to locate concentrations of fish and destroy them in one operation, either with encircling nets or thousands of long lines with strings of baited hooks.

Nations owning salmon-producing rivers quickly recognized the danger to the species. Within a decade the catch in the Davis Strait alone increased from an annual sixty metric tons to over two thousand. However, Denmark, which exercises sovereignty over Greenland, has steadily refused to recognize the threat.

The Danes contend no scientific proof exists that salmon being taken in international waters off Greenland or the Lofotens come from any special river or that deep-sea fishing is directly related to numbers of salmon in normal spawning areas.

Nevertheless, it is an open secret that this is nonsense. Danish crews usually rip off tags of any fish taken in the ocean and thus destroy evidence that the fish had earlier been captured and marked by game wardens in particular sites. However, cooperative Danish fishermen have quietly shipped evidence—in the form of tags—to authorities seeking to restrain the salmon slaughter.

Meanwhile the catch in the few remaining great rivers of North America and Europe has been declining at a precipitate and disastrous rate. This trend does not affect Denmark, which has had no salmon rivers of its own for years.

Two organizations exist which could in theory end this tragic situation—the International Commission for Northwest Atlantic Fisheries and the Northeast Atlantic Fisheries Commission. Unfortunately, no country opposing any proposal favored by either commission is obliged to observe it—and the Danes don't.

Thus, although ideology has been ignored in favor of ecology, and the United States, Canada and Spain have joined the Soviet Union, Poland and Rumania in the salmon-preservation fight. Denmark refuses. In this it is supported by West Germany, a far less important fishing factor.

There is really no way of bringing the Danes to heel except by concerted action. Today an opportunity for such action exists. Denmark is seeking membership in the European Common Market. Surely its application can be shelved until Copenhagen agrees to cease deep-sea salmon netting, a process which probably doesn't earn more than $3 million extra for the country anyway.

It is reasonable to impose this kind of penalty on ecological crime just as—which I have previously written—it would be reasonable to defer final action on Britain's admission to the market until the British, like the Europeans they hope to join, start treating dogs like human beings and let them freely in and out of their islands so long as their medical and travel papers are in order. Salmon and dogs somehow make mankind's life more tolerable and should be treated accordingly.

SALE OF AMERICAN FEED GRAINS TO THE SOVIET UNION

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SEBELIUS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, the recent sale of American feed grains to the Soviet Union gives the United States access to one of the largest grain markets in the world—Eastern Europe and the U.S.S.R. This contact and the "statesmanship" decision by maritime leaders to load grain on foreign-flag vessels could ultimately provide grain producers with the best of both worlds—planting freedom and flexibility and elimination of price-depressing domestic surpluses. The net result could bring a fair price for farm products and adequate compensation for the farmer's investment, industry, and productivity.

In agriculture today, we are experiencing a real dilemma. Farmers, of course, want planting freedom and management flexibility to harvest full bounty from their available land resources. Yet, farm prices are a painful reminder that overproduction severely depresses prices and farm income.

We can resolve this dilemma and improve farm prices by increasing demand through expanded markets at home and abroad. In my home State of Kansas, I have been most impressed by the cooperative efforts of the Kansas Association of Wheat Growers, the Kansas Wheat Commission, and Far-Mar-Co., Inc., regarding wheat utilization and domestic market development. This intensive research under the dynamic leadership of Dr. Wayne Henry and Ben Garrish will mean expanded markets and more extensive utilization of wheat and wheat products.

It is most unfortunate that this landmark development regarding exports to the Soviet Union has prompted controversy and undue criticism. I feel that the editorial "Export Criticism Errs," which recently appeared in the Southwestern Miller places the terms and impact of this agreement in proper perspective. With unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I submit this well-written editorial to the attention of my colleagues. The editorial follows:

[From the Southwestern Miller, November 30, 1971]

EXPORT CRITICISM ERRS

A silly by-product of the sale of American feed grains to the Soviet Union is the tempest in a teapot over whether prices on Commodity Credit Corp.-owned oats and barley in effect represent subsidization of a Communist livestock and poultry industry. The furor mainly involves gross misinterpretations, along with ignorance of the importance of export markets to agriculture and the economy. The basic facts are that the C.C.C. has sold to exporters 24,000,000 bushels of oats and 39,000,000 bushels of barley at f.o.b. prices that are less than the domestic market. The levels at which the C.C.C. sold the grains were very much in line with competitive prices from other selling countries and were below domestic quotations primarily because the latter are elevated by the availability of price support loans. Without delving into the difficult issue of whether those world prices equal the cost of production for U.S. farmers, it is correct to state that American prices are above the world market, rather than that the world market is below domestic quotations.

It is recognition of that actuality that is largely responsible for the export subsidy program. Even though open market loan rates on wheat were reduced at the start of the certificate program in 1964 to a level that more nearly reflected world prices than in the past, a subsidy has been paid almost daily since then with the primary aim of facilitating competitive offerings of U.S. wheat and flour. Actually, no subsidy payments have been made on feed grains for a number of years, because U.S. corn and

grain sorghum, the major feed grain exports, have in effect set world levels. Oats and especially barley meet greater competition than those grains in world markets, and that is why the C.C.C. elected to make them available at below-domestic market levels.

Truly incredible in the carping at the Soviet trade is the foggy thinking that would equate the sale with subsidization of the expansion of livestock and poultry production in the Soviet Union and the assertion that this is somehow part of a Communist plot. "Is it in our interest in the long run to subsidize the expansion of the Russian livestock and poultry industry?" asks Representative Neal Smith of Iowa in an unbelievable display of naivete, concerning the very developments that would most benefit the fabled corn growers of his state. The possible emergence of a thriving livestock and poultry economy in the Soviet Union and other Bloc nations is one of the most exciting dreams of American feed grain producers. The entire effort of the U. S. Feed Grains Council, as an organization charged with the responsibility of expanding U. S. feedstuffs exports, is directed toward stimulating such developments in many parts of the world. If the Soviet sale represents just a small step toward turning an underdeveloped livestock and poultry system in the Soviet Bloc into one approaching a developed one, it is an event of tremendous importance to the future success of American feed grain farmers.

Some of the criticism of the feed grain business also overlooks one very important facet of export trade. Even though barley and oats have been made available to U. S. exporters at levels below the domestic market, the fact that this country will gain the foreign exchange involved in the sale is a very major benefit.

If one can find amusement in misguided criticism, the most hilarious part of the Soviet sale criticism is the implication that somehow American consumers are being discriminated against because U. S. grain is being made available to Soviet users at lower prices than in this country. On the basis of the benefits for the American export potential and the U. S. position in world markets, that argument is fallacious in the extreme. It would be well for those who voice such concern to turn their attention to an example of indisputable discrimination against American consumers, as posed by the wheat processor certificate levy. The users of feed grains in the United States may not be able to obtain oats and barley as cheaply as their Soviet counterparts, but in the case of wheat foods, the cost is raised by a tax of 75 cents on each bushel ground. Therein lies complete disregard of the American consumer.

MINORITY VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE HENRY B. GONZALEZ ON H.R. 11309

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have today filed the following dissenting views with the Committee on Banking and Currency.

This bill provides the administration unprecedented economic powers; no President in peace or war has asked for, much less been given the kind of power authorized in H.R. 11309. What is more distressing is that no cogent, positive, convincing case has been made in support of this legislation. Your committee has heard much about a crisis, but not much about what it consists of and how it should be met. The extensive testimony of an array of economic experts served only to underline that there is a deep and troubling conflict of opinion over the causes and cures of our economic woes.

