

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 112—PART 6

MARCH 29, 1966, TO APRIL 18, 1966

(PAGES 6873 TO 8284)

### AMENDMENT OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY ACT OF 1949

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, as amended, which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

### RESOLUTION OF COUNCIL OF CITY OF TOLEDO, OHIO

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the Council of the City of Toledo, Ohio, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

#### RESOLUTION 100-66—DECLARING COUNCIL'S SUPPORT OF THE DEMONSTRATION CITIES ACT; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY

Whereas there is presently before the Congress of the United States H.R. 12341, Demonstration Cities Act and H.R. 12946, Urban Development Act, both proposals having to do with the physical reconstruction and rehabilitation of American cities by focusing all of the talents and techniques of our society upon the problems of the American city; and

Whereas a massive demonstration cities program would provide cities of all sizes with grants to plan, administer, and assist in defraying the local share of the cost to provide for the renewal and reconstruction of our cities; and

Whereas it is the sense of this council that these two programs are of the utmost importance in our present society; and

Whereas it is the desire of this council to urge all of the Representatives in the Congress to act favorably upon this legislation: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Council of the City of Toledo:*

SECTION 1. That the Council of the City of Toledo does hereby express its complete and total approval of the Demonstration Cities Act and the Urban Renewal Act as provided in H.R. 12341 and H.R. 12946, and does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to give its approval to said acts at the earliest possible time.

SEC. 2. That this resolution is hereby declared to be an emergency measure and shall take effect and be in force from and after its adoption. The reason for the emergency lies in the fact that this resolution is necessary for the preservation of the public interest and welfare.

Vote on emergency clause: Yeas 8, nays 0.  
Adopted: April 4, 1966, as an emergency measure: Yeas 8, nays 0.

Attest:

C. T. DIEFENBACH,  
*Clerk of Council.*  
JOHN W. PETER,  
*Mayor.*

### REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. TALMADGE, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 2822) to amend various provisions of the laws administered by the Farm Credit Administration to improve operations thereunder, and for other purposes, reported it favorably, with an amendment, and submitted a report (No. 1102) thereon, which report was ordered to be printed, and the bill to be placed on the calendar.

### REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. MONRONEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated March 25, 1966, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 3205. A bill to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1963 to strengthen the work-study program for vocational education students; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONDALE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

S. 3206. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, so as to prevent the loss of veteran pension benefits as the result of increases in social security benefits authorized by the Social Security Amendments of 1965; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MCGOVERN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

### STRENGTHENING OF WORK-STUDY PROGRAM UNDER VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1963

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to strengthen the work-study program under Public Law 88-210, the Vocational Education Act of 1963.

Although this program has been in operation but a short time, directors of area vocational technical schools in Minnesota have been unanimous in their praise of what it has accomplished. Through providing work opportunities to full-time students at vocational schools, it has made it possible for many students to stay in school who otherwise would have been forced to drop out for financial reasons. And it has provided valuable work experience, often in the vocation the student is planning to enter after graduation.

In the United States, during the present year, an estimated 85,100 students from age 15 through 20 are earning \$25 million in jobs provided under this work-study program. In Minnesota approximately 825 students are earning \$447,000.

My proposal would strengthen this program in three ways. It would eliminate the requirement that, as of July 1, local educational agencies pay 25 percent of the cost of student compensation. It would remove certain unreasonable restrictions on monthly and annual earnings. And it would increase the amount of money available to State and local authorities for administering the program.

As the law is presently written, 100-percent Federal financing is provided for the first 2 years, but beginning in

fiscal year 1967 State and local authorities would have to supply 25 percent of the funds for student compensation. Many are unable to do so, because of the growing squeeze on State and local revenues. In my State, the onset of 75-25 matching would mean that local school boards would have to pay this 25 percent out of their limited resources. And since about three-quarters of the students at Minnesota vocational schools are not residents of the school district where they attend, it is likely that some school boards would not feel justified in themselves providing the 25 percent required. I, therefore, urge that 100-percent Federal financing be maintained, and my bill would accomplish this objective.

