by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 58, and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following: "(b) No member which is an insured institution as defined in section 401(a) of the National Bank Act, any agent, or any person, stockholder thereof shall pay or agree to pay to a broker, finder or other person for obtaining funds to be deposited or invested in such member hereinafter in this section referred to as deposits. For the purposes of this section, the payment made to any other person to induce the placing of a deposit in such a member shall be deemed to be a payment of such compensation by the member, and if the member had reason-ably should have had knowledge of such a payment when it accepted the deposit."

"(c) No violation by a member of the provisions of this subsection or of regulations issued hereunder shall subject the member to a penalty of not more than 10 per centum of the amount of the deposit to which the violation relates. The Board may recover the penalty, by suit or otherwise, for the use of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, with the costs and expenses of the recovery."

"(d) For the purposes of this section, the term 'payment of interest or dividends' includes any agreement to pay interest or dividends and includes payments to the depositor or investor or any other person directly or indirectly, through any person or enti-ty, director, officer, agent, or substantial stockholder of the member in which the deposit is made. If the member had or reasonably should have had knowledge of such a payment when it accepted the deposit. The Board shall by regulation prescribe definitions of the terms 'payment of compensa-tion' and 'compensation' and shall prescribe such further definitions of 'payment of interest or dividends' as it may deem appropriate for the purposes of this section. The Board shall prescribe such rules and regulations as it may deem necessary to effectuate the purposes of this section and prevent otherwise.

Chapter 3—CERTAIN GIVEAWAYS PROHIBITED

Sec. 121. Amendment of section 19(j), Federal Reserve Act.
122. Amendment of section 18(g), Federal Deposit Insurance Act.
123. Amendment of section 59, Federal Home Loan Bank Act.

§ 121. AMENDMENT OF SECTION 19(j), FEDERAL RESERVE ACT.

Section 19(j) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 371b) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Except for the payment of interest on deposits subject to limitation under this section, no member bank may offer or deliver any merchandise or any certificate, stamp, ticket, or other obli-gation or memorandum which is or may be redeemable in merchandise, money, or credit as an inducement to any person to make or add to any deposit."

§ 122. AMENDMENT OF SECTION 18(g), FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE ACT.

Section 18(g) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1838(g)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Except for the payment of interest on deposits subject to limitation under this section, no insured bank may offer or deliver any merchandise or any certificate, stamp, ticket, or other obligation or memorandum which is or may be redeemable in merchandise, money, or credit as an inducement to any person to make or add to any deposit."

§ 123. AMENDMENT OF SECTION 59, FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK ACT

Section 59(a) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (13 U.S.C. 1420b) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Except in the case of interest or dividends subject to limitation under this section, no member may offer or deliver any merchandise or any certificate, stamp, ticket, or other obligation or memorandum which is or may be redeemable in merchandise, money, or credit as an inducement to any person to make, or open, or add to any deposit or account."

Chapter 4—CERTAIN EQUITY PARTICIPATIONS PROHIBITED

Sec. 131. Definitions.
132. Prohibition on equity participations by lenders.
133. Civil liability.
134. Criminal penalty.

§ 131. DEFINITIONS

(a) The definitions and rules of construction set forth in this section apply for the purpose of this chapter.

(b) The term 'lender' includes any commercial bank, trust company, mortgage banker, savings bank, building and loan association, savings and loan association, insurance company, or other person or organization engaged in the business of making or placing loans.

The term "equity participation" refers to—

(1) An ownership interest in any property or enterprise;

(2) Any right to any payment or credit which is proportionate to or contingent upon the net or gross income from any property or enterprise, including but not limited to a share in the profits, income, or earnings from a business enterprise of the borrower;

(3) Warrants entitling the lender to purchase stock of the borrower at a fixed price;

(4) Shares warrants entitling the lender to compensation based upon changes in the market price of the borrower's stock over a specified period.

§ 132. PROHIBITION ON EQUITY PARTICIPATIONS BY LENDERS

No lender may accept any equity partici-pation in consideration of the making of any loan.

§ 133. CIVIL LIABILITY

Any lender which acquires an equity participa-tion from a borrower in violation of this chapter shall be liable, and shall be enjoined, assign all its right, title, and interest therein to the bor-rower and in addition be liable to the bor-rower in an amount equal to twice the fair market value of the equity participation at the time of its creation or at the time of demand, whichever is higher, and shall in ad-dition be liable to the borrower for his rea-sonable attorney's fees and costs of suit as determined by the court in any action to enforce the liability created by this section. Any such action shall be brought in any dis-trict court of the United States regardless of the amount in controversy, or in any other court of competent jurisdiction, within six years after the date on which the liability arises.

§ 134. CRIMINAL PENALTY

Whoever willfully violates the provisions of section 132 of this chapter, or willfully and knowingly procures or aids another to violate it, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 18515) making appropriato-
work in alcoholism, are just coming into being and have just started to grow. They have not been hampered. I am offering this amendment to try to make sure that we are at least establishing a precedent so that this will not continue to be an uncontrollable item jumping from one single fiscal year to the next. The Federal Government is utterly powerless to restrain it within reasonable limits. My amendment narrows down section 208, the section that provides that in this field States can only increase the administrative cost up to 115 percent of last year's figure. My amendment would change section 208 in a way which would continue to permit full spending for the so-called social services such as day care, home nursing care, alcoholism, and other services that are carried out for welfare recipients. None of those services would be affected; none of those who are engaged in bringing that aid to welfare recipients would be affected in any way under my amendment. Furthermore, my alternative would in no way restrict Federal matching for the training of staff at the local level. My amendment would, however, be a limitation on the expenditure of Federal funds authorized by the State under local administrative of public assistance programs. The limitation would restrict increases during this fiscal year, 1971, for basic staff to 115 percent of that which was employed last year. Even with my amendment the States would be able to obtain increased Federal matching for about 2,400 additional State and local workers, a total of about 150,000 employees.

Finally, the concern of so many of my colleagues and the concern expressed by many States that section 208 would prevent many States from establishing social service programs—or enlarging their present programs—would be corrected by my amendment. My amendment would save the Federal Government about $50 million. In the time I have had since early this morning I could not give the State-by-State details on those savings. My amendment would make it possible for the welfare administrator to see the services that the Federal laws require in the cities. It would make it possible for the worker to give one dollar to the foreign missions. It is one of the services that are most important in the present language in the bill. If I did not understand it, the Governor of my State and the commissioner of public welfare of my State—which is one of the States that would be most affected—would certainly make me understand it.

Let me repeat what I said. The amendment will save the Federal Government about $50 million. Now, $50 million spread over 50 States, and including such buses as New York, New Jersey, Illinois, and all the rest, cannot mean the crippling of administrative services, because it is really a small sum.

The significance of the amendment is not the $50 million. It is the notice that, as far as building up administrative costs is concerned, it is seeking to put some limit on them.

We further have been able to estimate that the amendment would not prevent the employment in the administrative field, the addition of 2,400 State and local workers, which would bring the total up to about 150,000 employees engaged in purely administrative work.

That is the best we can do.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, in other words, the language of the Cotton amendment, which really is in the nature of a substitute for section 208, would make the language on page 38 read as follows: none of the funds contained in this title may be used for payments to any State for fiscal year 1971 for administrative expenses under titles I, IV (part A), X, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act which, in the aggregate, exceed 115 percent of the aggregate amount estimated for these programs for such State for fiscal year 1970.

Now, I think what I have said in explanation of the amendment has established the very heart and we shall face. If it is adopted it cannot be applied to and would not affect the services of any social worker or persons engaged in day care, for working mothers or the alcoholic worker. In all the various social services encompassed, only to the administrative staff, which is created and authorized by the State is affected. Even in that it allows them a 15-percent latitude. Mr. President, it would seem to me that this is a reasonable and safe method of dealing with this matter. The real point involved is the increasing need of getting the Federal dollars to the recipient. It always reminds me of a story that I heard and that I keep thinking about the other day. The pastor of a church went to his richest parishioner and asked him for a donation for foreign missions. The parishioner who was a very wealthy man, proceeded to give the pastor eight hundred dollars. The pastor, shocked beyond expression, said: I am sorry. I rarely criticize anyone for giving what they feel they should give, but you, the wealthiest man in the parish, and in our city—this year, that one dollar to foreign missions seems to me shocking. I do not understand it.

His parishioner reached in his pocket and said: Here is $100 to get the dollar to them.

That is an exaggerated picture, but, in the first place, it is only in public welfare that we let down the bars and commit the Federal Government to 75 percent. I do not object to that figure, because public welfare is one of the things that we do for the people of this country. But it is only in public welfare that we let down the bars and say, Go ahead and build up all the bureaucrats you want, because we have plenty of them here in Washington. Go ahead and build up 50 other bureaucrats, and whatever you do, it is an appropriation with no end, an appropriation with no ceiling whatsoever.

I have given that matter, as have the other members of the committee, careful thought. We feel that the language in the bill as reported by the committee—although it is unanimous on the part of the full committee—because of the intent and purpose might very well serve to prevent this. We feel that it is fair to the recipients. We carefully restrict it to administrative costs. The Federal Government continues to say to the States, You can spend whatever you feel you want to or you ought to in dealing with the Federal funds, in day care, in taking welfare to the needy—and also, mind you, you must train; this does not affect the expense of training workers—all this you may continue to do and we will vote the bill up to 75 percent. We only ask that you do preclude enough administrative costs. That is where they put people and the desks and that is where there is a tendency, no matter how sincere the effort may be, to have a surplus of people who are not actually delivering the services to the people already, the ailing, and the aged. It would seem to me that this is fair and represents a minimum safeguard for the Federal Government in the only field, so far as I know, in which we have an open end commitment in appropriations.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I am very glad to yield. Mr. CRANSTON. I would like to ask if the Senator knows the dollar effects on the various States, and overall, of the amendment. We are New York, exact dollar figures based on present experience and present costs that would be lost to each State if section 208 is not altered or eliminated. Does the Senator know the effect of this amendment?

Mr. COTTON. As I said very carefully, I was able to obtain, in the time since last night, the number of additional State and local workers that this limitation would permit all over the country. I understand very clearly we have very accurately estimated the present language in the bill. If I did not understand it, the Governor of my State and the commissioner of public welfare of my State—which is one of the States that would be affected—would certainly make me understand it.

Let me repeat what I said. The amendment will save the Federal Government about $50 million. Now, $50 million spread over 50 States, and including such buses as New York, California, Illinois, and all the rest, cannot mean the crippling of administrative services, because it is really a small sum.
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ator's amendment, there would still be a loss to the States across the Nation of $161 million. There would be a loss of approximately $60 million, under the Senate's amendment, to my State of California.

Mr. COTTON. That is the increase.

Mr. CRANSTON. Regarding the 2,400 potential new administrative personnel under the Senator's amendment, with an 8 percent increase in the cost of doing business, it is questionable how long that number of workers would be available. Administrative costs nationwide went up 38 percent last fiscal year in this general program, and the February 20, 1970, figures show that, even if the administrative costs were frozen for the States, we would have a 36 percent increase going on for services.

So immediately there are going to be higher costs confronting the States. Secretary Richardson just announced an unprecedented increase in the caseload for welfare, and if we have an increase in caseload, we will obviously have an increase in administrative costs also, accompanying it.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator said there would be a severe problem confronting my State and many other States if the Senator's amendment was adopted. Finally, I wonder if the amendment is clear. I mean, the increase in the basic cost; it merely says the Federal contribution shall be limited. The State can put on all the people it wants to. But our only concern—and I appreciate that there are a lot of programs now involved in $618. It is well known that the Federal Government is not a wise employer and that the States can come from the place where the highest employment rate now in the United States. You fellows in California are pickers compared to us.

Mr. CRANSTON. The Senator said "the Federal contribution shall be limited." Mr. MAGNUSON. Unemployment rate. I mean. But when we face HEW, and find that there are now on the payroll—it is pretty hard to find these figures, but we finally got them—$18,000 people on State and local government civilian salaries contained within this appropriation. That is $18,000 people throughout the country, and we think that maybe the administrative costs are a little too high. If everybody paid $18,000, received an average salary of $12,000 or $15,000 a year, that is $9 billion. If there is any criticism of these programs—that goes for OEO and our various programs, and in many cases very justifiable, that there is too much administrative cost, that salaries are too high.

We have heard that in many places, and that they are eating up what should be going to the actual program and the people. We were trying to figure out some way in which we could have some kind of a ceiling, or slow this administrative growth up, because when you get up to $18,000 people just to administer HEW programs in the field, while it is true, in all fairness, that a great many of these people are in social security shops, where the people have to go all over the country, that is a pretty large sum.

What the Senates of New Hampshire is trying to offer is—do not like a particular percentage; I do not think that is the way to go at it, but I think maybe there ought to be some way to slow this up a little bit, and get more of the funds to actual recipients. We have some new programs. I suppose alcoholism and drug addiction are the best examples which we beefed up last year, but which still had just a minimum number of employees. This year we heard of increasing those two programs, in which appear elsewhere in HEW, but which do have an impact upon programs and services we are talking about here. I know that in welfare much good has been accomplished with counseling programs and increasing those two programs, which would have to have more than 115 percent if they want to do more; and there have been other cases like that.

I do not know; maybe we ought to send a few copies of "Parkinson's Law" around to all these offices. That is a pretty staggering figure, $618,000 people outside of the Federal Government being supported by HEW. And if you add very administrative costs plus the salaries, you are running into billions of dollars. What we are trying to do is see if we cannot put some kind of ceiling on this.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not know the answer. This is only the Federal contribution we are talking about. It does not stop the States from adding, if they wish.

This would be a 15 percent increase in a new year. I was a little worried about the 15 percent for the administrative or the 110 percent. I thought perhaps 120, 150, maybe 200 percent could be doubled. That might mean more than a million people employed just to administer these programs, and this is what bothers us.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. First, you are talking about a percentage of last year's money; you are not talking about last year's employees. It could be the same employees, with some cost-of-living increase, that in the last 2 years they could be doubled. That might mean more than a million people employed just to administer these programs, and this is what bothers us.

Aside from that, is not the very Department which has asked for this limitation on the part of the committee the very Department which also has some supervisory responsibility over the way the States operate their departments and over the percentage of overhead and administration, and so forth? Why do they have to have an arbitrary limit?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator. Perhaps we should give them the responsibility and not have a percentage. If a State comes in and makes a technically legitimate case that they have to hire 100 more people on a certain type of activity, we are required to match it, and it is an open end.

Mr. HARRIS. I think that is not so. They have some supervisory responsibility.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They can turn down the whole thing.

Mr. HARRIS. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think you ought to go in the Record at this time. Twenty-three States would not be affected by this at all. Ten States would have to reduce expenses between 30 and 59 percent. Eleven States would be between 60 and 89 percent. Ten States, of which California is one, that would probably have to reduce their requests from 100 percent of what they ask to 80 percent in the Federal contribution, in the field of administration.

I see the Senator from Louisiana in the Chamber. Louisiana would have to go down to 80 percent, according to this.

We have all the figures here. The saving—about 15 percent of the administrative—would go to the Federal Treasury, to this appropriation. Twenty-three States receive and would receive, even under the limitation, all they ask for. My State happens to be in the category of Louisiana. This is under the committee amendment, not the Cotton perfecting amendment.
ment. My State is in the same position as Louisiana.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, will the Senate yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. That is the question I was going to ask the Senate. Mr. MAGNUSON. I will tell the Senator the position Oklahoma is in.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not believe the Senator can, because he does not know what portion applies only to administration and what portion applies to social services and training personnel.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This applies to the whole.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator from New Hampshire earlier indicated that he was not able to break it down.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This is his amendment, which would limit it purely to administration and not the social workers and services.

Mr. HARRIS. That is what I mean.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This is for the whole.

This is based on the committee amendment, not the Cotton amendment. The Cotton amendment would save approximately $50 million, but we were not able, in the short period of time, to break it down as to States.

It would be about $50 million; whereas, this one, as the Senator from California has pointed out, would run approximately $131 million or $161 million, a significantly larger amount.

Mr. CRANSTON. The figure for California, based on a November figure, which is later than the committee’s, is $78 million cost to California. If the Cotton amendment were adopted, it would be approximately $60 million cost to California.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Most of these people are not in the office, the administrators. Most of them are out in the field, out doing their work. They are delivering, we agree. Social services. The Cotton amendment applies only to the office types, and not to services rendered to recipients.

We have some responsibility with respect to the pending monies. We cannot just spend it. I have been in some of these offices in my State, and I suppose other Senators have. I have not been out with the social workers on their rounds. I have been to places where they should be.

What bothers me is the cost of the 618,000 people we have now. If there is a legitimate criticism, if there is one legitimate criticism, of our whole welfare program it is the fact that administrative costs take up too much of the money that should go to the people, and there is case after case after case of that. This is what we are trying to get at. I just wanted to give the background of this. Personally, I do not like the percentage ceiling. I do not think that is the way to go.

Mr. LONG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRATTON). The Senator from Louisiana is recognized in his own right.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, let me ask you.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Javits amendment.

Mr. COTTON. No.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Excuse me. The Senator from New Hampshire has asked unanimous consent, and I think that it will be the Javits amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I do not know whether I will be able to be present for this vote, since I am committed to be out of town later.

I would like it known that I am opposed to the amendment.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been exerting all the efforts that any administration has ever exerted—in fact, I think they probably have worked harder and more diligently than any administration in the history of the country—to try to increase spending for welfare and medical care.

We on the Finance Committee have been besieged by those representing that Department who want to increase the cost of the public welfare program by more than $4 billion a year and want to double the number of welfare recipients. We have studied their plan. Finally, in the spirit of compromise, I have gone even further than my conscience would dictate to try to accommodate their views for a $4 billion increase in public welfare expenditures.

At the same time, while the Department has been trying to get the Finance Committee to double the number of people on welfare and to increase expenditures by $4.5 billion, they have been trying, on their Cotton bill, to work on the Appropriations Committee, to get them to cut the money available for the services that the States are required by law to provide—a law which they themselves advocated. This does not make much sense at all.

We on the Finance Committee have the duty and the burden of voting the taxes to pay for all this legislation, whether it is social security or public welfare or some other kind of legislation. This is the committee’s unpleasant duty, to find the money to do all that—and we are not complaining about it. The majority on that committee has consistently been willing to provide for what doubling the number of welfare recipients is. We have never been niggardly. We have always been willing to walk up to the lick log and put our licks and take our share of the responsibility for raising the taxes to provide for social security, public welfare, Medicare, Medicaid, and other programs.

If we are the ones authorizing some legislation, we have to find the taxes to pay for it. The fact that we cannot balance the budget is not the fault of the Finance Committee. It is the fact that other committees vote to spend more money than we can raise. If I do say it, for the most part, that is the work of our able Appropriations Committee. I am not complaining about their work. I am noted for appropriations bills but I will say, as one member of the Finance Committee, that we tend to be as tight as Dick’s hatband.

I have seen Senators who served on both the Finance Committee and also on the Foreign Relations Committee, and I am one of them—I have seen those Senators go to the Foreign Relations Committee and vote to give away everything. They would not have the courage to vote to raise the taxes in the middle of the Capitol dome, and then walk over to the Finance Committee room and proceed to be as tight as Dick’s hatband about giving anyone anything. When they are inside the Finance Committee, it seems as if there is not an atmosphere which overrules Senators when they realize that everything they vote for will also have to pay for. The Finance Committee has that duty in every bill.

Right now, the administration is $4 billion short of getting the money they are trying to get out of the Finance Committee for welfare. But at the same time they are asking the Appropriations Committee to double the number of recipients, and the Finance Committee, to deny the States the money due them for things which the Congress voted by law to require them to do. What would it mean if we voted for the limitation in this bill? It would mean that we would be talking about Federal law which requires States to provide services, while at the same time voting to deny the States the Federal matching funds that were supposed to pay for these services. It does not make sense.

Why did not the Department show the committee that authorizes this kind of legislation, the committee that raises the money to pay for it, at least the courtesy and the respect for it before they advocate both requiring the States to provide services and also keeping the Federal Government from paying its full share. It does not make sense.

The idea of a limitation might find sympathy among some of the members of the Finance Committee. The senior Republican member, the Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILMINGTON), I should think, might well wish to vote for a limitation of some sort, to save the Federal Government money. But it would seem to me that he should at least be offered the opportunity of being consulted about it.

I would think it would be most appropriate that this limitation be stricken from this bill before we bring it to the Floor. If that is the vote, and if that is the feeling of the committee, then it should be done as an amendment on the social security or public welfare legislation pending in the Finance Committee on Friday night. This legislation we in the committee are working on. If this legislation is out here on the floor and we are voting on it, it would seem to me that this would be an appropriate time to consider this matter.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President. Appropriations was considered. I am told, over in the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives. I can imagine what hap-
pened. The chairman of that committee looked down the State cost table and saw that this limitation would cost Texas $6 million. Another witness from Georgia saw that Georgia would be adversely affected to the extent of about $5 million, the California Representative saw that the cost to California would be $78 million, and so on. That probably was about the way it happened. The whole thing was dropped and forgotten.

Having failed to gain House approval, the Department went to work on the Senate side, where we have 46 Senators from 13 States and I did not work at all by the limitation. They figured they might be able to get a vote on the proposal in the Senate, or at least move it halfway to first base.

I find it passing strange to see the administration on the one hand trying to persuade the committee that has the authority to act on substantive legislation in this area to spend $4.5 billion on welfare while at the same time moving behind the scenes trying to get another committee to gut the program affecting three States they say are proposing to help.

I would hope that the Senate would vote down this proposal. If Senators want not to lose the gimmicks, they may be able to provide a reduction of service, it should be on the social security bill that will be coming out. It will be a big one. Senators can then do whatever their hearts desire about it. If they do not want to provide the services, then let them vote to reduce the services. Having done so, then let them vote to reduce the spending. It would be appropriate that the same bill that provides for additional expenditures should also provide for whatever reductions Senators want to vote in the program.

I, for one, would be most pleased, if I have to vote on this, to vote for a bill that loosens up on the tight ends at the same time it tightens up on the loose ends. That is what the social security, medicare, medicaid bill would do that is now before the Finance Committee. The bill will make a reduction where we think it can be justified and it will spend more in areas which I think want to be spent.

I hope very much that the cutback in services as proposed by the Appropriations Committee would not be agreed to as an amendment to this appropriations bill. I would hope that those of us who have the responsibility of authorizing the services legislation would be permitted to participate during the remainder of this session in looking at this whole problem in the context of the social security bill that will be before the Senate later on this year.

Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana, Senator Ribicoff, is very much impressed with the phrase that he used, when he talked about loosening up on the tight end and tightening up on the loose end.

The problem remains before the Senate, which does not in any way preclude the whole section 208 being stricken out later in the day, would make it clear that the limitation under the 15-percent increase limitation shall affect only the administration figures and shall not in any way affect the social workers, the day care people, the people who work with alcoholics, and any of the other various services — those people who are carrying the services to the recipient. That lid will be taken off entirely.

Mr. LONG. It may very well be that the Senator's amendment might be an improvement on what the Appropriations Committee has recommended to the Senate. I am not here to debate that, I am here to propose an amendment that in my opinion would be a much broader bill.

I am not here to point the finger of scorn at anyone, because everyone is trying to do the best they can. It gives them the blind. Probably, the limitation in this bill would save, would be more than offset by the cost of the committee amendment. If Senators want to oppose the amendment for the blind on the floor of the Senate, I cheerfully invite them to do it. I tried to do it a few years ago and the Senate gave me my "lumps" when I tried to oppose the proposal.

Mr. President, I agree with the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee of which I am a member. I do not think it is an amendment, or even an amendment to an amendment, but it is an amendment to the whole.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I agree with the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, of which I am a member, that we do not want to make any sense to me.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts just left for an appointment. He wanted to speak on this amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am not in control when we vote. I think that when we do vote we ought to have a rollcall vote on the pending amendment which, I take it, ought to be defeated. Then we can go the whole way.

I want to do it. I tried to do it a few years ago and the original idea is dropped and only one-third is pressed.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I agree. We should have a rollcall vote on the amendment. I presume that very likely we have the votes to defeat it. We are trying desperately to get this bill passed some time before we leave this evening.

If we could get an agreement on time, say 5 minutes to the side, and then have a quorum call and later explain the amendment after the quorum call, we can get it out of the way. We will have a lot of time then for the big battle that may come up on other things.

Mr. President, I say to the Senator from New Hampshire that we could not agree to 5 minutes. But we probably could agree to a time limitation. We ought to have a rollcall vote.

One way to shorten the matter would be if the Senator would withdraw his amendment. We could then offer our amendment which would strike all three sections to which this amendment addresses itself. If that amendment falls, the Senator could bring up his amendment which would attempt to strike only two provisions of the section 208.

Mr. President, I think we could proceed on that basis. My hope is that the Senate will strike the whole section. As the Senator from Louisiana said, it is bad in principle, although it is very well intentioned.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, after all, no matter how many groups constitute themselves as an appropriations committee of the Senate, the fact remains that the Appropriations Committee worked long and hard on this bill, including this provision. There are approximately 5,000 pages of evidence. It was unanimous. If the Appropriations Committee did not have some of their requests, I think they have a right to let the Senate refuse to let the Appropriations Committee change what they voted for by voting it down.

If this is agreed to, the Senator can go ahead and get rid of the whole thing. I would feel that it would be presumptuous for me, representing the chairman of the committee and other members of the committee, as well as myself, to ask that, in view of the fact that the Appropriations Committee desires to make this relaxation and further curtail section 208, we vote on it.

Mr. President, I should not think we should be compelled to withdraw it. I think we ought to be allowed to vote on it within a reasonable time. It is too long to explain what this amendment does. It does not have any effect whatsoever on the ultimate question of abolishing the entire section 208.
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has had his say. We want to put on our case now.

I am not prepared to agree to a time limitation of facts time. The House ruled we that we will unduly delay the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, would the Senator yield, so that I may make a brief statement in support of the amendment?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I have not had a chance to say what I wish to say. But if you will allow it, I have not finished my statement, I will be glad to yield the floor. I have been waiting for some time to speak on the matter.

I rise as a member of the Senate Finance Committee and as a member of the Senate, as Senators know, who is somewhat more than a casual interest in the matter of welfare assistance and social services.

The Finance Committee is considering at this time rather sweeping recommendations for changes in the welfare program of the country, which I strongly feel we should do. As a matter of fact, I have offered legislation that is now pending in the Senate Finance Committee which would limit the next year's budget for the welfare system of this country which is desperately needed. It would federalize the welfare system so that we would have greater control over the whole question of administration.

Mr. President, the section which is now in question before the Senate is not the way to go about holding down costs. Rather, legislation along the lines I have just mentioned is the best way to see that people themselves benefit more, as they should, from an improved welfare system and that we hold the administrative and other costs within some reasonable limits.

The distinguished Senator from California (Mr. CLEASCOM), the distinguished Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BIRNCOFF), I—some 25 other Senators altogether—have offered an amendment which would delete the entire section which would limit the expenditures by the Federal Government for the purpose of matching State costs for administrative expenses, services, and staff training in the welfare program of the country which exceed 115 percent of the costs for 1970.

That is a totally unrealistic recommendation which the administration has made. It seems so incongruous, as the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has said, for the administration, or at least one arm of the administration—as a matter of fact, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Secretary Richardson and Under Secretary Veneman—to come before the Appropriations Committee and say that they would like to hold down and restrict the costs of social services, and then, these very influential figures come before the Finance Committee and say that we must improve and expand social services.

That is exactly what is involved. It is rather difficult to understand what is in the Senate. Often those who seem to say different things on these subjects before different committees.

The truth is that caseloads in this country have jumped enormously. Secrecy

tary Richardson and others have expressed great surprise and said they wonder why that is so. We do not have to look very far to see one reason why they have expanded, because the principal reasons is because of misguided economic, monetary and fiscal policies which have increased the number of people out of work in this country.

I refer to the monetary and fiscal policies which, for the purpose of getting control of the economy, have increased the jobless lines in this country. Many people have had their employment insurance run out; many people have worked a week, and many others have lost their opportunity for overtime. That is not necessary in this country, the richest country in the world with the greatest productive capacity, with the greatest demand for goods and services, and the greatest skills in a work force of people who want to work. I think it is a wretched and heartless policy which forces so many people out of work.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, will the Senate yield?

Mr. HARRIS. That is what is involved in this rising caseload. If we want to put people to work the administration should join the Senate in support of the bill which we have already passed to greatly expand employment in this country.

Any country which calls itself civilized and tolerates unemployment for those who want to work and are not living up to what it calls its standards, I hope that we may provide expanded job opportunities for the people of this country. They have been diminishing. That is what is involved here. That is one reason why there is a rising caseload. There is also the matter of a rising population from which that rising caseload comes. We also must consider the added programs the Senate has voted, such as expanding day care programs and family planning programs. Therefore, we cannot now come here and say arbitrarily: “We are going to cut down to 115 percent of last year.

The distinguished Senator from New Hampshire is entitled to commendation, as we are from Minnesota, as Mr. Washington, the chairman of our Appropriations Subcommittee, for what they intend. They hope we can hold down costs. But the hush hush method is not the way to go about it by these overall limits and I have steadfastly refused to support such arbitrary limits on spending in the past. I do not see why they should be put into this legislation.

Furthermore, I think the Senator from New Hampshire is entitled to praise for asking the Senate to consider two-thirds of the harsh impact of this section which is before the Senate; but he does not go far enough. He is not able to say what the impact of the remaining portion of these programs will be. In my opinion we have to come to a question a while ago he said he could not say what the increased cost to the States would be.

The States and local governments are already terribly burdened with rising costs. We want to hear from the services, without a similarly growing tax base. I do not see how we can say to them arbitrarily, “You have to cut back on these costs or pay more of them yourselves.” which is what we would be saying. This is not the way to go about it.

Despite the fact the amendment from New Hampshire goes part way, I hope the Senate will reject it. Then, the Senator from California, and I, and others will offer an amendment which goes all the way in recognizing that this is not a proper way to go about this matter. Our amendment will seek to strike the entire section.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, will the Senate yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. PEARSON. The Senator makes the point that, with the increasing caseload today, it is an arbitrary and a rather heartless position for the administration to support the reduction of section 208. I have some statistics and figures before me that come from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, relating to the point on which the Senator spoke so eloquently.

I know the Senator from Oklahoma spent a great deal of time on the Committee on Finance. I inquire whether or not the Senator, in his deep study of this particular program, could confirm those facts which give some indication why there is such great concern about the increasing costs of administration of the welfare program. For instance, I am advised that in the 5 years from fiscal year 1965 to fiscal year 1970, the administration costs rose from $9.3 to $13.1 billion, an increase of 324 percent. This does not mean very much unless it is related to the general subject about which the Senator spoke today, and that is the increased caseload in that same period.

Mr. HARRIS. I would like to have the opportunity to respond to the question. Mr. PEARSON, I would like to finish my statement first. The administrative costs increased 324 percent. The number of caseloads increased from 7.1 million to 10.5 million and the amount of money paid out increased from $4.4 to $7.1 billion. These facts indicate a 49 percent in the welfare rolls and an increase in 62 percent in payments. So there is a ratio of 300 percent increase in administrative costs while the number of cases increased about 50 percent and the amount of money paid out, about 60 percent.

Mr. HARRIS. Where was the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare while that was going on? Does the Senator from Kansas or other Senators feel the State can just willy-nilly operate a welfare program however it pleases with perhaps any level of administration and overhead it wants? The answer is no. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has some responsibility for this program. We have come in with plans to be approved by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Where were they when all this was going on? Are they impotent now? Where were the Senators, the men who sit in this Senate to put on some level when Senators cannot say what that will mean when applied to the rising costs of ad-
ministration? The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should assume its responsibility and if it cannot, then it is up to Congress for the administration of welfare and related programs. If he does not have sufficient power to hold down these costs which he feels are rising unnecessarily, the Committee on Finance is obvious the place. And after all, we have jurisdiction over these laws and he should come before us and say so, and not go to the Committee on Appropriations and ask for an arbitrary limit of 115 percent on the cost of administration, social services and training, or any of these matters.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. PEARSON. Could the Senator state where the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare was during the years 1965 through 1966? At that time a Democratic administration controlled Health, Education, and Welfare. I do not recall that HEW made any overtures to the Committee on Finance at that time.

Mr. HARRIS. For reasons from now on is the Senator still going to be saying that? This administration has been in power a good while. The laws have not been repealed. The powers of the Secretary have been under the laws. If he does not, he should come before the Committee on Finance and ask for the powers he wants to help him see that administrative costs in these programs around the country are held down.

Lastly, I would point out to the Senator that since President Nixon took office the administrative costs to which the Senator from Kansas refers have risen 38 percent in just the last year, and that was before the reorganization of Nixon.

Mr. PEARSON. The point I wish inquire about is the Senator's statement that there should be a relationship to the increased amount of money paid in welfare and administration costs. I simply cite the figures to show the administrative costs have increased over 500 percent while at the same time the caseload increased 50 percent. The Senator made the point, and I think he is absolutely correct, that if there is going to be an increase in the amounts that should be more administrative costs. I think the Senator from New Hampshire made a good point today. But the ratio is so great between administrative costs and the caseload number that I think the Secretary of HEW is on pretty firm ground when he comes to the Committee on Appropriations and indicates there should be some sort of limitation to hold these great administrative costs down.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not want to unduly belabor that point. The desire to bring up this matter is when we can make a difference. No one knows the effect of the proposed revised section and it is not just a matter of an expanding caseload, although that is a part of it. The Senate continues to give to the State welfare departments additional programs and asks them to fund their portion of these expenses from their own budgets.

For example, I myself offered an amendment to the 1967 Social Security Act to set up two new programs, one to provide for the use of social service volunteers in the welfare programs of the States and the other to provide for the training of social service workers. The other amendment was to provide for welfare aides, for hiring poor people themselves to work in these programs.

In addition, we have expanded the day care center and the child care program. All these programs have to be administered and that costs money.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare ought to come before the Committee on Finance, where we can look into the way 115 percent of the costs are rising, and he ought to recommend changes in the basic law; or, if he does not feel that he has enough power to deal with the rising costs, he ought to ask for additional powers. But to come before the Committee on Finance and ask for a limit of 115 percent which is not workable is not the way to proceed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), and the other Senators in opposition to section 208 of the committee bill under which Federal sharing in payments made by the States during fiscal year 1971 for welfare, staff training, and administrative expenses under titles I, IV—part A—X, and XVI of the Social Security Act—which covers assistance to the poor, the blind, the aged, and the disabled—would not apply to expenditure in the first 11 percent of the amount estimated for these purposes for fiscal year 1970.

The Senate Committee on Appropriations report indicates that this limitation will be 115 percent, a Government $161 million in 1971 and administrative costs of the program's principal defense of the section that welfare services, staff training, and administrative expenses cannot be justified as "uncontrollable" or "open-ended" appropriations, and that the approach to be economically unrealistic and shortsighted and inimical to the entire approach of the administration in dealing with the social problems that face the Nation.

According to statistics provided by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the immediate fiscal result will be that in 32 States something less than the full amount will be met, and in 14 of those States, less than 90 percent of the amount will be met. The States will be Georgia, Hawaii, Michigan, New Hampshire, and Pennsylvania—less than 90 percent of the requests can be met.

Mr. President, there is strong reason to believe that the effect on the States will be far more marked by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The predictable result of this limitation will be that most States and localities will either have to scrap a good part of their social services or assume additional fiscal burdens which are beyond their capability.

This result will obtain because the costs of administration and training are tied directly to the welfare caseload, and the latter can be expected to increase during this year at a rate far in excess of 115 percent. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare recently estimated that the welfare caseload for this fiscal year will increase 13.8 million persons, an increase of 20 percent above last fiscal year—and that in some States the case will be 20 to 30 percent greater than last year. The Department's own projections of the number of States that would be extremely affected by that plan are based upon the assumption that States are well in advance of the current rate of unemployment, which is now at 5.6 percent and is expected to continue at this high level or at even higher levels, pushing even more individuals onto the welfare rolls. In the meantime, inflation will increase the salary expenses for caseworkers and administrators; increases of between 6 percent and 15 percent are expected this year, and will effect a rise in the cost of many services.

Accordingly, a closed-end appropriation on services will deal a death blow to the development of social services in many States. During recent years, the States have been encouraged to provide their own funds to purchase welfare dependency. These have included new forms of day care, such as family day care, early childhood education, mental illness, community outpatient and treatment centers, halfway houses, and vocational centers.

However, States and localities—faced with rising administrative and training costs occasioned by the increase in the welfare caseload—will have no choice but to cut back on social services. While HEW statistics suggest that my own State would not be forced to cut back, the State itself forecasts a loss of $10 to $50 million Federal dollars.

The clear result will be that whatever savings there are will be diverted to parochial categories in 1971 will be paid many times against and again in subsequent years in the form of dependency on cash assistance.

Mr. President, this result also is contrary to three tenets of the New Federalism:

First, as noted by the President in his address to the Nation on August 8, 1969, the administration's welfare proposals:

As...
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NOT VOTING—22
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Wendell
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Bennett
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McGee
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Mundt
Pell
Peled
Goldwater
Russell
Saxbe
Sparkman
Stennis
Taylor
Tydings

Additional day care facilities serving school-age children and pre-school children are urgently needed in neighborhoods where AFDC and other low-income families live to enable those women to take advantage of work and other training and employment programs.

The provisions for child care set forth in the administration's Family Assistance Act underscore the increasing realization that lack of child-care facilities—not lack of initiative—represents for women the primary obstacle to economic independence, and even now we are meeting less than one-fourth of the need.

Second, it is incompatible with the doctrine of the New Federalism that the Federal Government assumes the costs of cash assistance, the responsibility for social services should be shifted from Washington to the States and the localities.

This tenet—which was expressed in the administration's proposal for manpower training—will have little application in the social services field under section 208. The States which have listened to this rhetoric and have done the most to respond to it will be forced to close a number of their programs to those that were just getting interested in social services will have street jackets placed on any innovative and responsible efforts. In contrast with these results, the administration's background paper for its social service reform amendments, submitted June 18, 1970, indicated that the Federal Government "must be concerned with expanding the quality and capacity of State and local government to accept these increased responsibilities."

Third, it is incompatible with the tenet of revenue sharing with the States and the cities. While the administration's figures suggest that these restraints will save the Federal Government iko out the States to make additional expenditures in order to maintain efforts. While the administration's proposal permits a 15 percent increase from 1970 to 1971, the fact is that 27 States in the country decreased in these years increased between 32.5 percent and 35.5 percent between fiscal year 1969 and 1970.

Mr. President, the House rejected any limitation on these essential services; and I hope that the Senate will exercise similar restraint. It would be unwise to continue on the one hand, to tell the Nation's poor that the road from poverty is traveled by those who work, while cutting back on the very efforts that allow them to help themselves.

Mr. HARRIS, Mr. President, I thank you from New York.

I hope that we may be able to arrange a time limitation. So far as I am concerned, and if my associates on the amendment are agreeable, we should be able to do so.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the yeas and nays have been ordered on the pending amendment by the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. Corroon)?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE). The Senator from West Virginia is correct.

Mr. COTTON. The yeas and nays were requested by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the amendment offered by the able Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. Corroon).

Mr. HARRIS, Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Byrd) to lay on the table the amendment offered by the able Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. Corroon). The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY, I announce that the Senator from Alabama (Mr. Allen), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. Bayh), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. Cannon), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Dodd), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Gore), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Hart), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. Inouye), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. McCarthy), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. McGee), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. Russell), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. Stafford), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Stennis), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. Tydings) are necessarily absent.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. Bellmon), the Senator from Utah (Mr. Bennett), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. Fong), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. Goldwater), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Hatfield), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. Sasser), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. Tower) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois (Mr. Percy) is absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. Mundy) is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. Munds), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. Tower) would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 35, as follows:
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Andersen
Brock
Brooks
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
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Cronin
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Gravel
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Jacquez
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Huntsman
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McIntyre
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Peck
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Williams, Mo.
Williams, O.
Williams, Okla.
Young, N. Dak.
amendment were adopted—that is, to strike it out altogether.

Mr. ALLOTT. That may be true, but I would not want to put myself in the position of waiting until that time to offer this amendment.

Mr. HARKER. For my part, I would be willing for those words to be changed immediately—before we strike the whole paragraph.

Mr. CRANSTON. I, too.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, may we have the Senator from New York recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, if this is the situation, I discussed this very briefly with the ranking minority member of the committee yesterday afternoon. I believe that this would be satisfactory to him, but I cannot state so unequivocally as a result. He is not in the Chamber at this moment. I am perfectly willing to ask unanimous consent that I may present this and have it accepted.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I would like to accept it, but I think that in all deference to the Senator from New Hampshire I would wait until he returns to the Chamber. Reluctantly object.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I will have to object, then, until I feel that my rights are protected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the first part of the Javits amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I had hoped that we could work out both these amendments quickly, and I am sure we will, but we can proceed with the Javits amendment right now. It has been the pending business. I ask unanimous consent that there be a time limitation of 10 minutes to a side on the Javits amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JAVITS. I object. That is too short. I said an hour. We will agree to an hour. We may not use it. A half hour on a side.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I modify my request to a half hour on a side.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, would that hour start right now?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. May I ask this of the Senator from Washington? Why can we not dispose of the Allott objection by putting in a short quorum call, so that the Senator from Colorado can check this matter out with the Senator from New Hampshire, and get it out of the way? Then we can go on with the Javits amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We will have to wait about 20 minutes to do that.

Mr. MILLER. I suggest perhaps 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. If the Senator objects, we will have to do it.

Mr. MILLER. I would hope it would not even be 5 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If Senators will just hold up for a moment, we can get both
presents funding at the level of Congressional authorization in the Economic Op-
portunity Act of 1964.

The bipartisan group of Senators sponsoring this amendment seek to meet our obliga-
tion to the programs around the country threatened with cutbacks, to Man-
power programs in cities with record high un-
employment also threatened with cutbacks, and for the many millions of families operating poverty programs operating at an ef-
fective level.

With unemployment at higher levels than in recent years, any cuts in the funds for the manpower and other poverty programs.

The Economic Opportunity Act Amendment of fiscal Year 1972 was denied a total spending level for regular OEO programs of $2,229,500,000. However, $50 million has already been appropriated, at the Administration's request, for desegregation assistance.

There are four parts to the amendment.

They include:

1. $65 million for Head Start, the full regul-
   lar authorization, and enough for a modest increase in the size of the program.

2. $25 million for manpower programs, the full Administration's request and an increase over the Senate committee figure of $769 million.

3. An additional $50.7 million for other OEO programs, to maintain them at an efficient level.

4. Language to assure that Manpower and Head Start programs are not reduced, ac-
cording to OEO delegation agreements by funneling the money through OEO. The Senate
   Appropriations' Committee bill directs the funds directly to the Secretaries of HEW and Labor in contravention of the OEO leg-
lislation.

5. Mr. President, I want to discuss each of these matters in some detail. First, however, I want to make a comment upon the flood of mail that my office, and that of my Sub-
committee, has been receiving on the House Appropriations proposal for the Administration, Manpower and Poverty has received from local Head Start, Manpower and Community Action officials.

These letters speak of substantial cuts be-
ing made in Head Start, Emergency Food and Medical Care and in such Manpower programs as the Concentrated Employment Program (CEP) and Operation Mainstream.

It is unclear how many of these cutbacks, in Administration's admission, the Administration is blaming Congress, and Congressional earmarking for these cutbacks in hope of a quid pro quo. Mr. President, the charge is simply not true. In fact, Congress has increased the funding for the Office of Economic Opportunity at a steady 7% modest pace.

The problem seems to be that the Admin-
istration priorities are changing, and money is being taken from some programs and given to others among the OEO programs.

To be precise: for both fiscal years 1969 and 1970 Congress appropriated exactly $1,946 billion. (In FY 1970 the Senate app-
proaches were cut back in conference.) This year, Congress is certain to appropriate a good deal more than the $1,946 billion approved last year. The House has already appropriated $2,046 billion and the Senate Appropriations Committee, $2,063 billion.

Therefore, any dollar cuts in individual programs are not the fault of the Congress. They are decisions by the Administration. The Administration has a right to make such decisions. But it is unfair to blame the Congress for such cutbacks.

The argument used by the Administration is that Congressional "earmarking" has "forced" cutbacks. Earmarking is the term used to describe the provisions in the bill that the Congres-
ss spells its best judgment as to how the two billion in authorizations should be al-
located among the OEO programs.

Congress was absolutely determined last

t year to earmark funds. The idea of giving any agency a multi-billion dollar blank check is of course objectionable. Thus specific dollar amounts—of both large and small—that had been suggested by the Administration in the Spring of 1969 were written into the law as programs such as Head Start, Legal Services, Alcohol and Drug Abuse, etc. However, since it was recognized that a new Administration needed flexibility, a provision was inserted into the legislation, allowing the Director of OEO to transfer up to 15% out of any program and transfer it to another.