If Congress enacts this legislation it will be taking only a stab in the dark. There is no persuasive testimony that the new economic policy is or will be any more effective than the once-touted and now forgotten game plan. Considering the enormity of the administration's past failures in economic policy, I believe that Congress has a positive responsibility to review and help shape future economic policy. But the Congress is reacting in a floundering way to the crisis, and apparently is unable or unwilling to evolve a policy of its own to replace the jerry-built apparatus that was created after the collapse of the disastrous game plan. This is sad and deplorable; the battering and bruising the body politic absorbed from the game plan should have strengthened our resolve to undertake a firm and positive hand in economic policy. Yet we are being asked to rubberstamp an unprecedented grant of power to an administration whose capacity for error in economic matters appears to be exceeded only by its stubborn determination to stay on a disastrous course.

There can be no doubt that this country is in serious economic trouble. For the past 2½ years we have had persistent, excessive unemployment. At the last report unemployment had crept up to a rate of 6 percent, meaning that 5.2 million Americans are trying to find jobs—with no success. If one considered the number of people who have simply given up looking for work, as have many of those unemployed for a year or more—and there are many of these—there may well be close to 9 million people who need jobs and cannot find them. Moreover, even as the rate of unemployment has increased we have had increasing trade deficits, a stagnant stock market, and a host of other symptoms that clearly spell recession. Ironically, though, we have had rising prices throughout this recession, and as matters grew worse the rate of inflation actually increased. All of this, which the administration dubbed a new type of inflation led to the junking of the game plan, so bravely advertised, with its monthly promises that things would get better. Be patient, we were told, better times are just around the corner. Then came August 15, a whole new ball game, as Secretary Connally puts it, and a demand for unprecedented economic powers.

We are told that wage controls are vitally important, but there are at least 5.2 million Americans, and probably closer to 9 million, to whom wage controls are meaningless—because they have no wages to control. The labor force will grow by a million people in the next 12 months. Moreover, we will be reducing our Armed Forces by an almost equal number, and the President has sworn to cut civilian Government employment by a hundred thousand. Therefore in order just to keep the number of unemployed from growing, the economy of this country must produce something like 2 million jobs in the coming year. This would require an economic growth rate of roughly three times what this country had from August 1970 to August 1971. The current economic indices do not show that we are enjoying anything like that kind of growth today, and even though some private forecasters are hoping for an increase of about 9 percent in the gross national product for the next year, this is at best only a hope based on the happiest possible turn of events. Even if that rate of growth is achieved—and there is no sign now that it will be—the number of people unemployed in this country a year from now will be about the same as it is today. Not even the most optimistic forecast predicts an unemployment rate of less than 5.5 percent a year hence.

If the kind of growth rate that the administration obviously hopes for is going to be achieved, it will require pushing the economic accelerator right to the floor. To the President and his advisers this means allowing great tax writeoffs, running a huge deficit and hopefully, holding the price lid down by means of artificial controls. It also means building a kind of inflationary time bomb; and the risk that the prices that do not go up now will very likely go up explosively once the lid is taken off the economic pressure cooker envisioned in the economic policy of which this bill is a part. It is in fact not so much a policy as a riverboat gambler's bet—and the stakes are very high indeed.

Unfortunately for your committee, the economic policy is tied into the tax reduction package. Unless the House, or its committees, examine the whole package of tax writeoffs plus controls, we will see only its parts. Since we have not considered the package as a whole, we are being asked to approve a program of which we have no more understanding of the true shape than the proverbial blind men feeling an elephant. The administration seems to be hoping that by allowing an unprecedented deficit of $3 billion or so, following on the heels of the likewise unprecedented $26 million deficit for the last fiscal year, plus unprecedented tax writeoffs for business will make the economy grow like tomatoes in a hothouse, and that price controls will keep inflation down to something like 3 percent a year. Three percent annual inflation may be less than what the game plan accustomed us to, but it is anything other than price stability. As any poor man can can tell you. The poor, the old, the unemployed, the minorities—all hoping for better days—will just have to keep waiting, under this plan. Be that as it may, this bill is only part of the economic policy we are being asked to approve, and we have never examined the whole thing as in total. The sum may be lesser than its parts, or greater—and we have a duty to know. We cannot act responsibly unless and until we at least have a full view of the program.

The bill before the House anticipates a need for controls that would be brought about by tax cuts and a deficit of gargantuan proportions. But he have seen neither the total of the tax cuts, nor the real spending plans, and cannot know in fact what the fiscal situation is. Neither do we know what the monetary policy of the Nation is. Nor do we know if the controls asked for will be needed. Indeed recent history should cause Congress to question whether there was a policy in

the past or even is one now. If we are in our present straits because we have failed to act on economic policy as a whole, we may well simply be repeating past mistakes by acting once again in a piecemeal fashion.

It is possible that the new economic policy, no less than the late game plan, is based on false assumptions. Some experts before your committee argued that this was precisely the case, and it is a possibility well worth thinking about. The price of being wrong twice in economic policy may be too much to bear.

The possibility that the new policy may be just as wronghead as the last, and that the administration may again doggedly refuse to accept change until well after disaster has struck, leads me to conclude that Congress ought to reserve to itself powers to review the policy at an early date. There can be no harm in this; if matters are going well, we need take no action other than to grant a further extension of powers. But if matters are going from bad to worse, we could act to revise policy as needed. The administration already has the power to follow its new policy through April 1972. By that time we should be able to clearly see what the policy will and will not do. We could, in the early months of 1972, review the situation and either extend existing powers granted the President or revise them. This bill, however, extends those powers and even broadens them, through 1973. This means purely and simply that H.R. 11309 will make impossible any positive congressional action next spring if the economy continues to perform below expectations. There is no reason for Congress to thus abdicate its responsibilities—especially in light of bitter recent experience in matters economic.

Some economists argue that a wage-price freeze will only postpone the symptoms of inflation, rather than solve the underlying problems. The President himself has argued against a freeze policy, on this same ground. The obvious question we should ask, but which has not been raised, is what happens when the price lid comes off. The object of this new economic policy is to create a very fast pace of growth, and by any standard economic theory, this means that wage and price pressures will increase, not decline, during the coming year. This suggests that if inflation is going to be brought under control, increasingly stringent actions may be taken by the administration to keep the lid on during the projected acceleration of economic growth. This in turn might serve only to aggravate the long-range problem of inflation, for the lid has to come off, or the pressure decreased, sooner or later.

If price pressures do build up during the expected spurt of growth we can expect not only more stringent regulations than we now have, but more elaborate ones as well. We would do well to bear in mind Benjamin Cohen's iron law of economic controls:

> To be effective, controls must reproduce at a rate faster than that at which means are found for avoiding them.

Thus, although the country is assured that the President wants no maze of regulations, if economic controls are going to be used and made to work, the regulations and redtape will multiply at an exceedingly rapid pace notwithstanding his promises to the contrary. It is certainly possible that the projected economic growth will never occur, but if it does, we will surely see Cohen's law in full operation, to the discomfiture of one and all.

Contemplating this likelihood of regulations multiplying geometrically, and the equal likelihood of ever more difficult enforcement, I question the wisdom of making the Internal Revenue Service the economic policeman of the Nation. The primary purpose of the Internal Revenue Service ought to be administration of the tax laws, and this should be its exclusive responsibility. To add wage and price control enforcement to its powers would concentrate too much authority within the Internal Revenue Service.