Second, my bill would remove present limits on the amount a student may earn in a month or a school year. There are no such limits for the in-school program under the Neighborhood Youth Corps, which is similar in its other provisions and general purpose. Moreover, the present limits hamper the operation of the program. A student is allowed to work 15 hours a week while school is in session, but he is limited to earnings of \$45 a month if he attends school within reasonable commuting distance of his home. This means that, if he is earning \$1 an hour, he can only work 3 full weeks out of the month. Eliminating the earnings limitation, while retaining the limit on hours, will eliminate this undesirable consequence of present regulations, and my bill would so provide.

Finally, my bill would provide a modest increase in the amount of work-study funds available for administration at the State and local level. At present State departments of education are allowed 1 percent of their allocation to administer a State plan, whereas the department in Minnesota could effectively use up to 5 percent to strengthen the State program. Similarly, local authorities need some money for administration, particularly when carrying on the program during summer months when regular school officials are not automatically available to supervise.

My proposal would provide a total of up to 10 percent of allotted funds for administration. It is the intention of this bill that this money be used at both the State and the local level.

Mr. President, a large number of directors of area vocational-technical schools in Minnesota, and other important officials in this program, have written to me in support of the changes which the bill I am introducing today would provide. I therefore ask unanimous consent that these letters be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3205) to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1963 to strengthen the work-study program for vocational education students, introduced by Mr. MONDALE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The letters presented by Mr. MONDALE are as follows:

HIBBING AREA TECHNICAL INSTITUTE,  
HIBBING PUBLIC SCHOOLS,  
Hibbing, Minn., January 3, 1965.  
HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: At this institute, we have been operating under the work-study provisions of Public Law 88-210. We note that there are a number of discriminatory provisions in the act when one compares it to the economic opportunity work-study program.

I am enclosing an information sheet which contains a number of the changes we would like to see made. Of particular import is the limitation on student compensation while school is not in session. This should be indicated by the term "vacation," since many schools operate under different vacation time schedules than as written in the law, from July 1 to October 1.

We feel, further, that it is discriminatory to allow earnings of only \$45 per month or a maximum of \$350 per academic year since the limitation is 15 hours per week. The school district pays the minimum wage scale of \$1.25 per hour. A student under the above provision would not be able to work the maximum of 15 hours per week during the academic year.

Since we feel that this program affords the opportunity of earning while learning, it should be a continued program. We are justifiably concerned that after the fiscal year ending June 1967, when each school district would have to expend 25 percent of this cost to carry on with the work-study program, that many school districts, including our own, could not absorb the financial burden.

There are other items in the information data enclosed which bear consideration for changes. I would appreciate it if you would use your influence to encourage Congress to revise this portion of Public Law 88-210 in accord with the information attached.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely yours,  
WILLIAM E. MAGAJNA,  
Director.

SOUTHWEST MINNESOTA  
VOCATIONAL SCHOOL,  
Jackson, Minn., January 13, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,  
433 Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: This letter is being written to you concerning the work-study program which began operations last year. In my estimation it is the finest program that ever could have been inaugurated for schools such as ours. Certainly it seems vastly superior to the OEO programs which are in existence. I would like to submit the following amendments to the bill which I believe would be beneficial and in order when compared to the other OEO programs.

1. I would request that 10 to 15 percent of the total budget be allowed for supervision of the program. That is, if the total budget would amount to \$20,000, I would like the supervisor to be paid from \$2,000 to \$3,000 per year, and this be reimbursed to us.

2. As it now stands nonlocal school residents can earn a maximum of \$500 during a fiscal year, while local residents can earn up to \$350. It seems to me that this is quite inadequate to meet the needs of many of the students at our school, and I would request that this ceiling be removed or raised to some more satisfactory amount.