The OEO officials have not been very pleased with earmarking, even with flexibility. They drew up their Fiscal Year 1971 budget requests with a provision written into the bill, apparently confident that they could get the earmarking provisions removed. The Administration attempted to do away with earmarking last year. They managed to get the language stricken from the bill in the Appropriations conference, but were refused to accept the Confer-
ence language on that point, and the House in that refusal concurred. This year an ef-
fort to eliminate the earmarking in the House failed.

Apparently in reworking their budget after this setback the Administration exercised its 15% flexibility option vigorously in order to support new administrative and Evaluation activities. And it has been informing local Community Action and Head Start directors of program cutbacks—and placing the blame on inadequate appro-
piations by Congress.

The Labor Department is also currently ordering cutbacks in the financialized programs, using as a justification the charge that "the House cut the manpower funds." In fact, as I said before, although the House cut the manpower appropriation for FY 1971, it had already appropriated more for OEO this year than Congress appropriated last year. Thus any cuts in the manpower programs are the result of internal allocation of funds made by the Administration. Funds to begin new programs, such as the $45 million STEP program, to help those who have been laid off from the JOBS program, and the $25 million budgeted for STEP II, a program to channel funds through the Governors' offices to help states in need of manpower, do not appear to have been earmarked.

The Administration has a right to do this. But how can the blame be laid on a Congress that is increasing the funds available for poverty and manpower programs?

There is only one way that the Administra-
tion can be enabled to both carry out the new programs that it desires and to keep faith with the established programs, and that is through a new amendment. The Administration is not properly funded for Office of Economic Opportunity programs proposed in this amendment.

HEAD START

In the Economic Opportunity Act Amend-
ment of 1964, the Administration authorized $398 million for the Head Start program. Congress has proven to be an exceptionally effective and popular program at the local level. Last year it approved $350 million. This year, ac-


ording to the Office of Child Development in HEW, the office that administers the program, it would take some $350 million to maintain the program. At the same time the New Obligational Authority for the program last year was only $292 million, but because of over funding available last year it operated at the higher $342 million level. This House over-
cover funds, apparently, are not available this year.

Even at the $342 million level the program was just beginning to meet the unmet documented local need for pre-school training for the children of the poor. It is estimated that the program serves only 18% of those who need year round help and 14% of the summer need.

If there were ever a federal program worthy of support, this Head Start program is it. It is the one program in the nation's future—it is the Head Start program. But instead of expanding the program, the Administration in its budget request, which has come to a cutback. With continuation costs pegged at $350 million, the Administration has asked for only $294 million, or a cut of $18 million. This is $18 million on the House of Representatives and $18 million on cities and rural communities around the nation.

The subcommittee did a survey of Head Start and Community Action programs to see how they were doing these cutbacks would be in re-

In response we received letters from all over the nation speaking of 7 percent, and 12 percent decrease in funding in Head Start pro-
gram funds. And this at a time when a 10 percent to 12 percent dollar increase is neces-
sary just to maintain services.

I agree for mid-1971. I do not dare place in the Record at this time extracts from some of these letters.

We propose going to full Congressional au-
thorization for Head Start. This would be sufficient to funds to serve an esti-

ated 59,400 children, still far short of the number needed, but for a solid demonstration of the commitment in this program, the expansion of programs for early childhood edu-
cation.

MANPOWER

Unemployment was 5.6 percent of the work-
force in October. It has been rising steadily ever since the present Administration took office. On the Washington Post of November 18 it was reported that the President is predicting unemployment of 8 percent in 1971 and perhaps 10 percent in 1972.

In an article headed "Losing Faith in Un-
employment" the columnist Evans and Novak quote New York economic consultant, Dr. Peter Rinfret, as projecting:

6 percent for the year 1970.

6.6 percent for mid-1971.

7.9 percent for end of 1971.

9.7 percent for end of 1972.

Mr. Rinfret's predictions are based on the assumption that the Administration will con-
tinue its present course. If those who are making those policies will be changed, such depression level unemployment levels as are pro-
ected by Mr. Rinfret are totally unacceptable. It is the job of this nation to be dead wrong in his pessimistic projections.

However, the serious suggestion of unem-
ployment rates over 9 percent must give us pause. It is required that all of us do what we can to see that the President has the tools he needs to fight unemployment.

The Senate demonstrated its support for the Administration's request for $13 million in September when, by a vote of 68 to 6, it passed the Employment and Training Oppor-
tunity Act of 1970. That historic act provides a basic authority for a full year for a year for manpower training and job crea-
tion programs, and further authorizes an ad-
mendment to the Social Security Act for a major Public Service Employment program.

This year the Administration requested a total of $1,549,494,000 for manpower pro-
gress, of which $747,494,000 under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, and the rest ($802,000,000) under the Economic Opportunity Act.

The House Appropriations Committee has allowed $1,504,704,000 cutting $44,700,000 of the President's funds. Of this request, $2,800,000 is taken from the MDTA request and $14,900,000 is taken from the OEO request.

The Administration plans to on that cut to local programs according to the fol-

owing schedule:
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Concentrated Employment Program
$6,500,000
Public Service Employment Program
$5,200,000
Neighborhood Youth Corps
in-school
3,200,000
Neighborhood Youth Corps
cutback
7,300,000
Neighborhood Youth Corps
out-of-school
7,200,000
Job Corps
9,510,000
Operation Mainstream
2,700,000

Total
41,840,000

In order to assure that these cuts will not be made we are including in our OEO amendment a request for manpower programs: $802 million.

Even at the Administration's requested funding levels these programs are grossly inadequate and underfunded.

During the past year the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty has held hearings in many cities around the country on examining manpower training programs. In city after city we found that the chief problem was lack of funds. In Los Angeles, for instance, local officials documented a need for 240,000 training opportunities. That is to say nearly a quarter of a million people in the Los Angeles metropolitan area that both poor and in a position to gain positive benefit and useful employment through manpower training. To meet this need the Administration requested and was denied for only 24,000 training opportunities: 10 cents for every $1 of need. This 10 percent ratio was repeated in other cities. We must propose legislation in this Congress to require the Administration request and we urge that the Administration think very carefully about using any and all available funds.

OTHER OEO PROGRAMS

The OEO bill, provides full Congressional authorization for Head Start and the Administration's request for Manpower programs. In addition, it provides $400,000 for Social Experimentation of which the Administration has set priorities—such as research, development and evaluation—and provides continuation funding at near the level of Congressional authorization for ongoing Economic Opportunity programs.

SPECIAL IMPACT

The Special Impact program provides opportunities for education, welfare, and development programs which the Administration has set priorities—such as research, development and evaluation—and continues funding at near the level of Congressional authorization for ongoing Economic Opportunity programs.

This program helps children who have been through Head Start maintain their gains during the early years in school. But the program reaches only 74,000 of the 408,000 young children from low income families who are eligible. It ought to be expanded.

Without additional funds, health and nutrition programs can only help a small proportion of those in need and provide funds for only a handful of new neighborhood medical centers. The documented need is for 600 Neighborhood Medical Centers.

The scandalous inadequacy of Federal expenditures for alcoholism and drug abuse is widely known. The meager OEO programs must be expanded. Under current procedures, less than 5 percent of the need for alcoholic programs, and less than 2 percent of the need for drug programs will be met.

EMERGENCY FOOD AND MEDICAL SERVICE

Without additional funds this program will be funded at about last year's level, reaching little more than half those identified as receiving help from medical and other emergency aid in this the richest nation in the world. And despite months of effort, no food stamp legislation has emerged from the House Agriculture Committee.

LEGAL SERVICES

The Senate Appropriations committee has allowed three million less for Legal Services than the Administration requested. Even at the Administration's request the program would only be reaching 17 percent of those who need it. Legal Services is perhaps the most successful of the OEO programs to be established and is a model of what can be accomplished within the system it is essential that all Americans have access to the courts and have their rights protected. That is the mission of Legal Services lawyers. They have gained the respect of the nation and the tenacious support of the entire legal profession. It is essential that we provide adequate funds for the Legal Services program.

VISTA

The Senate Committee has recommended a cut in the Volunteers in Service to America program. Taken together with inflation this cut will mean substantial drop in the size of this crucial effort to train people to work with agencies fighting poverty. At a time when all of us feel a responsibility to provide opportunity to young people to work constructively to make our society work and progress it is most unwise to cut back on one of the handful of Federal programs that provide such opportunity.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION

The Administration has repeatedly stressed its desire to increase and enlarge the role played by the OEO in testing out new concepts. The Agency points to the great value the income maintenance experimental and demonstration project in New Jersey played in the discussions this year of the Family Assistance Program. The Administration should have the funds it asks in this area.

Mr. President, with unemployment rising, with millions of Americans being disproportionately from the slow down in the economy, and with a clear need to stimulate the economy, the time has come to begin to meet our commitments to the nation and to provide adequate funding for the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The amendment we have proposed provides full funding for Head Start, the Administration's request for Manpower programs, and adequate additional funds to implement the new priorities in research, Development and Evaluation and to maintain existing programs at an adequate level. I urge the Senate to approve this amendment.

REMARKS ON DELEGATION OF HEAD START AND MANPOWER PROGRAMS

Mr. President, in making this Appropriations Committee has reported to the Senate provides for appropriations of funds directly to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the Head Start and Follow Through programs and directly to the Department of Labor for the Work and Training provisions (Title I) of the Economic Opportunity Act.

The Appropriations Committee would appropriate to HEW $339,000,000 for Head Start and $70,400,000 for Follow Through and would appropriate the Labor Department $760 million for Work and Training, thus leaving $694,400,000 for other OEO programs under the Office of Economic Opportunity. Appropriations for the Appropriations bill as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee. Together these items add up to a total of $2,053,900,000 under the authority of the Economic Opportunity Act, although the Appropriations Committee would split up the funds in the bill three ways to HEW, Labor, and OEO.

The Appropriations Committee's proposal for appropriating portions of the Economic Opportunity Act funds directly to HEW and Labor contravenes the provisions of the legislation from the standpoint of the authorization legislation—the Economic Opportunity Act.

I am chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty, and the Senator from New York, Mr. Javits, is the ranking minority member. Our subcommittee has legislative responsibility for the programs. The Appropriations Committee proposes to make direct appropriations to HEW and Labor. Our subcommittee has drafted legislation which would accomplish direct funding to the Labor Department of all manpower training programs.

The Manpower Act, consolidating all manpower training provisions in the Labor Department effective July 1, 1971, passed the House on Tuesday of this week, after having passed the Senate on September 17. In a week or so, when both conferences are likely to resolve the differences between the House and Senate bills. We held 22 days of hearings and 10 previous hearings before a period of months. However, the House and Senate bills, while having some differences, are identical in this respect. They both consolidate the Economic Opportunity Act provisions and Training provisions with other manpower training programs in the Labor Department. But it should be noted that both bills accommodate the consolidation effective next July 1, 1971.

But the Appropriations Committee report states its intention to make a judgment totally contrary to that of the conference committee. It would in the middle of the fiscal year change the arrangements for the rest of this fiscal year without any time for preparing for the changes. In acting upon the manpower bill, both the House and Senate quite deliberately delayed the effective date for the consolidation of HEW, Labor and OEO. The organization of manpower programs is a difficult and delicate process, and we wrote certain protections into the bill to preserve certain unification elements that were abolished with Economic Opportunity Act programs. It will take time to gear up for the changeover. An Appropriations Committee should not change the present arrangements in the middle of the year with no lead time.

Our committee also has Head Start legislation on the agenda. We held hearings on that program this year. At the beginning of the next session we will be acting on legislation with respect to Head Start as well as other Federal welfare programs.

I believe it is the general expectation such authorization legislation will place direct responsibility for Head Start with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. There are many questions for the authorization committee to consider in acting upon such a bill. The main one is whether transfer of authority is effected is a complex matter.

This body has never looked favorably upon appropriations bills making changes in authorization acts. That is the reason legislation transferring authority to other offices is properly carried out through the proper procedures of the Senate. What the bill reported by the Appropriations Committee does, however, is to appropriate funds directly to HEW and Labor without legislative authority.

Let me explain the situation under the existing legislation, the Economic Opportunity Act. Section 171 of the Act states that the "Director (of the Office of Economic
Opportunity) shall carry out the programs under this title (title I, Work and Training programs), except that applications for programs under section 622 (d) of the Economic Opportunity Act, shall be submitted directly to the Secretary of Labor to carry out certain programs under title I OEO Act programs, the Appropriations Committee has reported an appropriation without legislative authority in the substantive authorizing legislation. Likewise, section 245 applying to Head Start states that "The Committee recommends that the acts approved under this title be directed to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the same manner, the Work and Training programs authorized by the OEO Act have been delegated to the Labor Department for administration. These delegations are in complete accord with the Economic Opportunity Act. Section 622 (d) of the Economic Opportunity Act authorizes the delegation of functions of the Director of OEO to other agencies, with the approval of the Senate. In fact, in its original conception in 1964, the Economic Opportunity Act embodied the delegation concept. It was understood from the outset that the functions of the OEO Act would be carried out directly by OEO and other functions would be delegated for actual administration to other agencies but that OEO would retain a significant role in policy-making and coordinating functions. Now, maybe that is a bad idea. But we have that idea for 5 years and suddenly, in an appropriations bill, there is an attempt to do away with that concept. The Appropriations Committee has reported provisions which would give the Secretary of Labor the authority to make changes in appropriations, perhaps. Maybe those who don't like the idea of delegated programs have a good point. But why shouldn't a member who feels that way come forward and vote against the bill and testify as to his feelings. Furthermore, any member can propose an amendment to the authorizing legislation. It should be obvious to all that it occurs in the final stages of action in the appropriations bill, with a third of the fiscal year having already passed, that the OEO appropriations is being split up into direct funding to three separate agencies. When the President's budget was submitted at the beginning of the year, the OEO appropriations were considered to be an integral part of the president's budget. So I think the Appropriations Committee is agreeable with the objective of the Appropriations Committee, but the Appropriations Committee wants to make the direct appropriations to the Department of Labor and not to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. First, I point out that this really is legislation in an appropriations bill. I have so frequently heard senior Senators on Appropriations Committees and other committees advising everyone on the record that it is not legislation in Appropriations Committees, but that is exactly what this is. If I thought the Appropriations Committee was going to circumvent this principle and include legislation in appropriations bills, I do not understand any hearings such as we conducted from November to May—22 days on the manpower bill, hearings that were conducted in Los Angeles, Corpus Christi, Cleveland, Milwaukee, and Washington. Then, after conducting the hearings from November to May, we had executive sessions extending over two months, in which we marked up the bill. It was our considered judgment that the effective date for removing this responsibility from the OEO for working out delegation agreements for the performance of the various functions by HEW and Labor should be July 1, 1971. That judgment was based upon the extensive hearings and the reluctance of the departments to do it. They studied this bill the whole year to determine whether they could delegate the power. They did not do it. They passed it to the 1971 law, which was a good way to do business, to appropriate money to one department and tell that this was the way we intended it, and then to leave it to the department to spend the money and let the first department delegate the power. We do not know which one they are going to delegate to the Labor Department or to HEW. They are now operating Head Start under HEW and the Job Corps program under the Labor Depart-
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They do not understand it themselves. The power to delegate is one that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or the Director of the OEO can exercise any way he wishes to under this arrangement. We have no way of knowing whether it goes to a given program such as Headstart or to some other programs.

The committee did a good job. We put the money requested in for all their programs. We hope it will work. Some of these programs will be new. Some will be delegated and another is not. There is a lack of coordination and proper direction. Last year, we did not know who was going to be the Director for 9 months.

The Appropriations Committee should not be put in the position of appropriating money for a lot of programs when the expenditure power is going to be delegated. We did not even know who the director of OEO was going to be. Incidentally, he changed his mind about OEO. He was a Member of the House. I think he is doing a fine job. Before the House committee he did not want it appropriated to those running it, and he probably does not support

But this is a bad way of doing business.

Mr. President, I will not take much more time. But added to the bill by the Javits amendment would be $181 million. The Senator from New Hampshire and I pleased with the Senator from New York to separate these two items and let the Senate work its will.

We think that we have done a good job. If this amendment is rejected—and I hope that it will be—all of these programs that we have added for Headstart and the amendment. The committee itself intends to offer an amendment on Headstart.

I think there should be an amendment to the job training program, which is also very important. Senator Inhofe added to the bill in the Senate $311 million over the President's request.

I am getting up to voetoes now. I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin. However, the next time we come to get a third veto on this bill, I have been the recipient of most of the voetoes around here with the exception of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Pastore).

The committee did what was within its responsibilities. The $181 million brings many of these items right up to the authorization ceilings.

I know that the Senator from New York said yesterday that the classic argument of pipe items, the Appropriations Committee is—and I made that argument yesterday—that if we appropriate every dollar that is authorized, the Appropriations Committee might as well be done away with.

We have a chance after the bills are authorized to go through every item. We do that. The Senator from Wisconsin heard a lot of witnesses on job training. We heard pretty close to 250 witnesses on this bill for all of the programs involved.

My interpretation is that the authorization is a ceiling and that the Appropriations Committee has to take as fine to that authorization a tooth comb as it can and go through each item and within its capabilities and resources say whether we should go up.

That was my interpretation but if you are going to appropriate everything that is authorized in legislative acts we will do well quite well. The Senator said he spent several good, solid weeks on this matter and that he should not have had to do that. There is no use in our spending 4 months on this bill, sometimes morning, afternoon, and evening, if the appropriations are not needed.

The Senator said there is a great deal of argument about what has been said about policy. It could be argued on both sides, but the amendment contains all of these other items and the Senator from New York did not see fit to separate them. There is contained here an item of $33.9 million. Does the Senator know what that is for? That is for "Other programs." What are the "Other programs"? We have not defined them. They would be given $43 million to distribute or allocate or do what they want to do for one or any number of programs.

I think Congress has a responsibility to know where the taxpayers money is being spent. That is what this is all about. I am sorry the amendment was not separated, and strongly oppose it.

Does the Senator from New Hampshire have anything to add at this time?

Mr. COTTON. No; I merely want to corroborate and agree with my distinguished chairman. The trouble is we have so few Senators in the Chamber. I, too, have discovered the deficit in budget so I am not in a position to increase the amount for Headstart and I am in perfect agreement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And every other item is open for amendment.

Mr. COTTON. There are several items where we are going to use a ball-of-wax approach is defeated, this $181 million measure which imperils the entire bill. I want Senators to understand that we will offer an amendment to increase Headstart, and it can be moved by any other Senator.
We want to separate the wheat from the chaff and give Senators an opportunity to deal with these matters individually, an opportunity which we are refusing by the way this amendment is drafted. We were refused unanimous consent to take them up one at a time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes in order to reply.

The Senator said that the manager of the bill and the ranking minority member were refused something. I do not think they were refused anything. We have introduced an amendment because we believe the appropriation should be increased by $181 million; not by $60 million alone for Headstart or $40 million more for community action or a few million dollars for legal services or nutrition. We believe it should be increased by all those amounts, and not by just one of them. They cannot tell us what other things they want and submit the matter the way they want it submitted. After all, we are the ones who are fighting the battle. We have a right to say what we
I wish the administration would keep it all under OEO. I do not like to see disintegration and elimination processes going on in successful OEO programs. If there are many more disintegrations pretty soon we will have nothing down there but an empty office, a shell. Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

When I started this debate yesterday I made a statement and I would like to recall that statement in order to discuss this matter. The first thing I think I said was that I know the Senator from Washington and the Senator from New Hampshire feel the need as much as I do. There is no question they did their utmost in committee. I know this committee and so do other Senators. They did the best they could. Now, if the Senate is going to do better it is up to the Senate. I have no argument with them on that score.

The second matter is with respect to the devolution question, and we say that OEO should continue to have a role. But at least let us not change the procedure before the authorizing legislation expires, and when OEO has some vestige of authority to bring the poor into the picture. So—

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. What is the case, why did not the Senator agree to separate the question?

Mr. JAVITS. We cannot separate it.

Mr. PASTORE. Can we not separate the amounts from the policy?

Mr. JAVITS. I tried the same thing. If the Senator will look at the bill, he will see that the House amount of $8 billion was stricken and $800 million was inserted. That is where the decision was made. If one has to pose the question, I tried to pose it. We have to provide money to OEO and then lock it in, making it subject to these delegation agreements.

The Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. Corroon) put the question to us yesterday in unanimous consent. He was asking unanimous consent that the Senate vote on a principle. Nothing was sent to the desk to show how it could be done. It was sent to the desk for a vote on the principle, and that was on devolution, and not on an appropriation.

Mr. PASTORE. Could not the Senator write language to say that?

Mr. JAVITS. There is no need. If our view prevails, it will prevail. If not, we will vote on the amendment. Virtually the same thing. It was the same as the way the House did it—except the amount is increased—or we do not. We will vote on that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It was increased.

Mr. JAVITS. The way the House did it, but not a decreased amount.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. There were two comments made by the distinguished Senator from New York that I cannot let pass. First, I was not at all point interested in whether this money is handled by OEO or HEW or the Labor Department; I am now talking about the money—he said the committee wants Senators to introduce it our way, not their way. Well, this is their way. When we attempted to divide the amendment—and I am now not talking about who is going to amend it—as to what the amount would be, of course we wanted Headstart, for manpower training, and so on and so forth, we discovered, after the Parliamentarian had ruled—he ruled again or he examined it again—that on division one we had to vote on the whole amount. Then, after that, it was a matter of dividing up the whole amount. I specifically asked the distinguished Senator from New York if he would not let us vote on each of those five divisions of appropriations separately, so those who want to increase Headstart would have the privilege. He admitted—and he will correct me if I am wrong—that by this method that is forced upon us by the form of this amendment, on the No. 1 vote, if the whole amendment is appropriated and the amendment is accepted after that to change the other amounts, as I remember his words, he said, "There will be an ambiguity."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I would like to interrupt the Senator. He said I asked him to consider his own time. I do not recall ever using the word "ambiguity," and this amendment already earmarks $60 million for Headstart—I am talking about the amendment we are going to vote on now—and $41 million for manpower. There is no question about that—and it puts it under these delegation agreements. So those assertions are not correct.

Mr. COTTON. I do not quite accept that, because I distinctly recall it. I do not know what condition the record is left in, but I distinctly recall it. I think the Senator is a man in whose integrity and honor I have complete confidence; if it is not the word "ambiguity," perhaps it is the word "confusion." But I insist that you can vote the full amount under my amendment; then the rest is dividing up, and if in your attempts to divide it up you change the one full amount," he added, "I will have some question about its effectiveness."