When President Kennedy had his famous confrontation with the steel industry over price increases, he dispatched an emissary to the steel executives who merely raised the possibility that the tax accounts of the steel industry would have to be reviewed if the objectionable price increases were not rescinded. The prospect of a prolonged harassment of the Internal Revenue Service was enough to cause the now famous price rollback. This tactic might have been clever, in light of the fact that the President then had no authority to enforce his desires to roll back steel prices, but it also demonstrates clearly that having the taxman for a wage-price policeman will make threats and intimidation a key weapon in the economic arsenal of the Government. There will be few who dare question the taxman, no matter how arbitrary or capricious his acts.

Intimidation has no place in or out of Government, and I believe that wages and prices can be stabilized effectively enough without assigning the Internal Revenue Service to the task. Moreover, I believe that the IRS has quite enough to do to collect the taxes of the Government, without being burdened with a task for which it is not equipped or prepared to handle.

Phase I of the new economic policy produced an immense number of inequities, as your committee heard at great length. Some of these inequities have been reversed, others ameliorated and others continued, under phase II. The experience we have thus far indicates that Congress ought to provide for clearer guidelines for the economic policy than we have to date. This bill unfortunately would simply give the administration carte blanche; we have no assurance whatever the gross inequities we have already seen would be corrected at this or any other future time, and the bill provides no redress. This legislation simply passes the buck, in the pious hope that somebody, somewhere, at sometime will take care of the most glaring grievances and errors. We have readily available a gage of how fatuous this is. Far from making it easy for citizens to appeal from decisions of the economic cops, the administration bill would affirm everything that was done, right or wrong, and create procedure that would make appeals difficult or impossible.

Partisan claims and counterclaims have so obscured the real issues involved in this bill that it was virtually impossible for your committee to act objectively. Some Members frankly said that they were casting their votes according to instructions, which to me meant that they were supporting the bill regardless of their own judgments. The economy does not belong to any one political party; as citizens we all have an equal stake in it and concern for it. We each have equal responsibility, and partisanship has no place in a national issue as complex and vital as the economic policy.

Yet political considerations have been so pervasive that even simple procedural questions ensnared your committee in acrimonious disputes. And if such pettifoggery dominated the minor questions, thoughtful Members will readily concede that any meaningful examination of the bill, let alone the assumptions on which it rests, was impossible. It is no mere partisan matter to question the content, intent, and foundations the economic policies advocated by the President; if the emperor has no clothes he will appear naked to his courtiers and enemies alike.

We have a serious duty and heavy responsibility for economic policy. This bill is an abdication of duty and a complete failure of responsibility.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation.

Americans have long taken pride in the natural beauty of this Nation. According to the American Forestry Association, the oldest living trees in the world are reputed to be the bristlecone pines, the majority of which are found growing in California.

THE OEO-CHILD DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. VEYSEY) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House today could potentially affect the lives of more Americans than any other piece of legislation in this Congress. Whether the bill will be able to deliver what it promises, however, is doubtful. In its present form I think it will not.

I am concerned that important parts of both the OEO and child development sectors of this bill are so complicated and unrealistic that they are self-defeating. At the same time, the evaluation section of the bill has been so weakened that any chance of improving the various programs as they proceed seems remote at best. We are asked to authorize billions of dollars, and yet the bill has no effec-

tive mechanism to assure that these programs are effective.

I specifically question those aspects of the child development system which require the selection of a multitude of city applicants as prime sponsors to run a comprehensive plan in a given area. Small school districts across the Nation are recognizing the impossibilities of operating without consolidation. As the cost of education skyrockets, there are now a thousand consolidations every year.

Instead of 50 broad statewide plans, we are asked to develop a huge Federal bureacracy to analyze the overlapping applications of up to 40,000 communities. The needless duplication and waste involved is enormous. But more important, we are preventing ourselves from spending the money on the more effective programs. I think it is vital to give the Secretary the discretion to decide how large an area should be covered by a comprehensive plan.

We need child development, not bureacracy development.

I am also concerned over the proposed structure of the Legal Services Corporation. In California we have learned that more experience is needed before we institutionalize a lawyer-dominated corporation such as proposed in the bill. My friends in the legal fraternity are experts at accommodation and compromise. I am certain they can work effectively in cooperation with the Governors of the various States when they want to. In California, the Governor's veto has been important in bringing about accommodation.

My third objection to the OEO-child development bill, in its present form, is that the effective evaluation requirement which the House Education and Labor Committee included in its version was gutted in the conference.

I have been amazed to learn how little we have gotten for our $11 billion investment in OEO to date. We know there have been effective and successful programs, and there have also been failures. But no one in Congress is certain which are which, and there is no systematic approach to eliminate the ineffective programs.

The section on evaluation in the House bill, which I authored, would have required that the Director develop and publish standards for evaluation at the time programs are started, and then evaluate the effectiveness of each program and project as it proceeds. The conference accepted this, but for some reason they rejected the commonsense requirement that the Director take the results of these evaluations into account when he recommends future funding of various programs and projects.

Striking such a requirement not only emasculates the evaluation, it tells program managers that politics, not performance, is what counts at OEO. I cannot accept it.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the OEO conference report, and urge my colleagues to oppose it with me.

SPAIN HONORS WILLIAM M. HICKEY

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on December 1, William M. Hickey of New York was honored at the Embassy of Spain through the presentation by the Spanish Ambassador of the Gran Cruz del Orden de Merito Civil for his activities over the years in supporting the cause of making Spanish culture and American indebtedness to Spain known to the American people. In his response to Ambassador Arguelles' remarks, Mr. Hickey made a brief statement particularly referring to his efforts on behalf of the Spanish Institute in New York City. In these days when good relations with nations of Spanish background are so vital to the United States, I believe that Mr. Hickey's remarks have a particular pertinence and that they should have a broader audience.

With appreciation for Mr. Hickey's efforts over the years in this vital field and for his share in bringing the Spanish Institute to a high peak of effectiveness, I insert his remarks in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues.

Señor Embajador, Señora, invitados de honor, amigos.

Siento una profunda alegría al recibir este Gran Cruz del Orden de Mérito Civil, y agradezco este gran honor que Ud., Señor Embajador, y su gobierno, me ha concedido.

Me gustaría dirigirme a Uds. completamente en español, pero aunque lo hablo, no con fluidez, porque no tengo apportunidades suficientes para practicarlo en Nueva York.

Para este razón, y con el gentil permiso de Uds., quiero continuar estos breves comentarios en inglés.

It would seem appropriate on this occasion to tell you something about the Spanish Institute and how I become interested in things Spanish, and what I foresee for the Institute.

Some 23 years ago, in 1948, the World Bank had recently been organized and was receiving applications for loans from electric utilities, particularly in Mexico, but as yet had no staff to analyze them.

At the suggestion of some New York banks, the then President of the World Bank asked me to go to Mexico and report to him on these applications. My directors allowed me to do this work and the loans were made.

This was interesting work, but more important was the discovery of the rich Spanish heritage in the architecture, history, language and culture in that fascinating country, followed by studies and trips to Spain.

Then in 1954 I met a young vice president in the National City Bank who asked me to be a director in The Spanish Institute, which he was then organizing. His associates in the bank and many friends all say "There's only one George Moore." No more need to be said.

For nearly 11 years now I've been Chairman of The Institute. It has been an interesting and rewarding experience.

The Institute is devoted to bringing about a greater understanding in the U.S. of Spain and Spanish America and Spanish culture.

At the outset some 20 years ago I was struck by the lack of appreciation in the U.S. of the very important part the Spanish played in the history of the U.S.

This had not always been true, however. At the turn of the century Spain, Spanish art, Spanish history and Spanish literature went through a period of tremendous popularity here.

Witness the founding of the Hispanic Society of America in New York, a unique institution which has the greatest prestige among Spanish and Spanish-speaking people all over the world.