3. Students today can only work during summer vacations and expect to get paid for 8 hours a day. I would like to have all school holidays included so that the bill

would read "vacations" rather than "summer vacations."

4. The 1 percent supervision allowance at the State level is totally inadequate to meet the needs of supervisors, and it would seem much more realistic to raise this to 5 percent.

Lastly, because we do feel quite strongly that this is an excellent program, we would wish that it remain at 100 percent reimbursement rather than the 75 percent reimbursement that has been written into the bill for 1967.

Any consideration which you may be able to engender in this regard will be greatly appreciated. If I can be of further help by supplying more information, I would be most happy to do so.

Sincerely yours,  
DELBERT C. SCHWEIGER,  
Director.

GRANITE FALLS AREA TECHNICAL  
INSTITUTE,  
Granite Falls, Minn., January 14, 1966.

Re Suggestions for amending section 13 of Public Law 88-210 work study program for vocational education students.  
HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: We, in the area technical schools of Minnesota feel that one of the most important pieces of legislation now in effect is the work study program for students attending vocational schools. The act provides for financial assistance to students who may not otherwise be able to attend post high training facilities without some aid. We employ these students at various nonprofit agencies and pay them for their services.

At the present time, the law has some unfavorable limitations which I believe should be amended as follows:

Section 13(c) (3) should not have a limitation as to an amount in an academic year. The limitation as to 15 hours per week is fine. This would enable a student to work for a full 9 months instead of only 7 months.

Section 13(b) (2) Take out 1 percent and insert 5 percent. To effectively administer the program, sufficient funds must be made available.

Section 13(e) (2) Take out the sentence concerning State matching.

I also believe that approximately 10 percent of the total funds for the program should be allocated for local supervision.

I hope you will give these suggestions careful consideration and I urge you to end the discrimination against vocational students in work study programs. The work study program is a fine piece of legislation and is really effective. The program is efficient, and the aid gets right down to the person who can really benefit from the aid so that he or she may receive post high school training.

Sincerely,  
ELROY BURGESSON,  
Coordinator.

WILLMAR AREA VOCATIONAL  
TECHNICAL SCHOOL,  
Willmar, Minn., February 1, 1966.

Subject: Section 13 of Public Law 88-210—work-study programs for vocational education.

HON. WALTER MONDALE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The present work-study program has provided a tremendous opportunity for Minnesota youth to earn and learn while developing their individual talents to the fullest.

The Minnesota area vocational technical schools are providing excellent educational experiences in the classroom and laboratory in training youth to contribute effectively in

our world of work. The work-study program enables these youth to further develop their talents by providing actual work experience with a governmental employer.

The present law does restrict employment of students under the work-study program as it allows for noncommuting students a maximum of \$45 per month with a maximum limit of \$350 per year. A student from outside the city of Willmar with a room and board problem can earn no more than \$60 per month with a yearly limit of \$500 per academic school year. The law restricts vocational students in that it limits their work under the work-study program to about 7 months even though the student may be enrolled in a 9-month, 10-month, 11-month, or 12-month course.

Section 13(b) of Public Law 89-210 limits administrative funds for this work-study program. This limitation of \$10,000 is unrealistic because administration and supervision of the program statewide cannot effectively be done at this figure. Adequate supervision is necessary in order for the program to be an outstanding success.

Section 13(e) of Public Law 88-210 stipulates that the Federal Government contribute 75 percent of the total cost of the work-study program. One hundred percent payment from Federal funds would enable the State of Minnesota to offer an effective continuous opportunity for our vocational students that is not contingent on State legislation.

May I count on you to take the necessary steps to improve the educational opportunities of Minnesota youth through a better work-study program?

Sincerely yours,  
ROBERT W. JACOBSON,  
Assistant Director,  
Vocational-Technical Education.