So I insist—and I am not challenging and putting my recollection against his; whoever is right or wrong—in this form the Senate is not given the freedom to work its will on the different programs. We take the $181 million increase. Then perhaps we can reduce some of it. Perhaps we can divide it up, I do not know what happens after we vote it. But I insist that the Senate is not given the opportunity to work its will. Second—

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. COTTON. Certainly.

Mr. PASTORE. If the Senator is suggesting that one of this amendment is defeated in toto can we take up part for part?

Mr. COTTON. Yes, precisely.

Mr. PASTORE. If the amendment does carry, because it is all-inclusive, we will have lost that opportunity. Is that what the Senator is trying to say?

Mr. COTTON. That is exactly what I mean.
One other comment. I regret to get into these personal disputes, but the Senator from New York said he did not understand. Now, if there is a man in the Senate whose understanding is very clear on every point, it is the Senator from New York. He said to me: I do not know what it means when they say that we refuse to let the Senate work its will on this item by item. We did not refuse any such thing.

As a matter of fact, the unanimous consent agreement was requested, and the Senator from New York was the one who opposed the spending of dealing with this question in a down-to-earth, common-sense way, letting every Senator express himself on Headstart, on manpower training, on each one of these, I still say that is the only fair way to do it.

I hope the Senate will reject the amendment and then we can start to take them up one at a time and the Senate will have the opportunity to work its will.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has 8 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON).

INCREASE POVERTY AND HEADSTART APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment No. 1068, which I am sponsoring with Senators JAVITS, NELSON, and MONDALE, as well as a number of other Senators, and which would provide additional appropriations for programs conducted under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

Under the amendment, an additional $59 million would be earmarked for Headstart; $41.9 million for work and training activities; and $80.7 million for other essential poverty programs.

I strongly support each of these needed increases, but I would like to speak for a few moments with specific regard to the Headstart portion of the amendment.

Our amendment would earmark the full $398 million authorized for Headstart in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. It is the true one-time OEO's responsibility for insuring a poverty orientation, community involvement, and parent participation in Headstart programs by restoring Headstart's appropriation to OEO to administer under its delegation agreement with OEO.

It is estimated that the $398 million level of spending would enable Headstart to provide for 529,496 children, 57,806 more than were served during the last fiscal year and 120,606 more than could be served with the administration budget request figure adopted by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

I want to stress that our amendment to appropriate the full authorized amount for Headstart is not a rash attempt to expand this program in any way that will occur to the previous levels.

Under the administration's budget request for fiscal year 1971, Headstart would be able to serve nearly 200,000 fewer children than were served during fiscal year 1969, a reduction of nearly one-fourth of our children served. Even the 529,496 children who would be served under our amendment is still 134,594 less than were served in 1969, and would reach only 38 percent of the children who are eligible for and could benefit significantly from the Headstart experience.

The President made a strong commitment to early childhood education in his message to the Congress of March 3, 1970. It is unacceptable to do any less than to provide the full authorized amount for Headstart, set by the Congress after detailed hearings by the authorization committees in both Houses.

The community increase we propose over fiscal year 1970—approximately 58,000 more children than were served then—will make it possible to offer essential education, nutrition, and health services to a few more of poverty's children; perhaps the best chance to escape from the debilitating and degrading cycle of poverty and dependence.

There has been an enormous outpouring of support for Headstart in my own State in the last few months. I have received hundreds of letters from concerned parents, boards of education, mayors' offices, chambers of commerce, social welfare agencies, poverty agencies, and private individuals urging that the threatened cutback be rescinded and that the program be strengthened and expanded. Only yesterday I was visited by Headstart mothers and administrators who traveled at their own expense or with community-assisted funds to deliver their plea to me in person. They gave me petitions with almost 5,000 signatures of San Francisco residents.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a selection of the hundreds of letters I have received on this subject be printed in the Record at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, presently there are 19,000 youngsters in California under a full-year Headstart program, plus another 1,300 in summer programs. Under this amendment, there would be funds for an estimated 4,250 more children in California Headstart programs due to the reduction between summer and full-year programs, this would provide space for approximately 4,000 more children in full-year programs and 250 more in summer programs.

The consensus of the letters I have received from California and from around fully shared is that Headstart is one of the most promising and highly effective programs in our anti-poverty efforts.

The intellectual stimulation and growth which a disadvantaged child experiences in Headstart has a profound effect on his mental and social abilities, builds his personal worth and, therefore, on his later performance in formal education and his overall life style.

Parental involvement, a central tenet of the program, is important in developing a parent's greater understanding of the child's needs and abilities and encourages parents themselves to become actively involved in learning activities which can also have a bearing on the future of non-Headstart children in the family.

Finally, Headstart has had significant impact on educational institutions at the local level, encouraging innovative approaches to educating both the disadvantaged and the nondisadvantaged and demonstrating the value of paraprofessionals in the classroom situation and providing individualized attention.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to support our amendment to provide a Headstart for an additional 58,000 disadvantaged children. With a universe of need totaling 330,000 children under the budget request figure this small increase is a minimum step. It still leaves 719,000 children considered eligible for and in need of Headstart services without any such opportunity.

Our action to appropriate this increase would have significant symbolic impact and would increase the confidence of the poor in the willingness and ability of the Congress to back up our national goal of ending poverty in America.

Mr. President, already cuts of about 10 percent have been implemented around the country based on the overall poverty program reduction passed by the House.

Senator MONDALE and I joined in a letter to the President pleading with him to find the funds necessary to prevent a reduction in the scope or a dilution of the quality of Headstart, and citing his authority to do so.

I am sad to report today that we have not yet had a response to our plea and the pleas of thousands of Headstart mothers across the country.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of this letter be printed in the Record at this point prior to the other insertions I have requested. If there being no objection the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

October 19, 1970.

President Richard M. Nixon,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: We are writing to express our very grave concern about the cutbacks in funds for Headstart during this period prior to enactment of the Labor-HEW appropriation bill for FY 1971.

In our States of California and Minnesota, local Headstart projects are being advised by the HEW regional office that their total funds will be cut back by some 10 to 14 percent for this school year. They are also being urged to reduce the numbers of children served rather
than the quality of services offered until the appropriation bill is enacted and the level of appropriations for Head Start is finally determined.

As we understand it, the nationwide Head Start appropriations situation is as follows: You are faced with operations under the Economic Opportunity Act includes $339 million for Head Start. The House has passed H.R. 1851, the Labor-HEW appropriation bill for FY 1970, which is $18,200,000 to carry out the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act, including Head Start. Based on the House appropriation figure, we understand that OEO has recommended that Head Start’s proportionate share would be only $3,216,000. That is almost $5 million less than was allocated for Head Start in FY 1970 and $6 million less than your FY 1971 budget request.

On October 13, the Senate Appropriations Committee reported H.R. 1851, earmarking for Head Start $290 million, the amount you had requested. However, this figure still falls $11 million short of providing the same quality of service to as many full-year children ($630,000) as were provided in FY 1970. (That, of course, is because of some unexpected developments since your budget was prepared, particularly the cutback in the initiation level of local programs’ carryover balances, salary increases and new requirements for experimental Head Start programs.)

Under the resolution for appropriations as interpreted by the administration, the Head Start program is presently trying to operate with a shortage of some $5 million. Because it serves 20,000 children, the bill may have to be dropped from this extremely beneficial program. However, since no specific cutoff level for Head Start’s Operations Act authorization at $365 million for Head Start, there is no question of the legal authority to expend FY 1971 funds at a level to maintain the FY 1970 program rate of operations.

We are writing to suggest that you authorize the Head Start program to reduce regional offices and in turn local programs, that the $289,000 that you had to maintain the program at the FY 1970 level of operations will eventually be funded within funds appropriation program and will be reduced. We recommend that the program should not, therefore, eliminate any children from the program or reduce the effectiveness of the supplementary services provided.

Insofar as Senate action on the appropriation bill is concerned, we are sponsoring an amendment to increase substantially the appropriation for programs under the Economic Opportunity Act and particularly to earmark $388 million for Head Start—the amount earmarked for that program in the authorization bill. We believe that amendment has an excellent chance of adoption by the Senate and that the final FY 1971 appropriation bill will contain a 50% increase in the amount of Head Start. This is a likely be at least as much as your $2,680,000 billion request, which includes $339 million for Head Start.

Under the above analysis, what we are really proposing would mean that no more than $11 million above your Head Start budget level will have to be made available for Head Start programs out of the non-appropriated appropriated funds. This seems a very small price to pay for the quality of service you and the public assurances that we are committed to continuing at least at the same level of effort on their behalf and will not tolerate a cutback in services except in your good judgment if you will support the effort by directing your colleagues to provide a program.

We respectfully urge your favorable consideration of the recommendation we have made so that no children will have to be dropped and Head Start in frustration of the commitments which have already been made to them and their parents.

Sincerely,

ALAN CRANSTON,
WALTER P. MONDALE

EXHIBIT 1
SOCIAL WORKERS UNION,
Los Angeles, Calif., November 12, 1970.
HON. ALAN CRANSTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

CRANSTON: The Executive Board of this Union at its regular meeting in Los Angeles on November 8, 1970, has directed me to request that you take whatever action is necessary to ensure that appropriations for the Head Start Program for preschool children from low-income families.

Head Start is as the most significant part of the national effort to stop the poverty cycle. It provides early involvement of both parents and children in the educational and social skills means for early diagnosis and treatment of physical disabilities that could be permanent educational handicaps if not detected early.

We urge you to support an expanded budget to enable Head Start participation for an increased number of low-income children.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS GRAY,
President.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS, INC.,
San Francisco, Calif., October 20, 1970.
SENATOR ALAN CRANSTON,
Wash. D.C.

We are deeply concerned about press reports of White House decisions to substantially cut already meager anti-poverty programs administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity, including Health, Education and Welfare, and the Department of Labor. These cuts, when coupled with announced transfers and defenseless programs as legal services for the poor to new auspices, seem tantamount to a calculated effort to render impotent and ineffective what needs to be made strong. Certainly Head Start and Community Action, two of the threatened programs, must be protected at all costs.

The White House Director Donald Rumsfeld is protesting these cuts and changes indicates that the Administration is itself divided on the issue. We ask that you do everything within your power in relation to both budgetary changes and appropriations, and the impact of your office on the House decision-making, to question these planned cuts, and attempt to reverse them.

At a time when the specters of increased unemployment and living costs haunt the poor and threaten to impoverish new segments of our population, it would seem essential to strengthen and innovate, and not to weaken federal anti-poverty efforts.

JAMES M. KARLS,
President.

RESOLUTION BY BIOLA-PERSHING UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Whereas, the Biola-Pershing Union Elementary School Board of Trustees has had a continuing interest in Project Head Start’s offer of social, educational, and medical services to children in the school district; and

Whereas, research has shown Head Start to be one of the most effective community action programs actually helping to break the poverty cycle; and

Whereas, proposed budget cuts will mean the possible dropping of 50,000 students from the Biola-Pershing Union Elementary School Head Start Class, and the elimination of eighteen pre-school students from a vitally needed educational service; and

Whereas, there is dire need to increase Head Start funding rather than decrease it since only a small portion of the eligible children can now be served; and

Whereas, it is now accepted that preventive programs such as Head Start are ultimately more effective to the taxpayer than are remedial programs,

Therefore, be it resolved that the Board go on record as strongly urging that Head Start funding cuts be immediately restored, that Head Start funds be increased in the immediate future, and that monies appropriated by Congress in February, be earmarked for Head Start in order to eliminate the likelihood of cuts by the national administration. Adopted this 4th day of November, 1970.

FRANK MANUEL,
Board President.

AUGUST KERRER,
Clerk.

JACK RENOLD,
Board Member.

CARROLL NELSON,
Board Member.

ESCONDIDO UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Escondido, Calif., November 9, 1970.
HON. ALAN CRANSTON,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building, Washing-pton, D.C.

Dear Senator Cranson:

I am aware that you are already acutely aware of the need for the White House to channel some of the funds previously available for Head Start programs into other programs during the current funding year. Here, in San Diego County, we have been told that the program in Escondido will most likely have to absorb a 15% cut in its operations starting in February. Since we are now operating the program with more than the required 20% in-kind contribution and with less expensive non-credentialed help and the most frugal possible use of transportation funds, there is nowhere left to go but to cut the number of children. In our program, we are, at present only serving those children with the most limited English and the greatest medical needs. To cut any of these will be heartbreakingly.

It is my understanding that in making funds available to O.E.O. for the operation of Head Start, the Congress had not really intended for them to appropriate some of this money for other uses. If this was indeed the intent, is there anything that can be done to prevent this cut-back? It is particularly sad to contemplate that the funds are being cut and the costs are rising and, at the same time, at a time when the community commitment to Head Start and other compensatory education programs for the poor is at its peak.

Many of our volunteers come from the middle-class community and their understanding and enthusiasm for Head Start is apparent.

Please help us if you are at all able to do so.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. MARGARET HORTON,
Coordinator, Compensatory Education.

BOARD OF EDUCATION, FRESNO COUNTY,
Fresno, Calif.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Fresno County Board of Education has long been a supporter of the Head Start Program conducted by OEO and
November 20, 1970
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the local Economic Opportunities Commission, and

Whereas, the present project has reached only a small number of preschool children eligible for the program due to lack of proper funding, and,

Whereas, the program has been a most successful community development component of the War on Poverty within our community, state and the nation, and,

Whereas, the proposed cutbacks of 15% would severely curtail the operation of the program for the children and families involved,

Therefore, be it resolved, that the Fresno County Board of Education urgently requests reconsideration and restoration of authorized funding for the Head Start Program, and,

Further resolves that this resolution be forwarded to all representatives charged with making this decision.

ERNEST A. POORE,
Secretary, Fresno County Board of Education, Superintendent Fresno County Schools.

OCTOBER 29, 1970.

THE CITY OF CHULA VISTA, CALIFORNIA,

November 6, 1970.

Hon. Alan Cranston,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator Cranston: The Regional Head Start office in San Francisco has the funds for Head Start in San Diego County by $206,000 for our next funding year. This is a cut of 13.46%, but figuring the increased prices of food, transportation and labor, it is actually a 20% cut.

It is a shame that an apparently successful program such as that developed by Head Start in San Diego County is now faced with the possibility of dropping 300 to 400 children from the program before the school year is out.

Oder citizens are able to compensate and adjust for changes that must be made, but when a program is started for children and is then suddenly curtailed, their inability to understand may have a profound effect on their entire lives.

Please reconsider funding of the Head Start for San Diego County. Sincerely yours,

THOMAS D. HAMILTON, Jr., Mayor.

SOCIAL SERVICE DEPARTMENT,
Santa Rosé, Calif., November 6, 1970.

Senator Alan Cranston,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Cranston: I am directing this letter to you as an appeal for your support in blocking a pending cutback in the funding of Head Start.

I believe I can speak with some authority regarding the success of this program in accomplishing its stated goals during the few short years that it has been in existence. I have observed and commented on the following vocational background and direct experience with the program. During the last 19 years I have been employed in the Public Welfare System in California. The last five of these years have been as Director of a County Department; the four years in Kings County and the past year in Sonoma County. During these five years, I have also served on the Board of Directors for the Regional Community Action Agency, in each County, responsible for administering the Office of Economic Opportunity programs, including Headstart. During the four years I was in Kings County, I served as a member of the evaluation team for the Headstart program. We annually assessed the success of the program and its effectiveness and submitted a written report of our findings to the Regional Office of Economic Opportunity. This year, when making our report to Sonoma County, I have served as an agency representative to the Sonoma County Headstart Council. With this background you can see that I speak from more than just a rudimentary knowledge of the Headstart program.

During my years of experience in Public Welfare, I have learned many reasons for the patterns of dependency and poverty with which we work. One of the primary reasons, is a lack of basic vocational and educational skills, which are conducted while in Kings County, of the characteristics of our Aid to Families with Dependent Children Program. I can clearly state, that the average grade level attained by the fathers was sixth grade and by the mothers seventh grade. These parents came from family backgrounds which were culturally and/or economically severely deprived. Most had dropped out of school at an early age because they could not successfully educate themself in school and because of the economic pressures at home requiring them to seek employment. Most of these parents wanted something better for their children and saw Headstart as a means to that end. I believe the effectiveness of the Headstart program can best be illustrated by the following true story.

During one of my visits, as a member of the Headstart evaluation team, to a local school where a Headstart program had been in operation for two years, I had the occasion to talk with one of the kindergarten teachers regarding her impression of the Headstart program. She was critical of the program, stating that in some part of it she had been forced into changing her whole teaching pattern. The children entering her class from the Headstart program further ahead than the other children, as reflected in their knowledge, inquisitiveness and classroom skills, that they were a real challenge to her teaching skills. While this observation was intended as a criticism, it was, in fact, a welcome compliment, for it highlighted the very goals which Headstart endeavors to achieve.

At a time when our national leaders are seeking solutions to the problems of dependency and poverty, it does seem somewhat ironic that the current attempts to help reduce the effectiveness of one of the most potent weapons in the war on poverty. I am convinced that if the governmental pattern of poverty is to be altered, we must place our greatest efforts on the upcoming generation represented by the preschoolers who are now being helped so effectively through the Headstart program.

Thank you for your help as a concerned and responsible legislator in continuing the adequate funding of this most worthwhile investment in our Nation's future.

Very truly yours,

Paul M. Allen, Jr.,
Director.

HEADSTART,
San Diego, Calif., November 12, 1970.

Senator Cranston,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Cranston: The Head Start program in San Diego County, California, would like to express the deepest and sincerest appreciation of the efforts you have made in behalf of the Head Start Program. We hope that you can, with your help, make our needs more strongly felt.

A letter campaign supporting the amendment proposal co-sponsored by your office has been organized. Please help us to concentrate our efforts where they will be most beneficial. In your opinion, would it be best to write to the Representatives who might vote against the amendment? If so, we request the names of these representatives in order to make them aware of our needs and opinions.

Thanking you for your concern, we hope to hear from you very soon.

Sincerely,

C. E. M. STANLEY,
Parent Inq. Coordinator.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
National City, Calif., November 12, 1970.

Hon. Alan Cranston,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Cranston: The members of our Education Committee, as President of Directors, are concerned with the decision to reduce Project Head Start operating funds by 12.36 percent. This cutback will lower the number of children enrolled in the program in San Diego County from 1,200 to 900.

We feel that the Head Start Program has established a record of success in helping young children and we urge you to do whatever is in your power to restore the operating funds.

Your consideration will be appreciated.

Respectfully,

BERNARD C. SCHMIEK,
President.

THE CITY OF SANTA CLARA, CALIF.,
November 12, 1970.

Senator Alan Cranston,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Cranston: Speaking on my own behalf, I would like to express at this time my support for the Senate Appropriation Committee Amendment to H.R. 18515, which provided $359 million for Head Start, to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. I feel that Head Start has been a vital and viable program in our community.

It is my sincere hope that this amendment will meet with your approval and will be adopted by Congress and signed by the President. Programs of this type truly deserve our support and financial assistance in order for them to attain the highest possible degree of success.

Thank you for your consideration of this issue and I know that your decision will be in the best interests of all concerned.

Sincerely,

GARY G. GILLMOR, Mayor.

CONSTRUCTION AND GENERAL LABORERS' LOCAL UNION NO. 270,
San Jose, Calif., November 11, 1970.

Hon. Alan Cranston,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator Cranston: The members and officers of the Construction & General Laborers Union Local 270 are vitally involved with the continuation of the Head Start Program for pre-school children in low-income families.

This important program for pre-school children has been cut three of the last four years, and this last proposed cut of 13.5 per cent will destroy it.

We have been informed that you will introduce an amendment to increase Head Start funds by $398 million from the Health, Education and Welfare appropriation. The Senate floor after the recess.

Your great concern in seeing that this program be increased and not cut by 13.5 per cent for the best interest of these children is commendable and appreciated by all your constituents.

Respectfully yours,

R. H. MEDINA,
Secretary-Treasurer.

President Richard Nixon, The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. President: Upon reliable information that the nationwide Head Start Program is scheduled for the upcoming year 1971 of about 13% would mean a cut of $66,282, or 13.45%; a loss of at least 60 children and 10 to 12 preschool classes, leaving no preschool education for 280 children for four (4) months and no job for 70 persons for four (4) months, delegates of the Central Labor Council of Santa Clara County, AFL-CIO, in regular meeting November 2, 1970, voted unanimously to concur in its Executive Board recommendation to protest such cutback and to seek an increase in H.W. Appropriation for Head Start.

Organized Labor in Santa Clara County sponsored the very first Head Start program in this area and has since been strongly behind this type of program for pre-school children in low income families. This support is even more critical at this juncture of increasing un-employment and what seems to be working people to be inappropriate and unjust fragility in education, particularly in the dual area of social and lower income segments of Santa Clara County's social structure.

The Council therefore urges your support of a Senate Appropriation Committee amendment to increase Head Start funds when the Health, Education and Welfare appropriation reaches the Senate floor after recess. Sincerely yours,

EMERSON STREET, Business Representative.

CITY OF CARPINTERIA, CALIF., October 23, 1970.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON, U.S. Senator, Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: The Carpinteria City Council has become seriously concerned about the possibility of reduction in some of the programs sponsored by the Community Action Commission of Santa Barbara County. We are particularly concerned that the Head Start Program and the proposed cuts as they affect our area. We have attached to this letter an editorial which you may have already seen. It is our hope that you will feel very accurately and succinctly expresses our concern relating to this matter. We urge that you restore any cuts in this particular area and suggest instead that we do not agree on the need for economic in the government, that there are other areas much less critical to the future of our nation which can survive this type of reduction.

Sincerely yours,

ALLAN R. COATES, JR., Mayor.

CREESENCHILO DE ALBA, President, Carpinteria Valley Community Council.

ROBERT "OLLY" OLIVAR, Councilman and Community Action Commissioner.

Jacque PAULSEN, Community Action Commissioner.

COUNTY OF TULARE, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, Visalia, Calif., November 9, 1970.

Deputy ALAN CRANSTON, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: We have been advised by our local Community Action Agency that a 10% cut-back is proposed for the Child-Care and Head Start portions of the OEO budget for 1971. This would mean a substantial reduction in services for preschool children in low-income neighborhoods.

Head Start Cuts Hurt Children.

An effect of the Nixon administration's stringent funding priorities is the proposed head start program.