Our Institute was founded in more recent years and went through some difficult times when there was no understanding of the present Spanish government. This era has now passed and there is a much better feeling towards the extraordinary achievements of the Spanish Chief of State.

However, there is still much to be done and the Spanish Institute's aim is to bring as many scholars, artists and business people from Spain and Spanish America as possible before New York audiences.

As far as scholars are concerned we aim to be the voice of the Hispanic Society and to convey their message to a much greater number of people.

We hope to give the Spanish-speaking population of New York, who have, as do all newly arrived ethnic groups, difficulties in living in this metropolis, a new sense of the greatness of their heritage.

After all, St. Augustine, Florida is the oldest city in the U.S. And in it is located the oldest house of worship, wherein side by side are the coats of arms of Spain and the U.S., symobilizing the friendship of these two nations and their joint dedication to preserving the values of western civilization.

Toledo, Ohio was named after Toledo, Spain, as a result of inspiration from the Spanish writings of Washington Irving.

Of particular interest to me was learning the full name of the largest city in California. Many here call it "L.A." In San Francisco I understand some call it "Inferior California." But the full name is "El Puebla de Nuestra Señora, La Reina de Los Angeles de Porciúncula." To probably 1,000 people I have asked this question over the years. Only one, a professor of history at St. Louis University, knew the answer.

Yet, how much this name holds in the way of language, culture and history.

I mention this because it is illustrative of how much there is to do here in developing understanding and appreciation of Spain and Spanish America.

This we hope The Spanish Institute can accomplish in the years to come.

We are most grateful for the constant support of our Consul General in New York, Mr. Martin Gamero, the Spanish Tourist Office and this Embassy in Washington.

KEMENY ON NATIONAL TRANSPORATION

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, in his convocation address at the opening of the 202d college year, President John Kemeny of Dartmouth College characteristically addressed himself to a question of great national import and one which also had significance for the community of Hanover, N.H., and the surrounding area.

His proposal that we should turn our sights to the present unsatisfactory operation of our system of national transportation and dedicate our energies and resources to bringing it to an acceptable condition of public utility is timely and appropriate.

It is the hope that Dr. Kemeny's suggestion will be heeded and acted upon by those with the responsibility of doing so. I have advocated such a course for a long time and I hope that support for

such action will increase with the interest of such eloquent advocates as Dr. Kemeny.

For the interest of my colleagues I append Dr. Kemeny's address herewith:

THE PRESIDENT'S CONVOCATION ADDRESS

We celebrate the 100th anniversary of Thayer School at a time when it is fashionable to blame science and technology for all the ills of the world. Yet it is my conviction that the fundamental problem is our total inability to *manage* science and technology and to bring them to bear on the problems of society.

I would like to discuss this problem in terms of a concrete example, and I have chosen our national transportation system. My first observation is that we do not have a national transportation system. We have a historical accident compounded by shortsightedness, greed, and political manipulation.

We once had a great railroad network, and today at a time when many nations have rejuvenated railroad systems that serve as a matter of national pride, our passenger system is essentially dead. It was killed through greed. It was killed by the taking of profits without ploughing them back into maintenance and improvements. It was killed through gross mismanagement. It was killed through unions that became so greedy and shortsighted that in the long run they will put most of their members out of work. It was killed by a national policy that subsidized all the competitors of the railroads and neglected the railroads themselves.

Next we built an air transportation system, and in the beginning we saw great improvement. It is certainly wonderful to be able to fly coast to coast in five hours. For a while we seemed to have a policy of building up an air transportation system to serve all communities, including this one. But then profits fell; we lost interest in subsidizing air transportation, and we found more and more communities cut off from the national system.

Through these years the growth in the number of airplanes brought about new problems. We created congestion in the air which should have been completely predictable. We created sonic booms making life difficult in many parts of the country. We created the problem of moving thousands of people through highly congested cities to the terminals that service the airplanes. And, when all these problems confronted us, what great national plan was proposed to solve them? It was proposed that we build a supersonic transport plane which would produce greater sonic booms, which would mean moving more people through highly congested cities, and which would have a negligible effect on the problems that really worry most air travelers.

Take a typical trip by airplane from Boston to New York. From the time when you leave your home in a suburb of Boston, you fight through the traffic to get to the airport. You wait until you can get on the plane. You then have a short and usually pleasant flight to New York. You then wait for your baggage, try to get a cab, and fight even worse traffic getting into Manhattan. Of all of these, the only part that works well is the actual flight; and therefore it seems to me that if we are going to improve the air transportation system, one should work on those problems that are pressing on all people and not on a major new project that is going to be of benefit to only a handful of people.

We also built a great highway system, and this too had many benefits. Indeed we are fortunate in this part of the country; it is safer and less frustrating to drive on our great interstate routes than on the roads that existed a decade ago. I'm sure that students find the trip to Smith both faster and more enjoyable as a result of it. And in addition, in Vermont and New Hampshire you can enjoy the scenic beauty that accompanies these interstate roads. And yet these highways created problems of their own. With some one hundred million cars on the road, the problem of pollution in the nation is threatening the survival of mankind. At the same time we are using at an alarming rate natural resources of the world which can never be replenished. And while it is wonderful to have interstate roads when you live in Hanover, New Hampshire, they are threatening to bring death to the inner parts of several of our oldest and best known cities.

We have reached a stage where the main means of transportation (because we don't have a public system) is the private car. If you look at two examples of the effects of millions of private cars on cities, you can see the problem that confront us. Let me first take Los Angeles. It is a city that boasts of the greatest freeways—engineering miracles on which you can speed at 70 miles an hour right through the center of the city. I remember our experience the last time I was in Los Angeles. We went bumper to bumper on one of these 70-mile-an-hour roads at a speed somewhat slower than that which would have been possible with a horse-drawn carriage several generations ago. At the same time I witnessed thousands of cars fuming into the already smog-filled air. I saw the tremendous waste in resources. If my estimates were right, we averaged one and a half people per car, all going in the same direction for a stretch of twenty miles. I couldn't help thinking that there must be some rational way for providing a mass transportation system that would replace this completely haphazard, accidental method of transporting the majority of our people.

In New York the problem is much worse. I went to high school in New York City and it is a city I once loved. But since that time everything that man could do to ruin it has been done. It once had, believe it or not, a great subway system. It once had good bus service. It once had commuter railroads that people enjoyed riding. Instead of that, Manhattan today is the greatest traffic jam in the nation, with its streets permanently torn-up for improvements.

We seem to cater, in our planning of city transportation, to the desires and the whims of the rich and the selfish. We ignore the needs of the poor and those who do not have a sufficient voice in the affairs of our nation; and yet justice is done in the end, because while we make life almost impossible for the poor, in the not-so-long run we succeed in making life impossible for the rich and the selfish as well.

Let me mention one example of the way cities make major decisions. I happened to be in New York at the time of the great controversy as to whether to finance subway construction by means of raising the fare on subways or raising the toll to get into the city by car. This went on for a very long time. It would seem to any impartial observer that the solution was clear. If you raise the fare on the subway, then fewer people will take the subway, and it will be harder to maintain it and justify it, and you are going to encourage more cars to come into the city, to compound an already almost hopeless problem. If, instead, you raised the tolls on bridges and tunnels, you might encourage more people to take an interest in the public transportation system, and you might remove a few thousand of the cars that now pollute and jam up the city. You might even consider something drastic such as a $5 or $10 fee to get into Manhattan, or possibly a prohibition of all private cars in the central city.