BRainerd AREA VOCATIONAL  
TECHNICAL SCHOOL,  
Brainerd, Minn., February 7, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MONDALE: During the past year, we at the Brainerd Area Vocational Technical School have been operating under the work-study provisions of Public Law 88-210. We feel this is a fine program and has done much to aid students in their educational pursuit. However when one compares our work-study program to the economic opportunity work-study program, many discriminatory provisions become evident.

A needy student electing to take a vocational program is discriminated against in relation to other programs for needy students that have no limitations on monthly or yearly earnings. Under our program:

(a) A resident student living at home and commuting can earn no more than \$45 a month and a maximum of \$350 per academic year.

(b) A nonresident student not commuting can earn no more than \$60 a month and a maximum of \$500 per academic year.

The result is that the vocational student is able to work only a little more than 8 months during the school year regardless of whether he is taking a 9-, 10-, 11-, or 12-month course.

Further, the work-study program under which we operate supposedly allows students to work a maximum of 15 hours a week during the academic year. The school district pays the minimum wage scale of \$1.25 an hour. Therefore, when the \$45 and \$60 a month restrictions are considered, it is mathematically impossible for our students to work the allowable 15 hours each week.

In view of the above obvious discriminations, we feel that the limits of \$45 a month and \$350 an academic year for resident commuting students, and \$60 a month and \$500 an academic year for nonresident, noncommuting students, be eliminated from the

wording of the work-study provisions, Public Law 88-210.

We do feel that the provisions limiting students to 15 hours of work a week while school is in session is a good provision. However, we believe this provision should be waived during vacation periods (during Christmas and Easter vacations for example). For this waiver to be effective it again is necessary that the restrictions (a and b above) on allowable earnings be removed.

Also of concern to us is the provision to the effect that after the fiscal year ending June 1967, each school district would have to expend 25 percent of the cost necessary to carry on the work-study program. Many school districts, including our own, could not absorb the financial burden. The opportunity for "earning while learning" would no longer be available to our students.

I am enclosing an information sheet which explains in more detail the hoped-for revisions outlined above, and discusses two additional provisions needed to aid in the efficient administration and supervision of the work-study program.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY NYSATHER,  
Director,  
Area Vocational Technical School.

ALEXANDRIA AREA VOCATIONAL-  
TECHNICAL SCHOOL,  
Alexandria, Minn., February 8, 1966.

HON. WALTER MONDALE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: The Alexandria Area Technical School has been operating under the work-study provisions of Public Law 88-210. It has come to our attention that area schools are being discriminated against where the \$350 and \$500 limitations are placed on a student's earnings. A majority of our courses run for 11 and 12 months. Thus, a student ceases to earn any money for the last 3 to 4 months of his school year. We believe this to be a very worthwhile program and if a few of these inequities could be taken care of, it would be even better.

We have heard that President Johnson plans a reduction in the work-study allocations for next year. If this is true, I believe it would be a serious mistake. Many of our students that have been accepted for training next fall would have to drop out of school. This would come at a time when our country desperately needs technically trained people. Your support regarding the continuation and possible expansion, rather than reduction, of the work-study program would be appreciated.

I want to thank you personally for the kind attention you gave my son, Jim, when he visited your office as a delegate to Boys' Nation. His selection as the outstanding boy at Boys' State made Mrs. Ahlfors and me very proud.

We all want to thank you for the excellent job you are doing as a Senator from Minnesota.

Yours sincerely,

RAYMOND A. AHLFORS,  
Assistant Director.

CANBY AREA,  
VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL SCHOOL,  
Canby, Minn., February 10, 1966.  
Re work study program, section 13, Public Law 88-210.

HON. WALTER MONDALE,  
U.S. Senator,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: We at the Canby Area Vocational-Technical School are grateful for the work study program under Public Law 88-210. It gives low-income family stu-

dents an opportunity to make some needed income.

I would have some suggestion for amendments:

1. Section 13(c) (3), strike out everything after the first comma and place a period in its place, so it would read as follows: "provide that no students shall be employed under such work study program for more than 15 hours in any week in which classes in which he is enrolled are in session."