This program is one of the more salutary and practical aspects of the War on Poverty, providing educational, medical, dental, services for preschool children in low-income neighborhoods.

Achievements have been widely applauded in Sacramento and elsewhere through the nation. It has proved to provide otherwise disadvantaged children that first foot up the ladder which enables them to go on successfully through their later school years.

Although Congress specifically allocated funds for this program in a manner tied to funds allocated by the administration, officials in the Health, Education and Welfare Department have been unable to subvert Congress' will and have ordered budget cuts in communities across the country where Head Start programs have proved so valuable and effective.

It is not true that the proposed cuts to the Head Start program in the Sacramento community that the $100,000 cutback is being balanced in a way that no single aspect of the program will be killed outright.

The fact is that this program will not be available on the scale of the demonstrated need, instead of being contracted, its activities should have been expanded.

This is a strong index of the administration's scale of value, concerning the nation's priceless asset—its children. (Sacramento Bee.)

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, November 5, 1970.

Mr. ALAN CRANSTON, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CRANSTON: Please be advised that the Fresno County Board of Supervisors, at their regular meeting of November 3, 1970, unanimously approved the enclosed resolution urging Congress to restore the funds cut from Project Head Start's budget.

Your attention to the enclosed resolution will be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully,

CARL H. MELON, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Fresno County Board of Supervisors has had a continuing interest in Project Head Start's offer of social, educational, and nutritional services to children in Fresno County; and

Whereas, research has shown Head Start to be one of the most effective Community Action Programs in actually helping to break the poverty cycle; and

Whereas, proposed budget cuts will mean dropping some 300 of the 625 children now being served in Fresno County, and cutting the number of classes from 37 to around 25; and

Whereas, there is dire need to increase Head Start funding rather than decrease it since only one-tenth of the eligible children can now be served; and

Whereas, it is now accepted that preventive programs can be used to support the seemingly endless expensive to the taxpayer than are remedial programs;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that this Board of Supervisors strongly urges that Head Start funding cuts be immediately restored, that Head Start funds be substantially increased in the immediate future, and that monies appropriated for Congress for Head Start be earmarked for Head Start in order to eliminate the likelihood of cuts by the national administration.

Adopted by the Fresno County Board of Supervisors this 3rd day of November, 1970, by the following vote, to-wit: Ayes—Supervisors Reich, Ventura, Cassidy, Krebs, Craven.

Noes—None.

Absent—None.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN, LA MESA BRANCH, 5690 La Mesa Blvd., San Diego, Calif., November 11, 1970.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON, U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CRANSTON: As an Area Representative for Education of the La Mesa Branch of American Association of University Women I wish to express my concern over the proposed cut of 13.45% of the budget of the Head Start Program in San Diego for the coming year.

The present budget serves only one out of 5 to 6 children in the area where the children are currently served.

We are asking your special help in the matter of the need for Head Start, parents, and the Community at large, so that we may avoid such a cut.

Respectfully,

MRS. KENNETH GREENLEAF.

YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION, Santa Cruz, Calif., November 4, 1970.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON, U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CRANSTON: The Public Affairs Committee of the Y.W.C.A. would like to register its objection to the possibility of cuts in the Headstart budget for the 1971 fiscal year.

The Y was closely associated with early Headstart programs in Santa Cruz, providing both volunteers and space. We feel strongly that any program that aims at preventing poverty through the increasing and improving educational opportunities deserves top priority in budget considerations.

Reducing the Headstart budget by 13.45% prevents the program from serving the number of children who need them, thereby letting down the whole community.

We strongly urge you to support all efforts to increase and to protect the funds allocated to Headstart in this and in succeeding years.

Respectfully,

MRS. HUGH S. JOHNSON, Chairman, YWCA Public Affairs Committee.


HON. ALAN CRANSTON, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: The Board of Directors of the Pasadena Young Women's Christian Association is concerned by the recent cuts in the Head Start budget.

We feel that it is essential to prepare the disadvantaged pre-school child for the challenge of the school system; otherwise, the disadvantaged child slips behind his peers and soon drops out.

Head Start is one of the most successful programs in our country's effort to break the poverty cycle. In a decade Head Start programs have proved to be effective, not only for the children, but also for the parents who are involved through Head Start in educational and job-training programs.

Surely now is not the time to reduce services. We hope that you will do everything possible to restore Head Start funds and to en-
large the Head Start and pre-school programs for the disadvantaged.

Sincerely, 

ELIZABETH RHODES, President,

DOROTHY TAPA, Executive Director.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, just one thing. I hate to belabor this point, but somebody is suggesting that Headstart should not be taken up as a separate item.

I was one of the originators of Headstart. What we are talking about is this particular amendment. The Senator can submit any item he wants in reference to Headstart, any kind of amendment he wants, and bring it up in any way he chooses so that the Senate can work its will, up or down, the same as on any of these items.

I do not want Headstart to get mixed up with this basic policy question on fiscal management. The Senator can have all the time he wants to talk about Headstart, and move to increase the money or reduce it, either way.

Mr. CRANSTON. But understand, Mr. MAGNUSON. But why talk about Headstart now, until we finish this amendment?

Mr. CRANSTON. The defeat of the amendment would eliminate the funds that have been designated to insure that certain funds go to OEO, to increase the Headstart program—not beyond what it was in 1969; it would still be below that, but it would start moving in a favorable direction serving as many people as were once served.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Well, that is what we intend to do. But I do not know why the Senator brings Headstart into this. There are 15 other programs; we will take them one by one. The Senator from California can offer any kind of amendment he wants to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yield 3 minutes to the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Texas (Mr. Yarbrough).

Mr. YARBROUGH. Mr. President, I rise in support of this amendment, because it does include an appropriation for Headstart. The amendment also provides additional funds for the Office of Economic Opportunity to maintain past commitments in its basic, essential poverty effort which meets the administration request for innovative programs, research, and evaluation.

I am well aware and sympathetic toward congressional efforts to pare the budget. However, I cannot sympathize with austerity which substantially cuts back the programs designed to benefit the poor, whose interests are often in conflict with being sacrificed in the interest of economy. If this Nation is to maintain the confidence of the poor, our priorities and spending must reflect genuine concern for their needs.

The Headstart program is particularly dear to me because I have been close to it since its very inception. It was originally started by the League of United Latin American Citizens. It was then called the Little Schools of the 400 because its basic objective was to teach Mexican-American children who did not know English, 400 basic English words so that when they entered school they could begin to understand their English-speaking teachers.

The program was severely limited because of lack of funds. But it was so successful that the State of Texas passed a law incorporating the concept as part of their educational system. However, as often happens to programs for the poor, the State legislature did not appropriate enough money and so it died before it had started.

I can tell the Senate when Headstart originated.

During the early formative days of the great society, Dean John Silber of the University of Texas brought this program to my attention and I was able to get him an appointment with President Johnson and OEO Director Sargent Shriver, and a few months later Headstart was made part of this Nation's war on poverty.

When the OEO program was being written at the White House, Dr. John Silber, who was dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Texas, phoned me to tell me about the program. I did not know anything about it. It sounded a bit early for children to start in such a program. I phoned to Sargent Shriver, and he granted a 30-minute interview, which, after listening to Dr. Silber, he extended to 2 hours. Out of this interview, the Headstart program was born.

From the very beginning, Headstart has been the most successful of all our efforts to fight poverty. It has been praised by times to the President, that we now provide educational, nutritional, and medical benefits to children who are enrolled. Their parents are benefited also by allowing them for the first time to participate in program decisions affect their children.

I have received letters from Texas and from nearly every State in the Union protesting the projected cuts in the Headstart programs. Most of these letters are from parents and children who will suffer from these cuts in the program. They plead for the opportunity which the Headstart program provides for their children. They know it will certainly make a difference in the lives of their children. We know it will too. How can we allow one less child to go without the opportunity that will make the difference in life for him?

All this amendment does is to make good on the promises to the mothers and those children and to all Americans by earmarking the $398 million we authorized for Headstart when we extended the Economic Opportunity Act.

Another thing I want to mention is this program's impact on our unemployment rate. We have now an unemployment rate that has gone to the highest level in years. This past September, the Senate overwhelmingly passed the Employment and Training Opportunity Act in response to record setting unemployment rates. We have never had as many people unemployed since the great depression. The Department of Labor reports that the actual number of unemployed workers totaled 4.5 million in October. Since last October, 1 year ago, the number of unemployed persons increased by the Department of Labor has increased by 1.4 million. The most alarming fact about this statistic is that nearly 65 percent of this increase was among long-employed full-time workers who had received their last paycheck, or that there is no end in sight to this downward spiral in employment.

Clearly this is a time when we should increase, not decrease our manpower programs. The funds we are requesting are to cancel a part of the manpower training activities at the levels originally requested by the administration.

The Senate Committee on Appropriations recommends $1,504,790 for manpower programs under the Manpower Development and Training Act and the Economic Opportunity Act. Our amendment increases this amount by $44,700,000 to equal the amount requested by the Senate for the Headstart program and restoring the amount requested by the administration for Manpower and Training programs, our amendment provides funds for other essential antipoverty programs and activities that conducted under the Economic Opportunity Act at levels approaching those which Congress intended through the passage of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1969.

As a matter of fact, before Congress in 1969, before inflation became so severe, will provide minimum essential amounts needed to continue these highly successful and effective programs at visible levels if the so-called war on poverty is to maintain any sort of forward thrust it is important that Congress hold the line against retreat in such essential and effective programs as: legal services, emergency food and medical service programs, comprehensive job training programs, antipoverty programs, Vista, special impact programs for economic development, in urban and rural areas, and community action-local initiative programs. Our amendment appropriates a total of $2,245,500,000 for programs conducted under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. This amount is identical to the authorized figure in the bill which was amended in 1969. The Senate Committee on Appropriations has recommended $2,063,900,000 for the program. We seek an increase of $181,600,000 which will be earmarked as follows: Headstart, $59,000,000; manpower and training, $41,900,000; and the remaining $80,700,000 allocated among the other essential poverty programs which I described.
efforts to combat poverty. I strongly urge its adoption.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator for yielding.

I understand that the committee has reported out an amount of $339 million for Headstart. I also understood the Senator from Washington to say that it is the intention of the committee members to offer an amendment to the pending bill which would raise that amount still further.

Can the Senator from Washington tell us how much the committee plans to increase the amount of the appropriation for Headstart?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I can answer that question quickly. We had an amendment prepared because we checked with officials at Headstart. The sum of $339 million is what they had originally asked for. I think in the last 3 or 4 months, since they appeared before the House and Senate they claim now that they need another $11 million, or $13 million—in that range—to maintain their program at the present level of activity for this coming year. We have an amendment prepared to that effect. If the Senate wants to make it more—

Mr. AIKEN. Is it $15 million?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is $15 million. or something like that, we will be glad to do it. I think $15 million is a better figure. We are already $13 million over last year, and the $15 million would make it $28 million over last year, or close to 10 percent.

Of course, everyone is for Headstart. There is not a person in this country who is not in favor of Headstart. But someone has got to have some responsibility. This is what they said they could use for it, and it is $50 million over last year.

I hate to see Headstart where it is. I wish it would be aimed the other way. But that is the way the administration wanted it, and that is what they did. I am not wedded to this figure, but this is what they say will keep it going and do the job.

One would think, to listen to some of these speeches, that we were asking for the repeal of Headstart. Some repeal—$356 million. That is no repeal of Headstart. The sum of $355 million, I think, is a pretty good, sound endorsement of Headstart by us.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. COTTON. How much time is left on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has 2 minutes remaining. The Senator from Washington has asked for an additional minute.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire such time as he may require.

Mr. COTTON. Does the Senator from New York intend to use his 2 minutes?

Mr. WIPPS. No, Mr. President.

Mr. COTTON. Then I serve notice. Mr. President, that as soon as the Senator from New York has used his 2 minutes, I shall move to lay the amendment of the Senator from New York on the table, just as they laid mine on the table.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator from New Hampshire that I know that I thought he would do yesterday, in deference to his own point of view, with which I heartily disagree.

I yield myself 1 minute.

I am not a bit insulted. The essence of the amendment is that some members want to increase this appropriation by $181 million will, I hope, see through this per- siflage, with all respect, about devolution and direct appropriation, and under- stand that this is mere dollars and cents.

First, the fact is that we wish to increase the Headstart program by $60 million. Last year it was $326 million, and we are seeking to raise that to $398 million. I yield myself 1 final minute.

So far, the Senate Appropriations Committee has raised it only $13 million, to $339 million.

Second, we want to raise the manpower funds by $41 million; and third, we want to increase the outlay on other items—health, nutrition, legal services, community action programs, Vista, migrant programs, by approximately $80 million.

These are the real issues: do we want to increase these programs to the extent that this amendment does? That is the basic issue, in my judgment. Mind you, I have no arrogance about it whatever, on this question of whom it is appropriated to, because it is completely completed that by locking in these devolution agreements to expressly apply to anything which is appropriated.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield such time as he requires to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. I may say to the Senator from New York that my purpose in making the motion which I intend to make is not in any way hostile to him, but it is to emphasize the reality of this amendment to increase the OEO appropriation. I rise to urge passage of the amendment by the Senate.

When the Congress enacted the OEO legislation in 1964 it recognized at that time the need for specific efforts on the part of the Federal Government to assist economically disadvantaged citizens. At that time there were approximately 30 million Americans whose incomes fell below the poverty level of $3,000 per year. Today, there are an estimated 25 million people with incomes below the poverty index. The number has decreased but endless deprivation and frustration still shatter the lives of many Americans. That is why it is important that every available resource, public and private, be mobilized to change these conditions.

The amendment before us, if passed, would provide a total of $2.25 billion for programs conducted under the Office of Economic Opportunity. Considering the seriousness and the extentiveness of poverty in the United States, that amount itself is a small amount. The appropriation could easily be three to four times that amount. Be that as it may, the amount is nonetheless $182 million over the amount recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee. This represents a substantial increase over the amounts requested by the administration and the House.

The $2.25 billion represents the remainder of the appropriations authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1969, excluding $50 million which were appropriated earlier this year for school desegregation assistance.

Under provisions of the amendment $358 million are earmarked for the Head- start program and $802 million for work and training opportunities. Fifty-nine million dollars of the $182 million proposed increase would be added to Headstart, while $41.8 million would be used for work training. The remaining $80.7 million would be dispersed among a number of important OEO programs such as legal services, community action, research and development, and others.

Prior to the development of Headstart, thousands of disadvantaged children, ages 3 to 6, did not have the opportunity to participate in meaningful child development programs. Through the efforts of Headstart, they have been given a chance and much has been done to enhance their educational and physical growth and development. By far, Headstart has been one of the most popular and successful poverty programs. Not only does it reach our most disadvan- taged neighborhoods to help children, but, perhaps equally as important is the fact that it has involved the parents of the children in the program also. Therefore, I do not believe that this is the time to allow 26,000 youngsters to be dropped from this important program. If anything, the program should be expanded.

The 1970 appropriation of $326 million allowed the full year program to serve 282,500 children which represented only about 16 percent of the nationwide eligible population. An additional 14 percent, 208,700, of the eligible children participated in summer programs. For fiscal 1971 the administration requested $339 million which is the amount the Senate Appropriations Committee has recommended. However, due to inflation and other factors, the Office of Child Development estimates that at least $350 million will be needed in fiscal 1971 just to maintain programs at the level of the past year. The $350 million will not be sufficient to permit the conversion of all children to full-year programs which is what the Office of Child Development would like to do. The amendment before us will permit expansion of the program to accommodate an additional 50,000 to 60,000 children in


the program. This request is justified in view of the fact that the program has proven its effectiveness in helping disadvantaged children overcome many of the handicaps of their immediate environment and thereby become able to get the kind of education and life for all Americans, programs like Headstart might very well be funded in terms of billions of dollars. As an October 24, 1970, Washington Post editorial stated, "there are easily a million children who need it, not only among the poor but among the lower and middle classes," as well.

Finally, Mr. President, unemployment in this country has consistently risen during the past 13 or more months. Latest figures for the month of October show that at least 5.6 percent of the American workforce is now unemployed. This is one-tenth of 1 percent higher than it was in September of 1970 and 3.7 percent higher than the unemployment figure for October of 1969. Hardest hit by the unemployment are those individuals and families residing in urban poverty communities with an estimated 25 percent of these individuals unemployed. Equal or greater are the rates for black teen-age workers at 17 percent with unemployment among black teen-age workers in poverty areas at approximately 35 percent. Some experts predict that unemployment will peak at the current level or grow increasingly worse before it gets better. We must begin now to attack this serious problem. That is why we have offered this amendment. Passage of the amendment will eliminate the necessity to continue the Contrac-
tigated Employment program by $6.5 million; the Public Service Careers program by $5.2 million; the Operation Mainstream; $2.2 million from the Job Corps program; and $18.3 million for the Neighborhood Youth Corps, school, out-of-school, and summer programs.

If the amendment fails, all of these programs will be drastically reduced. It is imperative that we work to bring relief to the many families now affected by high unemployment. To do so requires a commitment—a commitment by the Congress and by the administration. As unemployment gets worse, more and more people and organizations will turn to the Congress for relief and for the relief of the problem of chronic unemployment. This body made an initial commitment when it passed the Employment and Training Opportunities Act little over a month ago. I was delighted to see that the House passed a similar bill on November 17. Both bills provide for the creation of public service jobs as a means for providing employment for the unemployed. All of these efforts are to be successful. Therefore, I urge the Senate to pass this amendment.

CHIEF: OUR FIRST PRIORITY

MR. MONDALE, Mr. President, the amendment No. 1068 to the Labor-H.E.W. appropriations bill, S. 1536, providing full funding for the OEO Headstart program is worthy of attention and support. We can see good conscience, no less—and indeed we should be doing more—for the children and families of the poor who benefit so greatly from this program.

For too long, this program, one of the few that we have created which promise to make it a reality in this country that all children, rich and poor alike, have the benefit of a decent education, has been understaffed and handicapped in achieving its goals: to provide a head start for children and families who, because of the vicious cycle of poverty, must enter regular school already behind their fellow students.

Many children are behind, not because of a lack of ability, but as a result of the limited educational opportunities available to poor children at critical ages because of the environment of our ghettos and rural areas. The limited education pro-
gram offerings are not for children by being denied warmth, companionship, and respect for ethnic and cultural identi-
ties they are retreating before they have a chance to know the dignity and self-respect which brings self-confidence.

Many children are behind, not because of lack of parental supervision, but because the parents of the poor have themselves been denied the opportunity to learn and know the benefits of education and thereby create that home environment which motivates their children to learn.

Headstart was designed to attack these problems—to broaden the educational horizons, in rural and urban areas, by bringing new educational opportunities to him; to halt disease by providing support health services; to end malnutri-
tion by providing nutritious meals; to bring children into contact with staff and other young people, to tend them with love, care, concern, and respect to poor children; to bring parents into the program as paraprofessionals and advisers to pro-
vide them the opportunity to learn and to teach. Headstart has done a com-
manding job to the extent that we have supported the program.

If we do not increase the Headstart appropriation, it means that we will reach fewer children in poverty, when there are millions of children who qualify for it but who do not get the program to enter. If we do not increase funds, it will mean one less center here, one less health aid there; an increase in the pupil-staff ratio, a cold lunch rather than a hot meal, no eye care checks or a complete eye examination.

We have an obligation to human beings, and particularly children, who are powerless to fight for themselves. It seems that we tend to forget that as we rush headlong into nonhuman spending on science, defense, highways, and the like. We must have as a primary priority our children, including the children of the poor and disadvantaged.

How are we going to end poverty if we create another generation of handicapped children? How are we going to prevent the rage and violence that has plagued our cities if we deny another generation of youth access to the American dream?

The amendment would raise the overall OEO appropriation to the level necessary to fund fully the amounts earmarked for each program in the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1969. The bill reported by the Appropriations Committee appropriates a total of $2,053 billion for these programs. Our amend-
ment would increase the appropriation for all OEO programs by $182 million so that we fully fund those programs at the authorized level. While the Appropriations Committee bill places the appropriation for Headstart, work and training programs, and through in different locations throughout the bill, this amendment provides for OEO program appropriations in one place, as contained in the House passed bill, and thus assures that the agreements delegating administration of OEO programs to the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare and to the Legislative Branch are met.

Let me emphasize that hearings before both the Senate and House authorizing committees have amply demonstrated the need for more Headstart. It takes $390,000,000 merely to continue existing Headstart programs at the fiscal year 1970 operating level. When the Economic Opportunity amendments of 1969 were enacted less than a year ago, the specific allocation of $398,600,000 was insufficient to meet the earmarked amount for Headstart. While Congress agreed to give the administration substantial flexibility to vary from these figures to the extent of 15 percent, the Congress did not intend the administration to be specific for particular programs. I find it difficult to understand why Headstart has been chosen as the object of cutbacks by the administration from the allocated amounts. This seems to me to be an agreeable form of obfuscation which we gave the Director of OEO.

I think it is entirely appropriate, therefore, in enacting this appropriation legislation to stress that with respect to Headstart, the Congress intends that there be no cutbacks below the specific amounts of $398,000,000. Such flexibility as we gave the Director of OEO should be used to increase the amounts available for Headstart. Instead of doubling and quadrupling the amount of the In- vestment for Development programs which the OEO has not yet developed adequate plans for, we should be supporting and enhancing proven antipoverty programs, particularly those that directly benefit and in- vest in the children and their parents.

Mr. President, I urge Senators to vote for this amendment to the Labor-H.E.W. appropriations bill.

Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. President, I support enthusiastically the Javits amendment, No. 1068, to the Labor-H.E.W. appropriation bill.

This amendment, which I have cospon-
sored, is necessary if we are to renew our commitment to improving opportu-
nities for all Americans. Programs like Headstart and manpower training which have proved successful should be expanded, not cut back. Even the increased funding which this amendment would provide is inadequate to fill present needs.

The administration requested $339 million for Headstart. But it is clear that to keep the program running at even its present level, a minimum of $598 million will be needed.

The last segment of society to fall victim to the slash of the budget cutter should be our children. Headstart is a program that has given renewed hope to hundreds of thousands of youngsters across America. In my own State of Maine, there are presently 15 Headstart programs helping over 1,000 children. Now is not the time to deny them the benefits of preschool development.

Instead of dropping children from the program, we should be adding children. Instead of cutting corners here, we should be building Headstart into the kind of constructive national program it has the potential of being.