I don't have to tell you what the outcome was. Subway fares were raised.*

When one looks at city planning, one sees cities that still have a hope, except for certain areas that are traditional bottlenecks where traffic jams up. And then you hear that three more great skyscrapers are built—and where are skyscrapers built? Right in the middle of the worst traffic jam.

The cumulative effect of all this lack of planning and shortsightedness, I claim, goes way beyond simply the discomfort that has been given so much publicity. It seems to me that we spend a major portion of our life rushing around like maniacs. I have great envy for some of my predecessors who had the luxury of taking a beautiful train and traveling leisurely across the country to visit alumni clubs, or possibly even taking a boat to Europe. That has been replaced by taking the fastest plane, getting out to the airport as quickly as possible, flying into the next city, being met there and rushed to your next appointment. And there are thousands of us, hundreds of thousands if not millions of us, who live our lives according to a schedule like that. We arrive at work tired and irritated, and therefore it is not surprising if we are unpleasant to our colleagues and associates.

In the process we destroy the quality of our environment and we use up our natural resources without any thought at all that other generations may follow us. And yet all the science and technology that is needed to alleviate this great problem and other great problems of society is known today. But we seem to be totally unable to manage it and to bring it to bear on the immediate problems of society. Somehow we can't take our transportation system and try to look at it as a whole. We fail to examine the interaction among the various components; the side effects, outside of the simple questions of how long it takes for a car or a train to get from one point to the other; the effect on the lives of human beings. We fail to examine the psychological impact of this tremendous rush and frustration; the effect on property, on scenic beauty, on the nature of the world we live in. Somehow we do not seem to be able to put this together into a sensible plan on which we can act.

Reaching the moon was a great achievement for man, and I for one am glad and proud that mankind has achieved this. What I can't understand is why we seem to be totally unable to mount a similar effort, for example, to design a reasonable transportation system for the United States. But perhaps this is because between earth and moon you do not find one hundred different political subdivisions. Perhaps it is because there is no opportunity for get-rich-quick schemes on the moon at the present time. Perhaps it is because we were not asked in this to make direct personal sacrifices for the betterment of mankind. Or perhaps it was because there once was a President of the United tSates who inspired the entire nation in a great goal and in a great concerted national effort that took us to the moon.

Thayer School enters its second century at a critical moment in the history of our country. If we continue the present path of inability to manage the great resources and great scientific and technological know-how available to us, we will witness the decline and fall of a great nation. But if we learn how to channel the miracles of modern technology for the benefit of mankind, we could be at the threshold of a new golden age.

Members of the Class of 1975, the future is in the hands of your generation.

* The reference is the creation of the 30 cent fare, not the current controversy.

DECEMBER 7, 1941—REFLECTIONS ON GREATNESS

(Mr. FLOWERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, who among us needs to be reminded of the

significance of December 7 in our Nation's history? For some, this date may have only historical importance, but for most of us there was a deep personal or family involvement in the relentless struggle that followed Pearl Harbor. In any event, it is altogether fitting and proper that we pause and reflect on this 30th anniversary of the precipitous beginning of World War II for America.

First to my mind is the memory of the untold sacrifice and suffering of so many fellow citizens. These were indeed the "times that try men's souls." From the near national graveyard that was Pearl Harbor—symbolized forever in the battleship *Arizona* lying at the bottom of her channel—to the battlefields of North Africa, Europe, and the islands of the Pacific, sacrifice and suffering were more the rule than the exception for Americans in the early forties. I am reminded of Edmund Burke, a great British statesman of yesteryear, when he said:

> All that is necessary for the forces of evil to win in the world is for enough good men to do nothing.

Fortunately, for the world of today and tomorrow, there were "enough good men" in 1941, and let us not ever forget that many of them were Americans.

Next to mind is duty. Duty might have seemed an unnecessary word for the times because a whole nation subscribed to the concept. In the words of Robert E. Lee at another critical period in our history:

> Duty is the sublimest word in our language. Do your duty in all things. You cannot do more. You should never wish to do less.

The spark of national greatness was certainly reignited during this era. While barely emerging from the stress of the great depression of the thirties, the United States was thrust onto the center stage as the only hope for a free world. And the call was answered with a sense of national commitment never matched before or since. The task undertaken was not to be an easy one, nor was the outcome for our Nation certain when World War II began, or at many stages through its perilous course.

Those immortal words of Thomas Paine rang as true on December 7, 1941, as they did in Revolutionary times:

> Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict the more glorious the triumph. What we obtain too cheap, we esteem too lightly: 'tis dearness only that gives everything its value. Heaven knows how to set a proper price upon its goods; and it would be strange indeed, if so celestial an article as freedom should not be highly rated.

So as we reflect upon this day 30 years ago, let us remember the times as they were—the sacrifice and suffering—the call of duty that thank God was answered—and the greatness that was and is the United States of America. And let us be proud to be Americans on this 7th day of December 1971.

SPEAKING UP FOR THE MIDDLE CLASS IN FOREST HILLS

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the controversy in Forest Hills over a low-income housing project is not a parochial issue. In the coming decade, practically every city and suburb in our country must confront the enormous problem of providing housing opportunities for low-income families while maintaining the stability of existing middle-income communities. No one should pretend that there are cheap or easy solutions to this problem.

I support the concept of scatter site housing, and as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee having jurisdiction over Federal housing programs, I am cosponsoring legislation that would establish sensible and equitable incentives for scatter site housing in the suburbs as well as the cities. But I do not support the Forest Hills project unless its present size is reduced. This is also the position of Congressman BEN ROSENTHAL and an overwhelming number of the Forest Hills residents who he represents.

The city's insistence on the largeness of this project—840 units in three 24-story buildings and nearly twice the size of any other project planned or built for a middle-income neighborhood in New York City—makes the Forest Hills situation unique and potentially damaging to the cause of scatter site housing. A concentration of this many low-income people within a middle-class neighborhood intensifies the fears and difficulties of economic integration.

If you have worked hard all your life, as most Forest Hills residents have, to give your family a safe home and a decent education, you rightfully worry about the possible deterioration of your neighborhood. And it is an understandable fear that a large infusion of poverty stricken people, many on welfare, will pose a threat to the way of life in a middle-class community. Like all New Yorkers, the residents of Forest Hills are alarmed about the increase in street crime and school violence. To characterize this concern as " racism" is an outrageous charge that evades what is really going on in the city and unnecessarily polarizes New Yorkers.

No one can seriously deny that the crime rate in our ghettos is higher than elsewhere—particularly among the multiproblem families on welfare. If anyone doubts this, let them ask a resident of Greenwich Village, a liberal community, what happened after many welfare families were placed in hotels in that area; let them ask what happened in Brooklyn Heights under similar circumstances—the increase in crime in both areas is well known.

The city itself recognizes that many welfare families create special problems for public housing. HDA Administrator Walsh has reported that 40 percent of the new tenants taken into New York City Housing Authority projects last year were welfare clients. Chairman Golar of the housing authority has said:

> We're taking in huge numbers of families with terrible social problems.

Crime, addiction, and vandalism plague public housing projects throughout the country.

But the Forest Hills controversy is more than just a fight over public housing—it is a middle class revolt against a city administration that has forgotten or given up on the middle class. The waste, ineptitude, and highhandedness of the city administration has destroyed much of the good will the city needs to win acceptance of its scatter site housing program. One cannot expect middle class New Yorkers to rally to the cause of the city if the city administration scorns them, ignores them or plays favorites at their expense. As one man recently told me—

> We get nothing for our money in the middle class. I mean we work hard and they walk all over us.

It is no wonder then that the middle class has turned to the concept of community control in order to gain some hand in determining the way of life in their neighborhoods.