The above would be easier to administer and also give the student a break.

2. Section 13(e) (2), strike out the following "from a States allotment under this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for the next succeeding fiscal year, such payment shall equal 75 percent of the amount so expended."

We hope that this program will continue at 100 percent for an effective program. I'm sure the Canby School District would drop the program if they had to help pay non-resident students for going to this school.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

DEWAIN L. ENGLUND,  
Director.

STAPLES PUBLIC SCHOOLS,  
Staples, Minn., February 15, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,  
U.S. Senator,  
Senate Building,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: The Staples Area Vocational School at the present time is serving 407 students from all areas in the State, and is also operating a work-study program for 100 of these students who are experiencing financial difficulty in continuing their vocational training. This work-study program is under Public Law 88-210 and there are some limitations and discriminations that exist in 88-210 that do not exist in other similar programs (economic opportunity work-study program for example) and these should be eliminated.

We have made several surveys to determine whether a work-study program is needed and what local area people think about such a training program. Almost 100 percent of the people felt that the program should be expanded, liberalized and above all continued. This is one program that is directly pointed at helping our youth to continue their education and eliminate pockets of unemployed and underemployed people. The work-study program survey has also helped us discover where past and present problems of poverty exist and now that we have discovered these people and their needs, there is a big job to be done.

Many of our school districts have expanded their facilities to the limits of their financial abilities, also, have furnished the work-study program with supplies, tools, and supervision, and would not be able to take on additional financial burdens as indicated in Public Law 88-210.

Enclosed you will find suggestions and justifications for amending section 13 (work-study programs for vocational education students) of Public Law 88-210.

I can think of no one better qualified to tackle this important problem, and I know you will assist in this matter. Whenever I can be of assistance in any way you will find me most willing to cooperate.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL J. MATANICH,  
Director, Area Voc-Tech School.

AREA VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL SCHOOL,  
Duluth, Minn., February 15, 1966.

HON. WALTER MONDALE,  
U.S. Senate, Senate Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As a counselor in an area technical institute, I feel that the work study

program is very important to our students. This legislation provides for financial assistance to students who may not otherwise be able to attend post high school training facilities without aid. We employ these students in related work at various public agencies and pay them for their services.

The present law has some unfavorable limitations which I believe should be amended as follows:

Section B(c) (3): The limits on monthly and yearly compensation should be deleted. The weekly limitation of 15 hours work when school is in session would alone be a most effective limitation. This change would allow a student to meet minimum financial needs for a full school year.

Section B(b) (2): To effectively administer the program, additional funds must be made available.

Section 13(3) (2): Delete the sentence concerning State matching of funds.

Funds should also be allocated by Federal legislation.

I hope you will give these suggestions careful consideration as they will end the discrimination against vocational students as compared to the work study program for college students.

The work study program is an excellent, effective piece of legislation. It gives aid to the students who must have it in order to receive post high school training and become employable in our society.

Sincerely,

GEORGE LARSON,  
Vocational Counselor.

EVELETH AREA  
VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL SCHOOL,  
Eveleth, Minn., February 25, 1966.

HON. WALTER S. MONDALE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: The Eveleth Area Vocational-Technical School has been participating in the work-study program, re section 13, Public Law 88-210, since September 1965. This program has certainly been a great help to the students that are taking part in it. It is my opinion that to make a more workable program, some changes should be made in the law. These changes are as follows:

1. Section 13(c) (3): I feel that when classes are in session there should be a limitation as to the number of hours a student should work as is stated in this section, but limitation of compensation to the student should be dropped as they could conceivably reach the maximum in less than 8 months. There should also not be any limitation on student compensation while school is not in session (vacation periods).

2. Section 13(b) (2): Strike out 1 percent and insert 5 percent. One percent is just not enough to administer this program in Minnesota effectively.