If the appropriations which passed the House of Representatives are not increased, 28,000 children who are presently enrolled in Headstart will have to be dropped. That would be a tragedy that we cannot afford.

There are some 6 million disadvantaged children under 6 years old in America. Yet Headstart enrolls only one-quarter of a million. We are helping less than one in 20 of the children who most need our help.

There can be no excuse for our not doing a better job in this area. We have a proven, workable program, and we have millions of children who can benefit from that program. Why should the children be dropped? We can do better.

Some say this issue has become embroiled in politics. There are some things that must be more important than politics. The lives of our children must be more important than politics.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the Office of Economic Opportunity remains as a clear symbol of hope to 25 million persons in this country who face the enduring misery of poverty. They lack adequate food; they are forced to live in unsanitary and deteriorating homes and they are the last to receive basic medical care. These are the constituents who have a vested interest in whether the Senate adequately funds the myriad of anti-poverty efforts that we have slowly developed over the past 5 years.

The amendment now before the Senate which I have cosponsored with colleagues of both parties would bring Headstart funding to a level that more nearly reflects our national educational needs and responsibilities.

Headstart is on the cutting edge of our attempts to provide adequate early childhood education for disadvantaged children. In countless cities and towns throughout this Nation, children from culturally deprived backgrounds have been given a step up by Headstart so that they might have the chance for an equal educational opportunity.

Despite the accomplishments of Headstart, we were forced to accede last year to a cut in the number of children served. As a result of this full-year program in most cities, costs increased somewhat but that rise was not matched by adequate funds. As a result, some 150,000 fewer children participated in the program.

The $339 million appropriated by the Appropriations Committee, while an improvement over the House version, will leave another 62,000 children without a chance for Headstart this summer.

In Massachusetts I am told by Headstart directors that the proposed level of funding will mean an 11-percent cutback in funds which will nearly gut the summer Headstart program. Last year, Massachusetts Headstart was cut by $843,000 and if this amendment is not approved, another $477,000 is expected to be cut from those programs.

Parents, teachers, and administrators have been united in their strong and continuing support for full funding of Headstart. I am now sending consent to introduce letters from Headstart Directors who have written in support of the amendment. They argue and I concur that this is not the way in which we should cut back on unnecessary spending. Priorities must indicate that these children have an opportunity to use the educational resources that this has available. Surely, if the Nation is willing to spend billions of dollars for unnecessary weapons systems we can afford $498 million for a program that offers a unique learning experience to 529,406 disadvantaged children.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MASSACHUSETTS COMMUNITY TEAMWORK, INC., Lowell, Mass.

Present Headstart funding level of $400,000 will be reduced by 9%. This group believes that budget cuts due to previous over-extension of funds and funneling of money into pilot projects has reduced the quality of the program. They are asking that the percentage of the reduction be reversed.

Concentrated Employment Program is currently funded at $1,600,000 and will be cut to $1,408,127. 240 enrollees will be eliminated. This program serves 13% of eligible population and a 12% increase would be necessary to maintain present level. The overall program serves 5% of eligible population and a 12% increase would be necessary to maintain current level.

The overall program serves 5% of eligible population, and a 12% increase would be necessary to maintain current level. Our concerns about impending cuts in manpower programs are especially acute since the employment picture in the area is quite grim. The unemployment rate is now 9.3%, the highest in the country, and one of the highest in the nation.

LEO F. DESJARDINS, Executive Director.


Present funding level is $2,655,340, of which $576,000 is for community action and $87,500 for Head Start. Head Start will be cut by 11%, by $5,576. 15 children will be dropped from program. 40% of eligible population is being served, and a 10% increase would be necessary to maintain present level.

STANLEY GAWDE, Director.


Present funding level for Head Start is $143,300 and will be cut by 9%, or $37,291 to $106,009. 46 children will be dropped; program will be shortened; adverse effects on personnel and services. Program serves 40% of 600 eligible children, or about 256 children, and an increase of 20% would be necessary to maintain present level.


Present funding level of $100,000 will be reduced to $82,448. "Deficits from prior years have been wiped out, with new operating surplus of $17,552. Program was reduced to $82,448 by the Appropriations Committee. It serves 36 children.

Present funding level for Head Start is $48,000. If the program is cut by 9%, 20 children will be dropped, leaving 18 children. Program was reduced to $48,000 by the Appropriations Committee. It serves 24 children.

Present funding level for Head Start is $30,000. If the program is cut by 9%, 20 children will be dropped, leaving 18 children. Program was reduced to $30,000 by the Appropriations Committee. It serves 24 children.

Present funding level for Head Start is $30,000. If the program is cut by 9%, 20 children will be dropped, leaving 18 children. Program was reduced to $30,000 by the Appropriations Committee. It serves 24 children.

Present funding level for Head Start is $30,000. If the program is cut by 9%, 20 children will be dropped, leaving 18 children. Program was reduced to $30,000 by the Appropriations Committee. It serves 24 children.

Present funding level for Head Start is $30,000. If the program is cut by 9%, 20 children will be dropped, leaving 18 children. Program was reduced to $30,000 by the Appropriations Committee. It serves 24 children.

Present funding level for Head Start is $30,000. If the program is cut by 9%, 20 children will be dropped, leaving 18 children. Program was reduced to $30,000 by the Appropriations Committee. It serves 24 children.

Present funding level for Head Start is $30,000. If the program is cut by 9%, 20 children will be dropped, leaving 18 children. Program was reduced to $30,000 by the Appropriations Committee. It serves 24 children.

Present funding level for Head Start is $30,000. If the program is cut by 9%, 20 children will be dropped, leaving 18 children. Program was reduced to $30,000 by the Appropriations Committee. It serves 24 children.

Present funding level for Head Start is $30,000. If the program is cut by 9%, 20 children will be dropped, leaving 18 children. Program was reduced to $30,000 by the Appropriations Committee. It serves 24 children.

Present funding level for Head Start is $30,000. If the program is cut by 9%, 20 children will be dropped, leaving 18 children. Program was reduced to $30,000 by the Appropriations Committee. It serves 24 children.

Present funding level for Head Start is $30,000. If the program is cut by 9%, 20 children will be dropped, leaving 18 children. Program was reduced to $30,000 by the Appropriations Committee. It serves 24 children.

Present funding level for Head Start is $30,000. If the program is cut by 9%, 20 children will be dropped, leaving 18 children. Program was reduced to $30,000 by the Appropriations Committee. It serves 24 children.

Present funding level for Head Start is $30,000. If the program is cut by 9%, 20 children will be dropped, leaving 18 children. Program was reduced to $30,000 by the Appropriations Committee. It serves 24 children.

Present funding level for Head Start is $30,000. If the program is cut by 9%, 20 children will be dropped, leaving 18 children. Program was reduced to $30,000 by the Appropriations Committee. It serves 24 children.

Present funding level for Head Start is $30,000. If the program is cut by 9%, 20 children will be dropped, leaving 18 children. Program was reduced to $30,000 by the Appropriations Committee. It serves 24 children.

Present funding level for Head Start is $30,000. If the program is cut by 9%, 20 children will be dropped, leaving 18 children. Program was reduced to $30,000 by the Appropriations Committee. It serves 24 children.

Present funding level for Head Start is $30,000. If the program is cut by 9%, 20 children will be dropped, leaving 18 children. Program was reduced to $30,000 by the Appropriations Committee. It serves 24 children.

Present funding level for Head Start is $30,000. If the program is cut by 9%, 20 children will be dropped, leaving 18 children. Program was reduced to $30,000 by the Appropriations Committee. It serves 24 children.
Present funding level of Head Start is $393,288 and will be reduced by 9 or 11%, by $35,996 or $43,262. Reason given: "reduction of prior year unexpended funds and anticipated reductions in appropriations, based on the earmarking language in the Economic Opportunity Act." 30-45 children will be eliminated from program; staff and services will be affected. 35-40% of eligible children are now being served, and a minimum increase of 10% would be necessary to continue at present level. Agency serves 90% population, and needs funds to expand main power programs.

AUSTIN C. CROSSEY
Head Start Director, Boston Community Development, Inc., Boston, Mass.

Present funding level of Head Start is $252,271 and will be cut to 15% or $218,044. Reduced appropriations was reason given. 30 children will be dropped, and staff and services will be adversely affected. 65% or 270 children out of a possible 415 children, now being served, and an increase of 10% is needed to maintain present level.

JHN F. LAVINEN,
Parent Coordinator, FRANK V. JONES,
Head Start Director, Barnstable Head Start Community Action Committee of Cape Cod and Islands, Inc., Hyannis, Mass.

Present funding level of $101,000 serving 120 children will be cut by 9-11% to $145,500 or $143,300. "Reduced House appropriations and deficit in return on unexpended funds from previous fiscal years" were reasons given. One class of 20 children will be dropped, and personnel and services will be adversely affected. 50% of current eligible 5-year-olds are being served, and a 5% increase in funds is necessary to maintain present level. OEO versatile funding has not been reduced, but 3 to 5% funding level increase would be necessary to maintain present level.

ARTURK F. KEMBR, Jr.,
Executive Director, Lynn Economic Opportunity, Inc., Lynn, Mass.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. GOBEL), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. McCARTHY), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STEVENS), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYSON) are necessarily absent.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. PENDLETON), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. SAXE), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) is absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDY) is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDY) would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) is paired with the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD). If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 35, as follows:

---

Not voting—22

Allen...Bay...Bellmon...Bent...Bennet...Cannon...Cannon...Cot...Dodd...Fong...Goldwater...Percy

So Mr. COTTON's motion to table the first part of Mr. JAVITS' amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. Is the remainder of the amendment still pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is correct; the remainder of the JAVITS amendment is still pending.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I think the Senate has expressed its desire to work its will on individual sections of the bill. I will submit amendments to individual sections of the bill. So will others who join me in sponsoring this basic amendment. I should like to feel free for that purpose now, and would like to make this suggestion, with all due respect to the manager of the bill, that perhaps this is a useful time, considering the hour, to try to arrive at some agreement on all amendments. I would be willing, and perhaps others will, before we close debate, to see that this could be a useful time to say that we will take 20 minutes on each amendment, 10 minutes on amendments to amendments, and try to lock up the bill, as we have argued just about everything.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Everyone? Mr. JAVITS. I submit that to the manager of the bill. Maybe I am saying this because I just got knocked down.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on all amendments the time be limited to 20 minutes, with 10 minutes for discussion and 10 minutes on any amendments to any amendment, with 5 minutes to a side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. MANSFIELD). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I think we should limit the time. We have discussed this matter and rediscussed it. The Senator from New York will probably come up with a substantial increase in funds for Head Start, and when the committee will come up with something—

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am about to present an amendment.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator from Washington will come up with his amendment, and we only get, how much time?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am going to present the amendment first and then other people can up it and can submit amendments up it, and then we can vote it up or down.

Mr. COTTON. We can vote the amendments up or down, yes. That would be only 5 minutes to a side, then, under this agreement?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Twenty minutes on each amendment.

Mr. COTTON. I believe the majority leader just suggested that we could live very well within the request by using one hour on the bill. So I withdraw my objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I modify the request to include 1 hour on the bill, on final passage.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, let us understand the request correctly now. There will be 20 minutes on each amendment, divided 10 minutes to the proponent and 10 minutes to the manager or whoever is the opponent; and 10 minutes on amendments to each amendment, divided 5 and 5, and then 1 hour on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This will be in the usual form.

Mr. JAVITS. That means the rule of germaneness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.
Mr. JAVITS, Mr. President, I think my amendment is still pending.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOK). The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk reads as follows: The Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON) offers the following amendment:

On page 33, line 16, strike out "$344,617,- 000", and insert in lieu thereof "$361,417,000".

On page 33, line 17, strike out "$339,000,- 000", and insert in lieu thereof "$354,000,- 000".

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the amendment is now directed at one of the items in the bill, namely, Headstart, which is administered by the Office of Child Development in HEW. The amount of appropriation in 1970 was $326 million. The Budget Bureau sent up the request for $339 million. The House cut that back to $320 million, but that back up to $339 million, or $17.7 million more than the House figure.

The pending amendment would add $15 million more, which would make it almost $33 million over the House figure.

We have had lengthy testimony from the OEO on Headstart and also from five or six witnesses from my own State who testified.

Since the hearing there have been some proems, they say, at OEO with Headstart and in the field. They say that they might be from $10 million to $13 million short of coming up to the amount necessary to maintain their program. So we have recommended $15 million over the House's $320 million, so that they will have plenty. That would make the total amount $354 million for Headstart.

Mr. President, I yield to no one in my dedication to Headstart since its beginning. I am one of the finer programs commenced by OEO. However, we are trying to be reasonable and keep it going as it should be kept going.

Mr. President, there will probably be some amendments to further increase this amount. The Senate can work its will on the matter.

The committee has worked hard and long. We think this is a reasonable figure to keep OEO moving and to provide for any increase they may need for this year.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, how much is the figure of $354 million below the authorized figure?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That would be $43 million plus below the authorized figure.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, do I understand that the amendment is offered jointly by the chairman of the subcommittee and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. Corman)?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. And in their judgment this will furnish everything that Headstart says it can use.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is what they told us and what other witnesses have said.

I know that there will be an amendment to increase this amount and the Senate can vote on it.

I will not yield back my time until I have to. Someone may force me into using some time by some statements that may ruffle my feathers a little bit.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, who controls the time in opposition?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. It would be the ranking minority member on the committee. That would be the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, here we have the classic result which is fine.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator from New York control the time in opposition.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Hampshire. That is very generous.

The classic result has now been achieved in the Senate, in my judgment, by tabling the portion of the amendment. I am not insulted, because that is the way it should have been done. Now we are down to the idea of breaking it down into individual components.

The first item deals with Headstart. It is not in the budget. I do not think we realize how little of the target we are fulfilling. If the Senate goes along with us we will amend the amount to provide for 441,000 slots; 441,000 slots—in the most conservative estimate—is something like one-fourth or one-fifth of the total target population.

We did earmark up to $398 million under the basic amendment.

"The argument made by the Senator from Washington that this does away with the Appropriations Committee is not a proper argument. He says that the Appropriations Committee does not do anything if we go to the authorization every time. That is not so in this case, because the authorization falls so far short of what ought to be done that we at least ought to go to the authorization. That is the argument here. It is not entirely a finite question. It is not a quantitative question. It is truly quantitative.

How much do we want to give of what ought to be given? Do we want to make it one-fifth or one-fourth? If so, how much do we want to give? We should at least give an amount up to the ceiling that has been established.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York admit that some of these programs have greater priority than others? Does he admit that?

Mr. JAVITS. I will admit that. However, I cannot let it go unchallenged, for this reason. We were not increasing this. This had relatively lower priority. The increases were perhaps $1 or $2, or $3 million.

Mr. PASTORE. That is not the point. Mr. JAVITS. Also, I cannot agree that only Headstart has a higher priority. I happen to feel that Legal Services ought to have the highest priority of any. I happen to feel that way. I think I understand the dynamics of the problem.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the whole argument of supporting the first part of the Javits amendment was that Headstart is a good program. I agree that Headstart is an excellent program and I intend to support it to its full authorization.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PASTORE. I will do the same thing on manpower.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PASTORE. And when it comes to the others, I will have to exercise my judgment.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is very gracious. When he is with us, we feel much better.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I wish to offer a substitute amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. The amendment would not be in order until the time is yielded back.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator argue the substitute now and we will submit it in due course.

Mr. CRANSTON. That will be agreeable.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from California.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of Senators Javits, Nelson, Mondale, and myself, I plan to offer a substitute amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator add the name of the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, will the Senator add the name of the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator add the name of the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE), the Senator from New Hamp-
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRANSTON. The amendment would simply restore the authorized amount for this program. Instead of $15 million as proposed in the committee amendment, the Senate would add $59 million to bring it to the full authorized amount.

It seems difficult to contend that they cannot handle these additional funds, since even with the adoption of this amendment we would serve 134,000 children, not the 98,000 children that were served in 1969. The Headstart program has been going downhill since the fact it is one of the most successful programs for the war on poverty programs. I give great opportunity to more underprivileged children who need a hand in the early days of their lives, in a way that involves their parents and families. The program has paid tremendous dividends in dealing with poverty in this society.

Mr. President, to be more precise, this is plainly not a reckless or rash proposal to add any vast sums. The administration budget request for fiscal year 1971 would have served nearly 200,000 fewer children than were served during fiscal year 1969, a reduction of nearly one-third in the total number of children served. Even the 539,000 children who would be served under our proposal is 134,000 fewer than were served in fiscal year 1969.

My final point is that even with the adoption of my amendment we would still be reaching only 36 percent of the children who are eligible for and who could benefit significantly from the Headstart program.

I do not see how it can be said we cannot handle the money that would enable us to meet the level of less than 2 years ago. And still under the amendment there would be 134,594 less children served as were served in Headstart programs in fiscal year 1969. We should be offering an amendment to meet the needs of the 719,000 eligible children who will not be served even at the $398 million level, but we are not doing that.

Mr. President, ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. Montoya) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) be added as cosponsors.

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

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CRANSTON. I yield.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I have served on the Joint Committee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty of the Committee on Labor for some years. I also serve as chairman of the Select Committee on Equal Education. I have spent a disproportionate percentage of my time on the question of why it is that this rich and powerful society somehow permit millions of children never to become full participants in the American system. We have reviewed thousands of pages of testimony about experiments, ideas, and notions to probe that single question. I would say, without any doubt, that the most hopeful, the most widely agreed upon single strategy known today to reach the problem of poverty and solve it is a high quality, early childhood development program, which is what Headstart is all about. If we hope to do something about poverty, the Senate will agree to the amendment.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota has been a great lender for many years in the Headstart program and no one knows better than he the importance of this amendment. I have greatly enjoyed working with him and I hope that the President and the Senate Finance Committee and particularly in working on his bill S. 2600, the Headstart Child Development Act, which I am privileged to cosponsor.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, how much time is remaining to the chairman?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from Washington I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I have great respect for Senators who want the full authorization for Headstart. I would be glad to vote for more money for Headstart than we have given. But I wish to call two things to the attention of the Senate. First, the President recommended this year $2,279 million more for Headstart than we have given. I support the Governor and the Senate and the House and I added to this nearly $100 million and the Senate has added more than $200 million.

It is easy, if one does not have the responsibility, and I am not being virtuous about it, to stand on the floor and let constituents at home know that a Senator fought for full authorization for Headstart. However, the authorization for Headstart is $78 million more than the House approved and some of us will be on the committee on conference and do all we can to prevail to hold this figure up as high as we can. The fact remains that the folks back home will think $78 million has been added to this matter.

Mr. President, it was never said, and I am sure the Senator from Washington intended to say, that this is all Headstart asked for; it is only what they said they could get along with. Let us be frank. I might be for more than that, but I have to stand up here and say to go $78 million over the House is a futile gesture.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. Cotton, do we say to our constituents when a request was made for $250 million for aid to Cambodia and we cannot take care of our children in America? These are questions we will have to answer. I am not being critical of the Senate, but if this country can afford to give $1 billion for foreign aid to foreign countries, why can we not afford to provide for the children in our country? That is the question in my mind.

Mr. COTTON. My good friend is asking the wrong Senator. I have voted against every foreign aid bill for the last 4 years and I am one Republican and one administration Republican who does not want the aid for Cambodia. I would just as soon throw it in the sewer.

Mr. PASTORE. I was just giving the Senator an argument for him to use in the conference. The Senate will have a full argument when he goes to conference.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I rise to wholeheartedly support the amendment of the Senator from California (Mr. Cranston) to provide additional funds for Headstart.

I have supported this program since its inception and have consistently voted for increases during the years of its existence.

We need to prepare our preschool children in low-income areas for full participation in the education process was high on the list of priorities of educators long before the introduction on Headstart. The years of Headstart's operation have proved the wisdom of the program. Those children fortunate enough to participate have demonstrated achievement far beyond those who have not been able to benefit from Headstart.

The evidence of community acceptance of Headstart has been brought abundantly to my attention in recent days and weeks. Nearly 1,000 New Hampshire residents, mostly parents of Headstart youngsters and community leaders familiar with its results, have expressed their full support of additional funds and their opposition to any cutbacks which would hamper the program. I believe the necessity of this amendment is quite clear. All across the country, Headstart programs report cutbacks of 7 to 18 percent in their Headstart allocations at a time when they would require a 10- to 12-percent increase simply to continue serving as many children as they served last year. This at a time by far and large the children are serving less than 20 percent of the children in their areas in need of Headstart services.

If we do not provide these additional funds, it will mean that children will not be able to attend classes; working mothers will be forced to leave their jobs to care for their children at home and will thereby suffer the loss of needed income; essential medical and dental care of Headstart children will be stopped. In addition, special breakfasts, snacks, and hot lunches, which are important to the health and well-being of these dilapidated and other services will be curtailed.

Mr. President, this must not happen. I urge that this amendment be adopted.

Mr. President, I will not burden my colleagues nor the Record at this point with length material which has come to me from the people of New Hampshire supporting Headstart. But, I would like to share one communication from one of the hundred I have received which I believe reflects the views of so many.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter from Mr. Jack Leonard of the Headstart program in Claremont, N.H., be printed in the Record at this point.
There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

YEAR AROUND HEAD START, Clarenmont, N.H.

Senator THOMAS McINTYRE, New Hampshire, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. McIntyre: As a teacher aid in the Head Start Program in Clarenmont, I am appalled to learn of the recent cut in the budget for this program. I think first of all of the thirty children that I will face each morning realizing that 'perfection' or anything will be a bitter pill. To cut the program, sending the children back home to their parents? It would mean an end to the jobs they are now holding, and a further drain on your welfare program. Financially, there is no real saving, and in terms of pride and independence there is no real help. Or shall we cut the essential medical care program, that these children receive?

It hurts on another level to recognize that once again the government is holding out one hand to the poor with help and stabbing them in the back with the other. To fight inflation for the working people by cutting back the very programs that offer them hope and reform for the future is hypocritical, near-sighted and blatantly political. When educational service for the future and improvement in the future, why is it always the first to be considered in the budget decreases?

We should ask for an explanation for the budget cut and a clarification for the government's intentions and commitments to the poor people of this nation. What guarantees are there for future cuts in this or other programs, guarantees that could begin to foster a real trust in our leaders and the future immediate restoration of the original budget when Congress reconvenes, and further ask an increase in the budget to meet the growing needs of the young people in this area.

Yours truly,

JACK LEONARD,
MINNESOTA SUPPORTS FUNDING FOR HEADSTART.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, possibly the greatest cause for divisiveness and disillusionment with the Government by the economically depressed is the holding out of promises and help, then abruptly withdrawing it.