However, community control does not mean every middle class neighborhood is opposed to low income housing. It is bitterly ironic that the city administration is resisting the pleas of the Forest Hills community to reduce the amount of low-income housing units while simultaneously refusing the demands of Yorkville, another middle class community, for more low-income housing. The middle class will, no doubt, draw the resentful conclusion that community control may work for the rich or the poor but not for them.

If the city administration continues to ignore middle class needs and belittle middle class fears, then the middle class will continue to leave the city and we will have gained nothing even if we build 10 Forest Hills. And tragically, the poor will suffer most. No great strides can be made toward securing the economic and social progress of New York City if it is not founded upon sympathy for, and the legitimacy of middle class aspirations as well as those of the poor. The city's refusal to scale down Forest Hills so as to reduce the number of low-income families only sets off one group against the other to the detriment of us all.

The city administration can still rectify its error by sitting down with the community and working out a reasonable settlement. It is not too late for the city to revive the art of compromise which has kept New York together through decades of enormous change.

BUREAUCRACY

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, one of the jobs of a Member of Congress is to assist constituents in cutting through bureaucratic redtape. Everyone of us, I am sure, has had the occasion to write a constituent and tell him that, "Yes, the Government made a mistake and to rectify the error, a check will be forthcoming for x number of dollars." Often this can amount to hundreds of dollars.

As pleased as I am to be able to give constituents this good news, and as

pleased as I am that mistakes can be found and agencies are flexible enough to correct them, every time a case like this comes up, I am plagued by the question of how many similar mistakes are being made and not being uncovered. I cannot help but worry how many people are not getting their full benefits. And I wonder if the particular constituent had not had congressional assistance, whether the error would have been found.

I have recently had a case that reflects in frightening detail the chaos that seems to rule Government bureaucracies. In this case, involving the Social Security Administration, the news was not good. Every time I wrote to the Social Security Administration, a letter came back saying that my constituent owed even more money than before. To portray for our colleagues the dimensions of the confusion, including the issuance of duplicate checks, I would like to run through the chronology of this case.

I do this not so much to criticize the Social Security Administration, because I know they have a tremendous benefit program to administer under very trying circumstances, but rather to focus attention on a problem that is endemic to many Government bureaucracies. I believe it is important that the Congress seek effective administration of the programs it establishes and insure that sufficient manpower is allocated to do the job efficiently and with as few errors as possible. In the long run, this type of operation generally saves money, and, of course, is far preferable for the people involved.

Mrs. X's son first wrote to me in March 1971 to say that his mother's check had suddenly stopped coming. She had not received her January or February checks—providing at the age of 74 her principal means of support. I wrote the Social Security Administration about this on March 10.

On April 6 Social Security called my office to say that a check for the payment due was being sent immediately but instead of including payment for January and February only, the check included payment for November through February. The entire amount for the check was $561.40. Mrs. X would either have to return the check or she could keep the extra money and go without benefits for 2 months. The error had been made because of the expedited payment procedure.

On April 19, Mrs. X's son wrote to Social Security by registered letter asking where the check for the excess payment should be sent. He received no answer until July 1 when Social Security wrote to Mrs. X stating that Social Security records showed an overpayment of $696.40: The $561.40 check issued April 6, plus $135 in benefits that had been paid in 1969, but had to be returned because Mrs. X had earned more than $1,680 during that year.

On June 11 Mrs. X dutifully mailed Social Security a check in the amount of $696.40.

Three months later, on September 10, Mrs. X received a brief letter from Social Security stating the following:

Based on our records you received a check in the amount of $561.40; of this total amount $426.40 represents an overpayment. Please remit this amount.

Knowing that she had mailed Social Security a check in the amount of $696.40 on June 11, Mrs. X thought that Social Security now owed her $270. As Mrs. X's son said to me:

It's hard to believe, the letters are completely contradictory.

I directed an inquiry about this to Social Security.

Now I have received a letter stating that a further review of Mrs. X's record shows that between January 1969 and October 1971 she had been overpaid $1,080.60. Fortunately, the computer did show that she had returned $696.40 and indicated that she now owes an additional $384.20.

Needless to say, at this point Mrs. X and her son are at the point of despair. They do not understand what is happening and are, of course, fearful that next month the Social Security Administration might claim she owes still more money. In the meantime, her benefits have stopped, and she is without funds to either live on or to return the $384.20 Social Security claims she owes the Administration.

The letter of November 30 which I received from Social Security is itself confusing and suggests that at this point even Social Security may not know where the mistake was made. Social Security has simply added up the benefits Mrs. X was due, collected the checks issued in her name, and figured that the difference between the two is the overpayment. Their letter follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,
Flushing, N.Y., November 30, 1971.

Hon. EDWARD I. KOCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KOCH: This is in further reference to your inquiry to Commissioner Ball concerning Mrs. X, New York, N.Y. 10028.

We have undertaken a further review of Mrs. X's record and we find that she had been overpaid $1080.60 through October 1971. She refunded $696.40 reducing this overpayment to $384.20.

In our letter of June 11, 1971, we advised you that Mrs. X was overpaid $696.40. However, additional checks were subsequently issued to her which increased the amount of the overpayment.

Mrs. X was entitled to receive the following payments:

Payment for—	Monthly rate	Less monthly deduction for medical insurance premiums	Total payable
January 1969	$21.00	0	$21.00
February through May 1969	156.00	0	624.00
June through December 1969	156.00	$4.00	1,064.00
January through May 1970	179.40	4.00	877.00
June through December 1970	179.40	5.30	1,218.70
January through May 1971	197.40	5.30	960.50
June through October 1971	197.40	5.60	959.00
Total			5,724.20

She received the following payments:

Payment for—	Amount of check	Total paid
January through April 1969	$628.00	$628.00
May 1969 through February 1970	[1] 152.00	1,520.00
January through February 1970	46.80	46.80
March through May 1970	[1] 175.40	526.20
June through December 1970	[1] 174.10	1,218.70
January through February 1971	348.20	348.20
November 1970 through February 1971	561.40	561.40
March 1971	174.10	174.10
March 1971	174.10	174.10
April 1971	174.10	174.10
Apri 1971	174.10	174.10
January through April 1971	72.00	72.00
May 1971	36.00	36.00
May 1971	192.10	192.10
June through October 1971	191.80	959.00
Total		6,804.80
Less refund		696.40
Total		6,108.40
Mrs. X received	6,108.40	
She was entitled to	5,724.20	
Overpayment	384.20	

[1] Each month.

The law provides for the recovery of an overpayment through the withholding of subsequent benefits payable on the same record.

The law further provides that recovery of an overpayment may be waived where the overpaid person was without fault in causing the overpayment to be made, and recovery would either cause her financial hardship or be otherwise inequitable.

Mrs. X will be notified directly concerning her overpayment and the requirements for waiver. She will be advised of the month our recovery action will begin in the event that she does not request waiver.

Our usual procedure in recovering an overpayment is to withhold the overpaid person's full benefits until the entire amount has been repaid. However, if this causes Mrs. X financial difficulty, she may request that we withhold only a portion of her benefits each month for the extent of time necessary to recover the overpayment. If she wishes this partial adjustment she may request it by getting in touch with our West 125 Street, New York Office. Mrs. X may also make any other request concerning her overpayment at that office. The people there will be glad to assist her in every way possible.

Sincerely yours,

PASQUALE F. CALIGIURI,
Regional Representative.

The purpose of this is not to say that Mrs. X is being billed for more than she owes—for one, I cannot figure it out myself. And if I cannot figure it out, how can an elderly lady of 74 figure it out? And so we have a situation in which big Uncle Sam is tormenting—figuratively speaking—a little old lady. Indeed, when the son called my office this week about the Social Security Administration's latest letter, he broke down and wept and said he feared for his mother's health because of the strain and the anguish his mother was called on to bear.