3. Section 13(e) (2): Discussing the section with school board members and local leaders, it is a consensus of opinion that the board would be in no position to pick up the 25 percent required by law for this program after June 1967, in light of the local tax situation and the additional burden upon the local taxpayers. This is true especially in Eveleth because approximately 70 percent of our students are nonresidents to the local school district. Therefore, I feel it imperative that the Federal Government continue this program on a 100-percent basis.

In this section, thought should also be given to provide funds for local supervision. I would suggest that approximately 10 percent of the expenditures be allotted for supervision.

Except for the above changes, the work-study program has been very effective in Eveleth. Many of the students in the Eveleth

Area Vocational-Technical School have been given a first experience in being employed and holding a job. The experience that they receive will develop in them sound concepts of work as well as form good work habits and the ability to be responsible.

I hope that I can depend upon you for your support on these changes which will make the program more effective. Any steps that you might take to remedy the situation will be appreciated.

Yours very truly,

EDWARD F. RUSS,  
Director.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,  
St. Paul, Minn., March 9, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.:

The area vocational-technical school work-study program got off to a very late start even though it was enacted December 1963. Moneys for the summer program were not funded until July 1, 1965. Even then, we were able to start a summer work-study program with 8 schools and 144 students participating.

In the fiscal year of 1965-66, as of January 1, 1966, we have 470 students participating in the work-study program and by the end of the school year will have over 500 students participating in the program. There are at present over 70 percent of the students in this program doing work directly related to the subjects they are taking. These students soon will be on the tax rolls instead of the relief rolls. If money is available, we will have well over 500 students who wish to participate in the 1966-67 summer program.

This fall we will have four new area vocational-technical schools operating in this State. This means that we will have over 600 students who will wish to and need to participate in this program during the regular school year.

We receive no moneys for supervision at the local level and we feel that at least 10 percent of expenditures should be provided for this very necessary work. During the summer, when most classes are not in session and instructors are on vacation, no moneys are provided for supervision of summer work-study programs at the local level.

At the State level we are allowed 1 percent of money expended for the work-study program or \$10,000, whichever is the greater. To be able to conduct the program it is the opinion of most that it should be increased from 1 percent to 5 percent.

The \$350 and \$500 limits that are imposed on the area vocational-technical school work-study program should be removed. The OEO programs, in contrast to the area vocational-technical school work-study programs, have no limits a participant may earn per year. The OEO also has much more liberal supervisory allowances.

Both the school directors and the needy students should know in advance how much money is available for this program. If they know this, both can plan ahead and make satisfactory arrangements.

Section 13(e)(2): Discussing this section with school board members and local leaders, it is a consensus of opinion that the school boards would be in no position to pick up the 25 percent required by law for this program after June 30, 1966, in light of the local tax situation and the additional burden upon the local taxpayers. This is especially true because approximately 75 percent of the students are nonresidents of the local school district. Therefore, I feel it imperative that the Federal Government continue this program on a 100-percent basis.

President Johnson has recommended in his budget that the area vocational-technical school work-study program be cut from \$25 million to \$10 million and at the same time asked for a budget increase of more than \$320 million for Job Corps.

You will note that the budget calls for \$177,500,000 for fiscal 1967 rather than the \$225 million as authorized under section 4, Public Law 88-210. You will also observe that the work-study program was reduced from \$25 million to \$10 million. The budget justification for this decrease reads as follows: "1967 estimates reflect reduction in work-study assistance as the Neighborhood Youth Corps program assumes responsibility."

The Neighborhood Youth Corps programs have not as yet successfully reached the smaller communities where 22 of the 25 area vocational schools operating and planned are located and where area vocational schools have work-study programs.

I am certain that a study of the vocational work-study programs being conducted in our State will disclose that these programs have been entirely successful whereas the Neighborhood Youth Corps cannot make this claim. We all recognize that something needs to be done for these youth. Why not, then, aid those students who have found themselves and who wish to further their training?