It causes the help to so many children, families, and communities. To seriously curtail its effectiveness by cutbacks is not good economy, but slow strangulation of a program that has offered the only real hope to so many thousands of children.

Excerpts from a letter from a Head Start parent in Minnesota makes this point more dramatically and with more emphasis than the most articulate speech writer.

My son Paul goes to Head Start. He is the only child I have, and because of a lot of happenings, pretty bad mishaps, Paul was sort of shy, afraid and unsure of people.

Head Start has given him assurance that this is a place where there will be room for him, whereas before he had only older kids to play with. Then when we moved all the children on our block were too old for him to play with. So this is the only place that gives the child a responsibility of his own property to property of others and to people.

He comes home after school and rattles off stories of poem or song, brings the house a funny water paint or crayon colored picture. These things, these few simple things, warm my heart.

Your amendment might enable another's son to be happy, another mother to be happy. I'm a mother of whom if I could have more of it I surely would have more of it, and must work hard for the few things I'm able to give him but Head Start has given him a lot I couldn't. Playmates to sing and to play with. May I urge you to describe how I feel for what I see in Paul since he's started. A little flesh on those ribs. He's hungry. I've never seen him so hungry before. I use to have to run behind him to pick up his toys with occasion help from him but now he picks them up right away because he thinks that's what all his Maggie would do.

So tell me we should cut Head Start. We mothers of Head Start are praying your amendment goes down the drain that our children get the advantages of that Head Start as our children have.

What answer will we have for this mother, and thousands of others like her, if we do not pass the amendment that provides full funding of Head Start programs?

In Minnesota, Head Start programs already operating on minimum budgets have been told that cutbacks of up to 20 percent could be expected. In southeastern Minnesota, where only 40 to 60 children are served, it would result in severely curtailing, if not eliminating, an effective program.

The Dodge-Steele-Waseca Citizens Action Council, Inc. in Waseca, Minn., reports:

The impact on our total program will be devastating. Our Agency is small. Further stranulation by the cutting of funds could make nothing more than simple window dressing in the eyes of the low-income people we serve.

A Headstart parent in Shakopee writes:

Regional officials have said that our Head Start program may be cut as much as 10 percent. I am to understand this as I feel that they should be allowed more money not less. Right there serving only 50 children out of 300 or so eligible for Head Start. This program that could be done for these children. It's just a shame that we cannot serve all the eligible children. And with the money they are receiving it would be hard to do the job properly. They're doing a wonderful job on the money they have—but there is no doubt they need more money.

The director of the Minneapolis Headstart program telegraphed:

As Director of the Minneapolis Headstart Program I would like to protest the proposed cutback in the funding level of Head Start. Currently 268 disadvantaged children aged 5 are receiving free breakfasts, lunches and essential medical care on a full year basis. We are serving less than twenty-five percent of the eligible families in Minneapolis, an area with more than 10,000 children in Minneapolis quality and would benefit from our comprehensive services. A ten to fourteen percent cut would equal twenty-five to thirty thousand dollars. It is very hard to see how you can cut back on the losses and effects on any of our programs. It is our responsibility to provide this service to the children of our city.

In a similar vein, Headstart parents in St. Cloud, Minn. state:

We are well aware of the tremendous cost increases in the last few years--items as food, transportation, and health services, which are essential parts of our program. Yet for the last four years we have been required to operate at the same level.

In the meantime, we have repeatedly heard and read about the high priority the administration has placed on welfare; for childhood programs. In view of this we find it extremely difficult to understand why we are now faced with funding cuts.

I have received other communications from participating parents, teachers, and community citizens from all over the State of Minnesota, Wisconsin, North Dakota, Iowa, Buhl, Chisholm, Doctor River, Alborn- Brookston, Moorhead, Northome, Orr, Virginia, Jordan, Shakopee, throughout all of the Twin-Cities area of Minneapolis, Stillwater, Hennepin County, Tri-County CAP, Beloit, Sycamore, Carver County, CAC, St. Cloud, Grand Marias, and Meadowlands, to name only a few. Similar appeals for full funding of Headstart have come from practically every State in the country. Dr. Robert J. Redfield, pediatrician describes the Headstart program as "the most successful far-ranging program for our Nation's disadvantaged children that the Federal government has ever undertaken." He concludes:

I have had personal contact with many pediatricians throughout the country whose views are similar to mine. I think that a de-emphasis of the Head Start Program, and certainly the proposed budget cuts must be considered a de-emphasis is exceedingly inappropriate. At a time when such basic rights as equal health opportunities and education are just being gained, these disadvantaged children are foremost in the minds of many, the de-emphasis of this widely accepted program must be viewed as a direct blow to the hopes of those concerned with orderly change.

As an example of the improperly of such action, D.H.E.W. is placing as the number one priority the following: "To intensify D.H.E.W. efforts and improve co-ordination of efforts at the Federal, State, local and private levels to benefits children during the first five years of life." The de-emphasis of the Head Start Program seems to me to be a clear contradiction to this stated D.H.E.W. program.

Hon. John Dempsey, the Governor of Connecticut, says:

The proposed reduction in funds will affect many children throughout the nation by either reducing or eliminating the services available to them. At present children of our country are too important to risk investment in their well-being to be decreased.

And strong support for this bill was expressed by Gov. Forrest H. Anderson, of Montana.

Each of these communities has reiterated that what we do with our children today, prepares them for the future. They emphasize the education, medical and dental services, and nutritional benefits
For the Neighborhood Youth Corps summer job program, $7.8 million.
For the Neighborhood Youth Corps out-of-school program, $7.2 million.

Mr. JAVITS: There is $9 million provided.

For the Concentrated Employment Program—where we have a set-hard core program in a given slum area—$8.5 million.

For public service careers, $5.2 million.

For Mainstream, which as our colleagues know, is a program largely to help older people, $2.2 million.

This all is according to the budgeting which has already been done by the administration itself.

The total number of additional training slots which will be provided if this amendment carries is 33,950. The amount of improvement in overall terms—because we are dealing with more than 900,000 people who are being trained—very small, in terms of percentage. But in the key areas for which this amount is budgeted, it becomes critical, very important, and extremely helpful.

Mr. JAVITS: I have a feeling of the Senate that it wished to vote upon; each of these items separately, and bearing in mind that this one, like Headstart, is discussed in the greatest detail, I should like to submit—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself 2 additional minutes. I should like to lay it before the Senate on this basis.

One final point, Mr. President. Again I go to the fact that has been argued here in terms of the function of the Appropriations Committee.

Certainly, the Appropriations Committee has every right to feel that its function is one of screening, but it also has a function of determining what shall be the program and while the Appropriations Committee may feel that a committee set of priorities ought to obtain in respect to a particular situation, the Senate may have its own views as to the importance of the programs I have described.

Mr. President, I should like to point out again the target population and how much of it is reached. In respect of manpower training, it is estimated that the number reached in even so highly a desirable program is roughly only a tenth of those who ought to be reached if we really could do the job comprehensively. My amendment seeks to buttress and strengthen this program in given sense, and while the administration's budget request and no more. I hope very much that the Senate will look favorably upon it.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? Does the Senator from Washington yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as I understand this—and I want to be very fair about it—the Senator from New York has taken the section "work and training programs" all in one. Is that correct?

Mr. JAVITS. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. The total to be added is $41,900,000. We have removed the House amount on all these programs. I know there are many important programs in here—in school and summer programs and the Job Corps. The big item is the Job Corps and the LEAP that I, as I have added, is being administered in the Labor Department.

We thought we had a pretty good figure, from the testimony of the people who run these things, the Senator from New Hampshire and I made an attempt to increase the dropout program, but we tried to spread the money equitably between the counseling services and the dropout, because we did not see how we further separate the two. There is a great dearth of counselors—one for every 1,000 students in the country, or something like that.

We have no more to say. We think that we have given a reasonable amount, and we feel that the House, with a fine-tooth comb, too. But the Senate can direct us, if it wishes, and that is its privilege, to go to the House with this extra amount.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself 1 minute. Mr. President, this is very creditable, and I am grateful to the Senator. It bears out exactly how I felt about this whole debate. Once we got over this devolution question, I really felt that it became a pretty issue, in which the members of the committee, especially the Senators from Washington and New Hampshire, did the best they felt they could, within the context of the Appropriations Committee; and if anything further was to be done, it would have to be done in the Senate.

I most respectfully submit that this is a well warranted increase, considering its purposes and considering that even if granted, it still is within the President's budget request.

SUPPORT OF JAVITS-NELSON AMENDMENT TO H.R. 18515

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I also wish to express my strong support for the Javits-Nelson amendment to H.R. 18515, the fiscal 1971 Labor-HEW appropriations bill.

As chairman of the Senate Committee on Aging, I wish to direct my remarks to the funding provisions for work and training programs for older workers.

Last month our unemployment-rate continued to increase — leaving 4.7 million Americans without jobs.

All age groups have been hard pressed during our economic slowdown, but older workers and their families have been especially hard hit.

Today there are nearly 1 million persons 65 and older who have lost their jobs.

For persons 55 and over, unemployment has jumped sharply by 72 percent since January 1989.

Once unemployed, these older workers may be hardest hit by a rise in joblessness. Individuals 55 and older now represent about 17 percent of the civilian
work force. But, they constitute more than 23 percent of the very long-term unemployed—27 weeks or longer. The rates for these long-term jobless individuals, Mainstream has literally been a lifesaver.

Mainstream has helped provide employment opportunities in needed community services for the chronically unemployed, who have limited prospects for jobs because of age or other disadvantages.

Several pilot programs funded under Mainstream—such as Green Thumb, Greater Eight, Senior Aides, and the Senior Community Service programs—have amply demonstrated that older individuals can make valuable contributions in their communities.

For example, participants in the Green Thumb program—sponsored by the National Farmers Union—have built more than 350 roadside parks, planted more than 1 million trees to beautify our countryside, and helped to develop and restore numerous historical sites.

The Elderly Job Program conducted by the National Council of Senior Citizens has also provided new job opportunities for low-income elderly persons in the field of health, education, welfare, and social work.

And the National Council on the Aging's Senior Community Service programs have rendered important and needed community services.

In my own State of New Jersey, these "senior aides" have provided valuable services as bilingual aides in elementary schools. As a result, the non-English speaking children have been able to make a better adjustment to the community, their schools, and the English language.

The Javits-Nelson amendment will help provide $41.9 million in increased funding for employment and training programs. Of this total, an additional $2.2 million would be used for Model projects increasing the Senate Appropriations Committee's recommendation from $38.8 million to $41 million.

This badly needed funding can help provide employment opportunities for large numbers of older workers. It can also be used to expand some of the successful pilot projects under Mainstream—such as Green Thumb, Senior Aides or the Senior Community Service programs.

And it can help many disadvantaged older workers back to the road of financial recovery.

The rewards of this action are many. For the elderly, a job can be a passport to self-sufficiency and self-respect. For his family, a regular paycheck can offer the promise of a fuller and better life.

And our society as a whole will benefit from the urgently needed community services provided by Mainstream workers.

Mr. President, I urge adoption of the Javits-Nelson amendment to H.R. 18516. Mr. SAVITS, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DUNN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FURBRIG), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. ISOURY), the Senator from Louisiana, an official vacancy, the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. McCARTHY), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RYSELL), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHAVER), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STERNER), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present, and voting, the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) would vote "yea," Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. SAXBE), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) is absent.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK) is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HARRIS). I announce that the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER). If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay." On this vote, the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG) is paired with the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT). If present and voting, the Senator from Hawaii would vote "yea" and the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay." The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 32, as follows:
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TEXAS—42

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aiken</td>
<td>Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks</td>
<td>Byrd, W. V.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bumbeck</td>
<td>Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd, W. A.</td>
<td>Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case</td>
<td>Cooper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos</td>
<td>Crenshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddy</td>
<td>Goodell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eloy</td>
<td>Griffin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>Harriette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriette</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[No. 391 Leg.]

NAYS—32

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allott</td>
<td>Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>Boggs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boggs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[No. 392 Leg.]

[No. 393 Leg.]

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

So Mr. JAVITS' amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I send to the Committee an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk reads as follows: The Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT) proposes an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK) as follows:

On page 36, line 17, strike out "estimated" and insert in lieu thereof "actually expended."

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, in the committee reported bill, section 208 provides that payments to State welfare departments for services, staff training, and administration not exceed 115 percent of the amount estimated for those purposes for such State for fiscal year 1970. The purpose of this section is to make administrative expenses controllable rather than open-ended. I believe that this purpose is admirable and justifiable.

I have never been in favor of "open-ended" appropriations. There are times when an "open-ended" appropriation is necessary because expenses which will be incurred are completely unpredictable. I do not believe that these instances occur frequently, and they should be avoided whenever possible. With the ever increasing Federal budget all measures which help to control the increase should be considered and implemented if possible.

With this background, I would like to say that while I applaud the intent of section 208, I am somewhat concerned with the procedure which has been used to implement the theory. Section 208 states in part that expenses under titles I, IV, X, XIV, and XVI, of the Social Security Act, in the aggregate, shall not exceed 115 percent of the aggregate amount estimated for these purposes for such State for fiscal year 1970. My concern stems from the fact that the 115 percent limitation which is to be applied is based on the estimated cost for fiscal year 1970. I am sure that when this provision was originally drafted only figures available were those which the States had submitted as estimates. I now understand that HEW has the actual ex-
penses for fiscal year 1970, rather than only those used for estimating. Because of this I believe that the 115 percent figure should be applied to actual expenses rather than estimated expenses.

One amendment is very simple. On page 38, line 17, strike out "estimates" and insert instead the words "actually expended." This in my opinion, is a fair and legitimate way of applying the intent of controlling expenses. If we have the actual costs it seems that it is much more accurate to apply the limitation to that figure. This is only fair and equitable in our responsibility to the States. I hope that the managers of the bill will agree with this approach and accept my amendment, which I have been informed that the administration has no objection with this change.

I have spoken with the manager of the bill, the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the ranking minority member of the Committee, a distinguished Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), who has an amendment which he intends to call up shortly, and the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON). It is my understanding from all of these Senators that they are perfectly willing to accept the amendment.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement by Senator DOMINCICK who had to leave the floor temporarily.

There being no objection, Senator Domnick's statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Senator DOMINICK

Mr. President, section 208 of this bill would place a limit on the heretofore open-ended appropriation for matching Federal funds available to the states for costs incurred in delivering welfare services. I strongly support this concept, and think the arguments of the Appropriations Committee and the Administration in support of the inclusion of section 208 are sound. I have been opposed to any open-ended authorizations and appropriations on the ground that they encourage fiscal irresponsibility and make it possible for the states to appropriate for cash payments to welfare recipients open-ended. But, those reasons do not apply to appropriations for the associated programs, staff training and administration. Placing a limit on Federal matching funds available for these costs would require State welfare agencies to streamline their programs and look for ways to increase their efficiency. I don't think the importance of this can be over-emphasized. A time when overall welfare costs appear to be soaring out of sight.

The report of the Appropriations Committee indicates section 208 was intended to limit expenditures for welfare-related costs in fiscal 1971 to 115% of those spent by the states in fiscal 1970 (i.e., a 15% increase). But, section 208 is worded so that the 115% figure is applied to the estimated rather than actual costs for fiscal 1970. Section 208 reads:

"None of the funds contained in this title may be used for purposes of any State for fiscal year 1971 for services, staff training, and administrative expenses under titles I, IV (part A), X, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act. The aggregate amount in excess 115 percent of the aggregate amount estimated for these purposes for any State for fiscal year 1970 (empiness added), I understand that estimates which would be relied upon by HEW in administering this section were submitted by the States in May, 1969. Well, now we are into fiscal year 1971, and the estimates for fiscal year 1970 are in. In Colorado, it turns out that the May, 1969, estimates were too low. Colorado's estimated costs were roughly $1,305,000, while our actual costs are over $1,353,000. This is primarily due to unexpected increases in the AFDC and food stamp caseload and increased need for day care centers. I am sure the estimates for fiscal 1970 were low in many other States for similar reasons.

I am now sponsoring with Senator ALLOTT an amendment which would merely apply the 115% limit in section 208 to the actual figures in each State for fiscal 1970, rather than the estimated figures. This is not inconsistent with the concept upon which section 208 is based, and I am advised that the Administration does not oppose it. I hope the Appropriations Committee will accept it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as far as I am concerned, I am glad to accept the amendment. I have consulted with the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS) and the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON). They are agreeable. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk reads as follows:

The Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), offers on behalf of himself and Senators RANDOLPH, MONDALE, CHURCH, POUZY and GURNEY the following amendment:

On page 28, line 21, strike out "$34,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$34,650,000".
On page 28, line 22, strike out "$1,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,650,000".

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I join in support of H.R. 18315, the fiscal 1971 Labor-HEW appropriations bill.

As chairman of the Senate Committee on Aging, I wish to direct my remarks to funding matters of vital concern for our 20 million senior citizens and others affected by problems related to aging.

The Older Americans Act;
The Age Discrimination in Employment Act; and

The White House Conference on Aging.

As a sponsor of these three measures, I can well appreciate the importance of adequate appropriations to carry out the intent of Congress as expressed in authorization legislation.

Yet, in spite of a compelling call for adequate funding for programs serving the aged, a psychology of retrenchment appears to have held at certain high levels of Government.

Too often the elderly have been thrust in the front ranks in the fight against inflation, although they are probably least equipped to make this sacrifice.

And too often they have been caught in a vicious economic squeeze because of these short sighted and ill advised decisions.

Fortunately there is a bipartisan movement in Congress to help change spending priorities for older Americans.

We have made some progress. But much more remains to be done.

Today the consideration of the Labor-HEW appropriations bill can be another important step forward.

First, however, I would like to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MAGNUSON) for his outstanding leadership in bringing this well-balanced appropriations measure to the floor for a vote.

Last June the ranking minority member of the Committee on Aging (Mr. POUZY) and I helped lead a bipartisan drive for increased funding for human investment programs for older Americans. Several of these recommendations, I am pleased to say, were approved in the Senate Appropriations Committee bill.

In July the House of Representatives approved $32 million in funding for the Older Americans Act and the White House Conference on Aging—the same amount as requested in the administration's budget. The Senate bill raises this amount by $2 million from $32 million to $34 million.

Of particular significance for the elderly is the $1 million in funding for RSVP—the retired senior volunteer program.

In the House-passed bill and in the administration's budgetary estimate, no appropriations were recommended for RSVP.

Established under the 1969 amendments to the Older Americans Act—which I sponsored—RSVP is designed to provide new opportunities for needed community services for persons 60 and older. RSVP volunteers perform services in their communities without compensation, but they would be reimbursed for their meals, transportation, and other out-of-pocket expenses.

Despite the widely unanimous endorsement for RSVP, this is the second consecutive fiscal year that no funding has been requested.

The $1 million in the Senate committee bill can help our Nation begin to take advantage of the wealth of skills and talent with which senior citizens are so richly endowed.

Leading experts in the field of aging have estimated that perhaps 1 million older American would be willing to volunteer if their services were solicited.

This is a readymade resource of talent which is still largely untapped. These volunteers are also ready, willing, and able to serve their communities. And they can be used in productive and purposeful activities, such as:

 Assisting schools as lunchroom supervisors;
 Playing and tutoring schoolchildren;
 Rendering services in hospitals and nursing homes; and
 Assisting elderly taxpayers in preparing their tax returns.
Foster Grandparents

Another important change in the Senate committee bill is an extra $1 million for the popular foster grandfather program. This program, which helps low-income persons 60 and over to provide supportive services for disadvantaged young children.

Unlike RSVP participants, these individuals are paid wages for their services. Today the program has grown to 68 projects with 183 participating institutions in 40 States. More than 4,000 foster grandparents serve 8,000 children daily and about 16,000 annually.

In my own State of New Jersey, I have personally seen the work of these devoted elderly persons. There are now more than 250 New Jersey residents providing needed services for approximately 1,600 handicapped, dependent, neglected, or otherwise disabled children.

At a recent visit to the Woodbine State Hospital in New Jersey, I was most impressed by the empathy between the foster grandparents and the children—to the point where the aged pioneers provide additional care for the youngsters beyond normal working hours.

We do not need any more proof that this program will work. We already have abundant evidence from elderly participants, individuals served, and community leaders.

What is needed now is a realistic financial commitment responsive to the growing needs of this successful program.

Age Discrimination in Employment Act

With unemployment reaching its highest level in nearly 7 years, millions of workers are finding it increasingly difficult to locate jobs. Many middle-aged and older workers are denied work because of their advanced age—in spite of the fact that we have a law prohibiting such discriminatory practices.

The committee bill will, however, provide vitally needed funding for more personnel to strengthen the enforcement of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act.

An additional $206,000 is provided for the Wage and Hour Division in the Labor Department, increasing the House appropriations from $27,953,000 to $28,159,000.

This $206,000 raise in the Senate bill will be used to provide additional personnel to ensure compliance with the provisions of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act.

Section 5 of the age discrimination law also directs the Secretary of Labor to undertake a study concerning the situation of older workers and other arrangements giving rise to involuntary retirement.

This mandate has still not been fulfilled, although the act was passed almost 3 years ago.

The language in the committee report makes it abundantly clear that this study should be undertaken expeditiously.

This study can help provide concrete answers and solutions for numerous employment and retirement problems affecting older persons. For example, it may tell us why the number of labor force "dropouts" for men 45 and older has increased by more than 30% in the last 10 years, from 7.8 million to 7.8 million. This increase will have to be financed somehow until such time as the budget for the coming fiscal year is developed in order to see whether or not said funds can be allocated.

Much the same mood of concern was expressed by Mr. Robert B. Robinson, director of the Board of Directors of Services for the Aging and President of the National Association of State Units on Aging. Mr. Robinson's letter said:

"Every effort will be made to send the elderly to the National White House Conference on Aging. There will be broad, wide-open support of so-called "look-at-the-facts" funds to carry out the directives they have already received or that are in process."

"Other comments about payment of expenses for elderly participants:"

Mr. James R. MacKay, chairman of the New Hampshire Council on Aging, said:

"We will attempt to send elderly participants to the White House Conference on Aging in Washington; however, this Agency can only provide financial assistance for those elderly to go as delegates. An effort will be made to generate local community financial support, and we hope the Congress will approve these funds already authorized for expenses of Conference delegates."

Mr. Charles Chaskes, executive director of the Michigan Commission on Aging, described involvement of elderly participants in the White House Conference "as an almost insurmountable problem unless Federal funds become available for this purpose."