Hopefully, for Mrs. X's sake, the Social Security Administration will be able to waive the recovery of the overpayment.

Mr. Speaker, last week President Nixon addressed the White House Conference on Aging and talked of new programs and benefits for the elderly. May I suggest that one thing he could do immediately—with no new legislation—is to give top priority to the Social Security Adminis-

tration and the processing of social security and medicare benefits. This would be received with gratitude by the elderly.

Having steered men to the moon and brought them home again with such navigational accuracy, we should have no doubt in our minds that we have the computer technology to meet the administrative demands of any benefit program.

NEEDED URGENTLY: SHORESIDE FACILITIES FOR THE U.S.S. "ARIZONA" MEMORIAL, PEARL HARBOR, HAWAII

(Mr. MATSUNAGA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 30th anniversary of the "Day of Infamy," the Japanese surprise attack on Pearl Harbor, which marked the beginning of World War II.

About 3,000 American lives were lost in that single initial battle. Our Navy was crippled. The most severe losses suffered by any one ship that day were suffered by the officers and men of the U.S.S. *Arizona*. Almost 1,200 men from the *Arizona* lost their lives that day; the bodies of more than a thousand men still lie entombed in the sunken hulk of the *Arizona* in the middle of Pearl Harbor. Ten years ago, Congress authorized the construction of a memorial at the site of the U.S.S. *Arizona*, in honor of the brave men who gave their lives for their country during the attack on Pearl Harbor.

The *Arizona* Memorial has since become a truly national memorial, visited annually by citizens from every State in the Union. Despite the fact that the memorial can be reached only by boat, it was visited by more than 700,000 persons last year. It has been estimated that by 1975 more than a million people will visit the *Arizona* Memorial every year.

Despite the great influx of visitors, the memorial remains adequate to handle the load; however, existing shoreside facilities are painfully inadequate. Visitors to the *Arizona* Memorial must wait for long periods of time, occasionally in inclement weather, for the opportunity to make the short pilgrimage by boat from the landing to the memorial itself. It is indeed a national shame that we have not corrected this situation.

Therefore, I have introduced in this Congress, as I did in the 91st Congress, legislation to rectify the situation. My bill would provide the usual visitor conveniences, along with a theater and museum for the orientation and education of visitors to the memorial. Films of the attack could be shown in the theater, and documents and other paraphernalia could be exhibited in the museum to assist the visitor in enhancing his understanding and appreciation not only of the U.S.S. *Arizona* Memorial itself, but also of the war in the Pacific and the need for constant effort to maintain peace with other nations of the world.

Today, on this 30th anniversary of the Pearl Harbor attack, I am reintroducing my bill, with the entire Arizona House delegation, the chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, and more than 100 other distinguished colleagues, as cosponsors.

At the conclusion of my remarks, I will include the text of the bill and newspaper editorials in support of my bill.

Mr. Speaker, the facilities proposed in my bill would add an educational dimension, not available today, to the millions of Americans who will be making their pilgrimage to the U.S.S. *Arizona* Memorial in the years ahead, while providing the usual visitor comforts and convenience.

I believe that the time has come to move speedily toward enactment of this legislation.

The material follows:

H.R. 12083

A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to provide shoreside facilities for the education and convenience of visitors to the United States Ship Arizona Memorial at Pearl Harbor

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to provide for the establishment and maintenance of permanent shoreside facilities (including, but not limited to, a theater and museum) within the Pearl Harbor Naval Base, Hawaii, to provide for the education and convenience of visitors to the United States Ship Arizona Memorial.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy may include and display in the theater and museum such personal property, relics, documents, memorabilia, and exhibits as he deems appropriate to assist visitors and enhance their understanding of the historic American interest in the Pacific Ocean areas, and to deepen their appreciation of the great heroism of the men who lost their lives at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941.

SEC. 3. In carrying out his duties under this Act, the Secretary of the Navy may consult with any interested individuals, groups, or organizations, including the Pacific War Memorial Commission of the State of Hawaii.

SEC. 4. There is authorized to be appropriated a sum not to exceed four million dollars for planning and construction of the facilities authorized in Section 1 hereof and such sums of money as may be necessary from time to time to carry out the purposes of this Act.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Nov. 3, 1971]

BETTER TO REMEMBER

Aside from the beach at Waikiki, Hawaii's most famous tourist attraction is the USS Arizona Memorial in Pearl Harobr.

Though it will be 30 years next month since the Arizona was sunk in the surprise attack on Oahu, the number of visitors to the memorial continues to grow rather than decline.

Last year 358,502 people made the trip to the memorial on Navy launches and a nearly equal number are estimated to have visited it by commercial tourist boats operating from Kewalo Basin in Honolulu.

Cognizant of this interest and the fact that visitors often have long waits for Navy launches traveling to the hulk at its resting place beside Ford Island, Congressman Spark Matsunaga has been pressing a bill to build a theater and museum at the Navy landing used for trips to the memorial.

He is suggesting that funds of up to $4 million be authorized to finance these facilities to tell visitors more about the famous Dec. 7, 1941 attack.

The theater could show films of the actual assaults and some of the effective re-creations of it. The museum would bring it to life with mementos.

This is a national project, not a local one, though Hawaii would welcome it.

Most visitors to the memorial are from out of State, persons who rate Pearl Harbor as one of the "must see" elements of their trip here.

Pearl Harbor, as one of the great historical battle scenes in U.S. history, ought to have this sort of memorial.

Island residents can help by writing to Mainland friends, newspapers and Congress members to call attention to the proposal and supporting it.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Nov. 22, 1971]

A NEW MEMORIAL

For better or worse, Pearl Harbor and Hiroshima stand out as the two most significant names recalling the gigantic Pacific War that started nearly 30 years ago, on Dec. 7, 1941.

The Japanese have rebuilt their destroyed city and made its center a national shrine, dedicated to peace by recalling the horror of war. Hiroshima and Honolulu, incidentally, have a sister city reationship.

Under the point of explosion of the first nuclear weapon used in war is a cenotaph with the names of Hiroshima's dead. Many acres of open area surrounding the bomb center are designated as Peace Park.

Within the park are the unrestored skeleton of a building that survived the bomb, an eternal flame, many memorials including memorial bridges, and a museum. In the museum the story of the bombing and its aftermath are shown and told with a grimly factual understatement.

Memorial efforts at Pearl Harbor so far have been limited to the shrine erected over the hull of the sunken battleship, U.S.S. *Arizona*, where more than 1,000 dead still remain.

Though it can be reached only by boat, the *Arizona* Memorial is visited by about 700,000 people each year, most of them visitors to Hawaii, American and foreign, including Japanese.

As the 30th anniversary of Pearl Harbor nears, a move is afoot, with U.S. Navy support, to expand the Pearl Harbor memorial by constructing a museum and theatre at the boat landing from which visitors are taken out to the *Arizona*.

The National Park Service is cooperating informally on planning for the project.

A 9.5 acre site is available just west of the present Ford Island ferry landing, and the adjoining sketch offers a Navy artist's conception of what might be developed. The Memorial is in the background, under the flag.

Rear Adm. Thomas B. Hayward, commandant of the 14th Naval District, supports the project.

It will mesh well with other plans to clean up the waters of Pearl Harbor and eventually to open some of its shore areas to park and recreational use.

In Congress, Rep. Spark Matsunaga, D-Hawaii, plans to offer a new bill on Dec. 7 to support the Navy's plan.