It is very evident that there should be an increase instead of a decrease in the amounts of money allotted for the administration of the area vocational-technical school work-study programs.

Enclosed please find information which bears consideration for changes. I would appreciate it if you would use your influence to encourage the Congress to revise this portion of Public Law 88-210 in accord with the information enclosed.

CECIL STENSRUD,  
State Supervisor,  
Work-Study Program.

CANBY AREA VOCATIONAL-  
TECHNICAL SCHOOL,  
Canby, Minn., March 29, 1966.

Re work-study program, section 13, Public Law 88-210.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,  
U.S. Senator,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MONDALE: I understand that students under the summer work-study program will be paid 75 percent by Federal funds and 25 percent by local funds. Our board of education will not accept the 25-percent tab in view that 80 percent of our students come from outside of the school district. Our board feels that we should not use local tax funds to pay for nonresident students. We hope Congress can restore the 100 percent reimbursement figure.

We have also lost our supervisor in charge of work-study because there are no funds available to administer this program. This places the whole supervision of the work study program on my shoulders and I don't have enough time to fully care for my own program now. We hope Congress can see fit to provide funds to pay this supervision. I would appreciate your checking into this problem for me.

Thank you.  
Sincerely,

DEWAIN L. ENGLUND,  
Director.

### CONGRESS SHOULD ACT TO REMEDY INJUSTICE TO VETERANS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I continue to be deeply disturbed by an injustice which has been done to many of our Nation's veterans as a result of

the 7-percent increase in social security benefits authorized by the Social Security Amendments of 1965.

Because of the increased social security payments approved by the Congress last year, approximately 30,000 veterans have been penalized by having their Veterans' Administration pension checks reduced. Moreover, these men and women who have given so much to their country are losing more from their veterans pensions than they are gaining from increased social security payments. Worst of all, they were given no choice to accept or decline the social security increase.

Mr. President, I believe this is an intolerable situation which ought to be corrected immediately by the Congress.

I should like to quote from just some of the many letters I have received from South Dakotans protesting this inequity.

A constituent from Custer, S. Dak., wrote to me last August:

I am now past 70 and a few months ago applied for my social security and veterans pension. My pension amounted to \$75 per month and social security to \$107 a month. I was allowed both of these. I can manage to get by on this.

But now with the increase in the social security I automatically go in another bracket and the VA tells me that they will have to cut me to \$40 a month because I'll be getting a few dollars over \$1,200 per year.

Can you see any justice in this? I can't. I don't know if this was the intent of the law.

You get a raise of \$7 on social security and get cut \$35 by the VA.

You really have to skimp to get by on \$200 per month now.

Please check into this and maybe something can be done. I hope.

Or, in the words of a constituent of mine from Huron, S. Dak.:

The new social security bill which allows for a 7-percent increase in social security benefits, will be bad news for some of our war veterans and veterans widows who, because of poverty and disability, are pensioned by the Veterans' Administration. The increase in social security payments will cost them more in lost VA pensions than they will gain in social security increases. The small increases will take many into an income bracket which, while still within the Government definition of "poverty," will automatically cut back or eliminate their VA pension eligibility, the loss in pension being greater than the increase.

An example being thus: an individual here presently receives \$47 per month social security and \$100 per month VA pension. The new 7-percent increase will raise the social security to \$51 per month, an increase of \$4. However, the increase raises the total nonpension income to the next higher step in the VA scale of permissible income for pension and will therefore cut the VA pension from \$100 to \$75 per month resulting in a \$25 per month cut on the VA pension and an overall loss of \$19 per month.

Needless to say, this new benefit will hurt like a kick in the teeth.

I realize that the original bill had an amendment added in the Senate to the effect that no pensioned veteran should suffer a loss in benefits as a result of the new increases, but in the final joint House-Senate conference it was knocked out.

I cannot understand why this amendment was knocked out, why the Veterans' Administration would oppose such an amendment