He expects most of the Arizona delegation to co-sponsor it and expects many other members of Congress to join in backing the project estimated to cost $4 million.

Though Hawaii will welcome this important facility, its real value will be national.

After they have seen Hawaii's beaches and recreation spots, visitors to the Islands make the *Arizona* Memorial their No. 1 destination.

The proposed facilities will add an educational dimension to this experience that does not now exist.

This opportunity to learn can be found at places like Valley Forge, Fort McHenry, the Alamo, Fort Sumter and Gettysburg, other

names that stand out in history. It ought to be offered at Pearl Harbor, too.

Those who support this plan can help it along by expressing their endorsement to friends across the Nation and to members of the U.S. Congress who will be asked to pass on the Pearl Harbor memorial bill.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MANN (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for Tuesday, December 7, 1971, on account of official business.

Mr. BLATNIK (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for Monday, December 6, and the balance of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. VANIK, for 20 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SEBELIUS, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. VEYSEY, today, for 20 minutes.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SEBELIUS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KEITH, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. GRAY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SEBELIUS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McKAY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BOLLING in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PASSMAN, and to include extraneous material.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SEBELIUS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PRICE of Texas.

Mr. ESCH.

Mr. RHODES in five instances.

Mr. ERLENBORN.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. QUILLEN.

Mr. COLLINS of Texas in three instances.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin.

Mr. HOSMER.

Mr. McCLURE.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. CEDERBERG.

Mr. FREY.

Mr. RUPPE.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McKAY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HAMILTON in three instances.

Mr. GRIFFIN in two instances.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS in two instances.

Mr. CARNEY in three instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. ROGERS in five instances.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI.

Mr. FOUNTAIN.

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts in three instances.

Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. FRASER in five instances.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. HANNA in five instances.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania in two instances.

Mr. BEVILL.

Mr. GARMATZ in two instances.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. WOLFF.

Mr. DINGELL in three instances.

Mr. HELSTOSKI in five instances.

Mr. HARRINGTON in three instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

Mr. ROY.

Mr. MOSS.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 345. An act to authorize the sale and exchange of certain lands on the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1115. An act to declare that certain federally owned lands are held by the United States in trust for the Paiute-Shoshone Tribe of the Fallon Reservation and Fallon Colony, Nev.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1475. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide for the restoration, reconstruction, and exhibition of the gunboat *Cairo*, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, 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. 5068. An act to authorize grants for the Navajo Community College, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 952. An act to declare that certain public lands are held in trust by the United States for the Summit Lake Paiute Tribe, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 149. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to proclaim the year 1972 as "International Book Year."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McKAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 8, 1971, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1344. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an annual report on the state of the finances of the Federal Government for fiscal year 1971, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1027 (H. Doc. No. 92-180); to the Committee on Ways and Means and order to be printed with illustrations.

1345. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of certain aliens, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 212(d)(6) of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 11309. A bill to extend and amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, as amended, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-714). 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. ABOUREZK (for himself, Mr. BEGICH, and Mr. HATHAWAY):

H.R. 12072. A bill to provide housing for persons in rural areas of the United States on an emergency basis; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ASPIN:

H.R. 12073. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the statutory rates for anatomical loss or loss of use; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 12074. A bill to amend chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional educational benefits to Vietnam era veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 12075. A bill to exempt from Federal income taxation certain nonprofit corporations all of whose members are tax-exempt credit unions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FREY:

H.R. 12076. A bill to amend the Community Mental Health Centers Act to reorganize certain grant programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 12077. A bill to amend the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANLEY (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MINISH, and Mr. SEIBERLING):

H.R. 12078. A bill relating to comparability adjustments in pay rates of Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HAMILTON, and Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT):

H.R. 12079. A bill to provide for posting information in post offices with respect to registration, voting, and communicating with lawmakers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LINK, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REES, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROY, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STEELE, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 12080. A bill to provide for posting information in post offices with respect to registration, voting, and communicating with lawmakers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 12081. A bill to amend chapter 313 of title 18 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINK (for himself and Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota):

H.R. 12082. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Knife River Indian Villages National Historic Site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA (for himself, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. UDALL, Mr. RHODES, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. ABOUREZK, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CABELL, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. CLEVELAND):

H.R. 12083. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to provide shoreside facilities for the education and convenience of visitors to the U.S.S. *Arizona* Memorial at Pearl Harbor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA (for himself and Mr. UDALL, Mr. RHODES, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ESCH, Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. FISHER, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HANNA, and Mrs. HANSEN of Washington):

H.R. 12084. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to provide shoreside facilities for the education and convenience of visitors to the U.S.S. *Arizona* Memorial at Pearl Harbor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA (for himself, Mr. RHODES, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. UDALL, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. KEE, Mr. LENT, Mr. LINK, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, Mr. MELCHER, and Mr. METCALFE):

H.R. 12085. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to provide shoreside facilities for the education and convenience of visitors to the U.S.S. *Arizona* Memorial at Pearl Harbor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA (for himself, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. UDALL, Mr. RHODES, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MINISH, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PIRNIE, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RARICK, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, and Mr. ROY):

H.R. 12086. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to provide shoreside facilities for the education and convenience of visitors to the U.S.S. *Arizona* Memorial at Pearl Harbor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA (for himself, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. UDALL, Mr. RHODES, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHWENGEL, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. SHIPLEY, Mr. SISK, Mr. STEELE, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. THONE, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. WARE, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WINN, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. YOUNG of Texas):

H.R. 12087. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to provide shoreside facilities for the education and convenience of visitors to the U.S.S. *Arizona* Memorial at Pearl Harbor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. METCALFE:

H.R. 12088. A bill to amend and expand the Emergency Employment Act of 1971 to reduce unemployment and stimulate noninflationary economic growth; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROGERS (for himself, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ROY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 12089. A bill to establish a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention and to concentrate the resources of the Nation against the problem of drug abuse; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 12090. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to move amphetamines and certain other stimulant substances from schedule III of such act to schedule II; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 12091. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first $5,000 of compensation paid to law enforcement officers shall not be subject to the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHMITZ:

H.R. 12092. A bill to authorize testing and research on the use of nontoxic substances in the diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of cancer; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SEBELIUS (for himself, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. SKUBITZ, and Mr. WINN):

H.R. 12093. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act so as to provide necessary assistance in connection with rural development; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 12094. A bill to provide incentives for the establishment of new or expanded job-producing industrial and commercial establishments in rural areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 12095. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to make a comprehensive study of the polar bear, seal, walrus, sea otter, and related species for the purpose of developing adequate conservation measures; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 12096. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to make a comprehensive study of the wolf for the purpose of developing adequate conservation measures; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 12097. A bill to direct the Interstate Commerce Commission to make regulations that certain railroad vehicles be equipped with reflectors or luminous material so that they can be readily seen at night; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.J. Res. 998. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Aging; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina:

H.R. 12098. A bill for the relief of Chae Il Kwon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 12099. A bill for the relief of Sara B. Garner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOW:

H. Con. Res. 477. Concurrent resolution relating to the status of Sylvia Yosifovna Zalmanson Kuznetsov, a citizen of the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE—*Tuesday, December 7, 1971*

The Senate met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God who has caused the light to shine out of darkness and hast revealed Thy glory in the face of Jesus Christ, let Thy light be upon us to illuminate our pathway and to give wisdom to our daily duties. May Thy kingdom come on earth beginning in us.

O Lord, may the memory of this day in history move us to a deeper commitment to the ways which make and keep the peace. And may this season of expectation be to us a time when we have joy as we work and peace as we pray.

In the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.