Quenien L. Emery, acting assistant secretary for the State of Washington Department of Social and Health Services, said:

"Unless Federal funds are available, our delegation will include only persons who can pay their own way or who are sent as delegates of an organization which will pay their expenses."

Mrs. K. Rose Wood, director of the New Mexico Commission on Aging, said that no State or matched funds are available to send anyone to Washington. She said:

"Efforts will need to be made to insure participation of the elderly poor and those in other income groups, but it would be too bad if only people who can afford to pay their own way are delegated."

Mr. President, the problem is not limited only to States which are many miles from Washington, D.C.; State officials from as nearby as Rhode Island and Pennsylvania also do not see how representation is possible unless Federal support is available.

Moreover, by making the money available now, older persons will know with much greater certainty that they will in fact be able to attend the Conference in Washington.

In May, State White House Conferences on Aging will be held to prepare for the National Conference in November. One of the functions at these State meetings will be to select representatives or at least to formulate a policy for selection of representatives.
But if funding is not requested for delegate expenses until the next fiscal year, the States will have no assurance that money will be available at all, to say nothing of its being available in time for the Conference.

During the past 2 years, the Labor-HEW appropriations bills have been considered in the Senate in November and December. If this occurs next year, it would be impossible for the States to assure their elderly delegates that their travel expenses will be covered.

In addition, there is strong precedent for this action. Payment of delegate expenses has been authorized for the last White House Conference on Aging in 1961. And I might add that the 1961 Conference led to medicare and other important measures for older Americans.

Therefore, I urge adoption of this badly needed measure to assure meaningful participation by a broadly based group of older Americans.

**ADEQUATE FUNDING NECESSARY TO INSURE ATTENDANCE OF DELEGATES TO AGING CONFERENCE**

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I join in support of the Williams amendment to provide an additional $650,000 for delegate expenses for the 1971 White House Conference on Aging. This additional money is needed and will be well utilized.

In my home State of West Virginia, there is genuine concern over the uncertainty of Federal support for travel expenses for the National Conference next November.

Louise B. Gerrard, executive director for the West Virginia Commission on Aging, states in her letter of concern:

"We are only too aware of the meaning of the White House Conference will be lost if a large number of elderly do not go to Washington. How to pay their expenses is a major worry. It seems to us essential that we get some Federal money for this purpose."

Funding for delegate expenses is urgently needed. If we act today to appropriate funds for fiscal 1971, delegates can be selected with assurances that they will be able to attend the Conference in Washington.

In May there will be State White House Conferences on Aging to prepare for the National Conference. One of the functions at these forums will be to select delegates to represent the States.

If we postpone action until next fiscal year for funding for delegate expenses, the States will have no assurances that money will be available for the November Conference.

During the last 2 years the Senate has not acted on the Labor-HEW appropriations bills until November and December. If this should occur next year, it would be impossible for the States to assure their elderly representatives that their expenses would be reimbursed.

Participation is absolutely essential if this Conference is to come to grips with the real problems of the aging—income, health care, housing, employment, and many others.

Their participation will also be necessary if they are to have an influential role in formulating a national action policy for older Americans during this decade.

I urge passage of the Williams amendment to the fiscal 1971 Labor-HEW appropriation bill.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter from the West Virginia Commission of Aging addressed to Senator Williams.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

**WEST VIRGINIA COMMISSION ON AGING**

**Charleston, W.Va., August 10, 1970.**

**Senator HARRELL A. WILLIAMS, Jr.**

Chairman, Subcommittee on Aging, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: I am pleased to respond to your request for information on our participation in the White House Conference.

**Questions One and Two.** Our staff is so small (12 full-time employees plus vacancies) that it is not possible to assign one person to White House Conference duties exclusively. At present, and for the next several months, the aging will take the major part of all staff time. This will mean a major part of our operating funds (staff and travel) will go for this purpose.

**Question Three.** We will have two forums of the week of September 20 in two of the nine regions of the state. The senior centers of the state’s fifty-five counties are in these two regions.

**Question Four.** We will operate on a shoe string, with donated facilities, and—hopefully—with donated lunches. We are having to limit our planning to one meeting at a time because of our present manpower. We will be focusing on low income rural elderly, including migrant workers, in our meetings. We will try to have at least one forum in each region. It is not possible to have all forums in one region and not other regions. We have limited funds. We do not think the program can be expanded this year.

**Question Five.** We make no plans to use the questionnaire until we see it. We have made pre-tests with elderly of limited educational backgrounds who have had no experience with "paper work." We want to cooperate in gathering information which will be usable in the future, and hope the questionnaire will be suitable. If it is not, we will do something on our own.

**Question Six.** All funding questions lead to this one. We are trying to improve our services. We are trying to do what we have. We expect no special state appropriation for conferences and, in the long run, there is no local money.

Our plans are not far enough along to report on the January-April conferences, although we hope to have good representation from all regions. The May meeting, which will be part of our observance of Senior Citizens’ Month, with a three-day program at a resort hotel, will provide a camp accommodation for 500 people over-night. The three-day program during the day. Our May, 1970 meeting was very successful, and already there is interest in the May, 1971 meeting. Governor Arch Moore and Senator Jennings Randolph were at the 1970 program.

**Question Seven.** Of course we anticipate them, primarily in assuring that all relevant groups and individuals have an opportunity to participate in a meaningful way.

**Question Eight.** Aside from elderly from all parts of the state and from all economic levels, we have little interest in making a short supply that we cannot give it the distribution it needs. I feel we have been promised more than we have gotten. We have great need for a policy formulation conference. The White House Conference, yet we have none. Some of the directives in the Guidelines are unrealistic, for our state, at least, particularly because of the short time span between the material and the date on which programs are to be held. And I hope we’re not being swept up in a national, general scheme. I feel unauthorized.

**Question Nine.** Some of the material coming from the Administration on Aging has been received and is somewhat of a shock. We do not have the human, financial, or material resources to carry on. It seems to us essential that we get some Federal money for this purpose.

It would be helpful to have representatives from public and private agencies, and for a range of organizations. To what extent, representation will depend upon the availability of funds.

We have attended meetings of the White House Conference, and I believe the only way we can get representation is by expedient action in this area.

**Question Ten.** I have questions about some of the guidelines. I do not know if the White House Conference will be lost. If a large number of elderly do not go to Washington, how to pay their expenses is a major worry. It seems to us essential that we get some Federal money for this purpose.

We appreciate your interest in these measures and we look forward to working with you on this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

**Louise B. Gerrard, Ph.D.**

Executive Director.
This measure would provide an additional $650,000 to help pay delegate expenses for the 1971 White House Conference on Aging.

One of the purposes of this Conference is to bring together persons from public and private life, including the elderly, to develop a national policy of action for older Americans.

Quite clearly, the attendance and participation of senior citizens at the Conference next November will be critical for its success.

Their full and open participation must be assured—regardless of their economic status.

Only in this manner will there be a broadly based group to focus on their pressing difficulties and the problems for tomorrow’s retirees.

In my own State of Minnesota, there is a special problem for elderly persons waiting for their Social Security Retirement. Because the money would not be able to afford a 2,200 mile round trip.

There is clear authority and a compelling need for payment of delegate expenses. The White House Conference on Aging in 1961, there was Federal support for travel expenditures for elderly participants. And it was the intent of the authorization legislation for this coming conference to cover such expenses.

But at the State level there is much uncertainty about the selection of elderly representatives for the Conference because there is no assurance that funding will be available.

In her response to the Committee on Aging questionnaire, Mrs. B. C. Leadholm, chairman of the Governor’s Citizens Council on Aging in Minnesota, described this difficult problem.

Since funds may be needed to send older persons as participants to the National White House Conference on Aging, however, the number who might attend will depend on whether there is money available and the resources of the older persons themselves.

Private funds are not available.

Passage of the Williams amendment would remove much of this doubt. Older persons would know with much greater certainty that they will be able to attend the National Conference.

The additional $650,000 provided in the Williams amendment is a modest increase in funds. But it is badly needed to assure meaningful participation by a broadly based group of older Americans.

Mr. President, I urge acceptance of the Williams amendment.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter I received from the Governor’s Citizens Council on Aging.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATE OF MINNESOTA, GOVERNOR’S CITIZENS COUNCIL ON AGING

ST. PAUL, Minn., August 19, 1970.

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.,
Chairman, Special Committee on Aging,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: The following information is submitted in reply to your letter of July 24th:

10. We are somewhat aware of what other states are doing but not as knowledgeable as we would like to be.

We are generally not satisfied with the rate of progress. Endless delays have been encountered and some material is still in draft stage. We are very upset by the fact that the questionnaires are not being returned prior to September 1st and that the use of it is being so restricted. The directions for planning and programs for the conference are too detailed in light of the fact that no money is being made available to states for such purposes.

Notwithstanding many frustrations, the Governor’s Citizens Council on Aging is committed to maximizing whatever opportunities exist in relation to the White House Conference on Aging in order to advance the interests of older persons.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. B. C. LEADHOLM,
Chairman.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I support the Williams amendment to increase funding for the 1971 White House Conference on Aging from $1 to $1.65 million.

This additional $650,000 would help pay the travel expenses for elderly delegates to the National Conference next November.

Mr. Williams, the White House Conference on Aging legislation was considered in 1968. It was contemplated that the total authorization of $1.9 million for the Conference would include approximately $650,000 for delegate expenses.

Without such assistance, many older Americans will not be able to attend—particularly low-income persons or individuals who would be required to travel great distances.

In my State of Idaho, older persons will be required to travel nearly 2,500 miles to participate in the Conference. This will, of course, require a substantial outlay, which persons living on fixed incomes could not hope to undertake.

However, participation by the elderly will be essential for the success of the Conference. Their attendance will also be indispensable if the Conference is to be truly open and representative of older Americans from all sections of our Nation. And, their participation will be necessary if they are to have a meaningful role in formulating a national action policy in the 1970’s for senior citizens.

The need for Federal funds to help pay delegate expenses has been stressed in correspondence to a questionnaire sent out by the Committee on Aging to State units on aging.

For example, Mr. Herb Whitworth, director of the Idaho Department of Special Services, aptly described the problem when he said:

We need to know what funds will be available from the Federal level for participation in the White House Conference activities . . .

The Idaho Office on Aging now plans on sending 12 representatives, including eight elderly delegates, to the White House Conference on Aging.

But without adequate funding made available for this fiscal year, these senior citizens will not know with certainty whether their expenses will be covered.
Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I understand this conference is to be held in November 1971.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I think this is for a very good purpose. I suspect that the reason they did not do this was because it looked as if it was too far in advance of the time we were holding the hearings.

The Senator now wants assurance that the provision I provided, I think that it is a good amendment. I hope that the Senator from New Jersey will see that this money is still there in November 1971. There has been a great tendency when we appropriate some money to use it up. Then we do not have it for the designated purpose despite the fact that Congress appropriated the money. They say that they will not spend it on anything else. No one can check on where the money will be provided. I think that it is then.

I hope that the Senator will watch this money and see that it is there.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. How many usually attend?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. There will be approximately 1,700 or 2,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. So the State representatives selected by organizations in the States and by perhaps State officials who are involved in the problems of the aging in their State.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President.

Mr. MAGNUSON. How many usually attend?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. There will be approximately 1,700 or 2,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. How many usually attend?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. There will be approximately 1,700 or 2,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. So the State representatives selected by organizations in the States and by perhaps State officials who are involved in the problems of the aging in their State.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The Senator accurately describes the representation from the various States.

The Senator knows that there are many organizations of senior citizens. This is a fertile area from which to draw representation. The State governments have representatives, and other citizens will be appointed to come who are unaffiliated.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I understand that the amendment simply provides for the expenses of the delegates to the White House Conference on the Aged.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I appreciate the explanation of the amendment and am a cosponsor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield back the reminder of my time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield back the reminder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senate from New Jersey.
A number of States have initiated programs based on current levels of fund matching, not anticipating that severe restrictions might be imposed on Federal contributions. These States will have to cancel social services, or look to already overtaxed State revenue sources to fill the gap. Cancellation or curtailment of sorely needed services will have severe economic consequences. Frustrated as they now are, Section 208 of H.R. 18515 is a step backward, when we should go forward.

I urge that it be stricken.

Mr. President, I am pleased to yield to the Senator from California (Mr. Cranston) who has really done yeoman service in putting this matter together in attempting to strike this bad provision from the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. President, I rise to explain and urge support for amendment No. 1076 to delete section 208 from the congressional report of H.R. 18515, the Labr.EOFEW Appropriation Act.

I submitted this amendment Wednesday afternoon with the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. Harris) and a bipartisan group of 24 other Senators in order to eliminate the arbitrary 115-percent limitation which the committee-reported appropriation act seeks to impose on Federal grants to States for administration, training, and social services for all welfare programs. If adopted, the amendment would restore the open-ended nature of the Federal share for these programs established by the Congress in the Social Security Act.

This amendment is being taken up in lieu of amendment No. 1070, submitted by Senators Harris and Ruskoff on November 17.

Before getting to the substance of this amendment, I want to express my deep appreciation to Senator Harris, Senator Monson, Senators Basko, and Senator Javits for their special help in gathering support for this amendment.

The background of the situation now before the Senate is:

Under the Social Security Act, grants are made to the States for the cost of State and local administration of welfare agencies, for training of staff administering public assistance programs and preparing for employment in these agencies, and for social services for recipients—including day care, job counseling, homemaker services, employment and housing placement assistance, family planning and alcohol and drug abuse rehabilitation.

The act also provides for the development and implementation of a program of family services and child welfare services in support of welfare recipients and to assist former and potential welfare recipients in staying off welfare rolls.

Under the act, all individuals wishing to make application for aid are guaranteed the right to do so, and the act requires that the aid be furnished with reasonable promptness to all eligible individuals. At this time of rising unemployment, and in the aftermath of the Supreme Court ruling invalidating residency requirements for public assistance, many States—including California—have been experiencing significant increases in welfare caseloads and financial assistance. Such increases are in turn escalating administrative costs for personnel to engage in determining and validating eligibility, programs management, and monthly payments to millions of recipients.

According to the President's own budget request:

The purpose of the grants for social services is to enable each State, as far as possible, to execute its responsibilities in the State, to furnish rehabilitative and other services to recipients and potential recipients to help them maintain and strengthen family life and to attain or retain capability for maximum self-support, self-care and personal independence.

This puts it about as well as anyone can.

In the President's fiscal year 1971 budget, there was a 110-percent increase in aid to States for old-age assistance, aid and medical assistance to the blind and disabled and AFDC, with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make exceptions, under certain circumstances. The House quite properly rejected this provision, but the Senate Appropriations Committee, in consequence, inserted a compromise limitation—raising the ceiling to 115 percent and eliminating the exception language.

The administration submitted data to the Senate Appropriations Committee purporting to show the likely State-by-State effect of the 115-percent limit and asserting that under that limit 40 States would receive 90 percent or more of their spending requirements in these categories for fiscal year 1971. As I shall seek to demonstrate, these figures are extremely understated and unreliable.

In view of the fact that eligibility for aid and services is expressly open ended under the Social Security Act. Any limitation following administration, training, and social services to carry out a State plan is clearly inconsistent with the basic purposes of the Social Security Act and with our desire to provide effective programs to assist welfare recipients in becoming independent—a purpose so well stated in the sentence from the President's budget which I have just read.

A major impact of the proposed limitation would fall on those States—which I have just read—so as to force the recipients of the aid to expand their services to bring them into line with current caseloads. Under the proposed limitation, the burden of such necessary expansion would fall on already overextended State and county taxpayers.

In the fact, the administrative as well as the supportive services monies are specifically targeted at keeping down the public assistance rolls by: First, seeking to ensure the even-handed administration of public assistance regulations and the avoidance of administrative errors, and second, identifying programs and monies specifically aimed at moving welfare recipients off the welfare rolls into employment and providing services which are "welfare preventive" for those most in danger of needing welfare.

In addition to States seeking to expand their administrative welfare support, the burden of the freeze now proposed will fall on already hard-pressed county and State taxpayers. And the comparable figure for San Diego County is predicted to be almost $3 million. In Kern, Merced, and Tuolumne Counties, and Bakersfield, Calif., which have shown increases of 20 to 30 percent. I have received letters of strong opposition to the ceiling from the following 29 California county boards of supervisors:


None of these jurisdictions has the available property tax base to raise the extra local share of funding without great hardship to already hard-pressed taxpayers if this arbitrary limitation is imposed. In light of the reforms proposed by the administration in its innovative family assistance plan, it is particularly incongruous for the Federal Government to seek to impose a ceiling of 115 percent on already overextended State and local programs which would enable them better to meet these new demands.

Moreover, the Social Security Act in effect provides a pact with States and their local welfare programs for the Federal share of administrative as well as supportive expenses to be open ended and to be governed by the extent of State expenditures and payments. To default on this obligation in midcourse would cause absolute havoc throughout the land.

One crucial fact that must be recognized is that most administrative and supportive services monies are the very antiwelfare and welfare-preventive programs that are most likely to suffer—if there is any flexibility—are the very antiwelfare and welfare-preventive programs I alluded to earlier. The States will just have to accept the cost if the welfare system is not going to break down.

Under the 115-percent limitation, the typical State's share of total spending...
will probably increase at least 25 percent in fiscal year 1971, and if the freeze were continued, for fiscal year 1972, another 25-percent raise in the State share is probable. Under these conditions, total State spending by fiscal year 1972 would have increased about two and one-half times given present welfare growth patterns.

Bringing about such a drain on already extended State and local resources seems a strange proposal for an administration which so strongly champions revenue sharing and a family assistance plan increasing Federal financial responsibility in this area. Rather, the administration has recommended a 115-percent limitation in section 208 as a blueprint for "reversing revenue sharing."

Mr. President, I will conclude my remarks with a brief analysis of the administration-supported State-by-State impact data on which the Appropriations Committee based its decision to recommend imposition of the 115-percent ceiling. That data appears to have been clearly biased toward the administration's point of view for the following reasons:

First, early estimates of State-spending requirements for administration, services, and training—the types which were presented to the committee, and which formed the basis of administration arguments—have tended, historically, to be notoriously inaccurate and conservative. For example, the States' May 1970 estimates of their 1970 spending under the actual 15-percent ceiling were off by about 15 percent. Yet, these May 1970 estimates formed the basis for the States' fiscal year 1971 estimates submitted at the same time.

Second, recent year-to-year increases in spending in these accounts have been far above 15 percent per year. The administrative component of these costs has been increasing faster than the services component. Administrative costs—which, while forming a function of caseload size—have been rising phenomenally in the most recent 6 months due to rapid, uncontrolled increases in the costs of administration and services.

For example, from fiscal year 1969 to fiscal year 1970, total costs nationwide increased 36 percent; the administrative component of these costs increased 38.3 percent; the service component 34 percent. For 27 States the fiscal year 1970 increase in expenditures for administration, training, and services was between 23.5 and 133.5 percent over fiscal year 1969.

The administration, based on these demonstrably understated fiscal year 1971 estimates, has projected a shift to the States of $150 million in welfare support costs. However, merely by projecting into fiscal year 1971 the nationwide rate of increase—36 percent—experienced in fiscal year 1970 over fiscal year 1969, fairly and even more conservatively, estimate of the shifted burden to the States would be $187 million. I say conservative because, as I have noted, the rate of increase over the last 6 months—about the increased 115 percent, according to HEW Secretary Richardson—has been even greater than the 36 percent fiscal year 1970 rate of increase.

Projecting into fiscal year 1971 this conservative fiscal year 1970 growth rate for these cost categories, we find that under the proposed 115-percent limitation, revenue sharing would provide less than their fiscal year 1971 requirements, and 39 of these States would experience cost increases in their State share of expenditures ranging from 30 to 150 percent in fiscal year 1971, with the State experience chart for the median of these 39 States increasing 63.6 percent.

Looking at this another way, under these projections, 34 States would lose at least one-half million dollars in Federal funds.

Moreover, the real point seems to be that no one can at this point estimate the fiscal year 1971 State expenditures with any degree of accuracy. The States' latest revised projections, taking into account fiscal year 1970 actual experience, projections which HEW has not released, show a total switch to the States of $211.5 million and that 29 States would lose a half million Federal dollars or more.

To give a clear picture of the great uncertainties surrounding these three sets of estimates and therefore the overall effect of the proposed 115-percent limitation, let us look at the projected loss of Federal funds under the freeze for eight States in fiscal year 1971:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Projected fiscal year 1971 estimate</th>
<th>Revised fiscal year 1971 estimate</th>
<th>Increase or decrease</th>
<th>Loss of Federal funds under the freeze</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>$8,352,000</td>
<td>$7,357,000</td>
<td>-975,000</td>
<td>$72,510,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>$5,478,000</td>
<td>$4,520,000</td>
<td>-958,000</td>
<td>$1,062,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>$8,605,000</td>
<td>$7,882,000</td>
<td>-723,000</td>
<td>$853,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>$2,884,000</td>
<td>$2,516,000</td>
<td>-368,000</td>
<td>$4,779,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>$2,520,000</td>
<td>$2,294,000</td>
<td>-226,000</td>
<td>$2,884,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>$9,874,000</td>
<td>$8,309,000</td>
<td>-1,565,000</td>
<td>$1,623,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>$3,113,000</td>
<td>$2,884,000</td>
<td>-229,000</td>
<td>$666,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>$659,000</td>
<td>$4,779,000</td>
<td>$4,120,000</td>
<td>$566,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. President, what we have here is a counterproductive provision which, without bringing reason to impose intolerable tax loads on the already hard-pressed taxpayers of most States and localities or to greatly disrupt administration and provision of services—and therefore the effectiveness of most welfare programs. This freeze also will stifle in administration and services in those States now relatively deficient in allocation of resources and energies to those categories.

That is why this amendment is strongly supported by the National League of Cities—U.S. Conference of Mayors, the Governors' Conference, the AFL-CIO, and the Public Welfare Association of America.

I ask unanimous consent that recent letters from the Mayors and Governors Leagues be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

**National Governor's Conference**


HON. ALAN CRANSTON, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: I understand that you will be offering an amendment to delete Section 208 of H.R. 18515, the Department of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, 1971. Many Governors were indicated that if Section 208 is enacted it would be extremely costly to their State by decreasing the level of Federal participation in State costs of administering welfare and providing social services. They therefore support efforts to delete Section 208.

I have attached information which indicates the fiscal impact on each State if Section 208 is enacted.

Sincerely,

ALLEN JENSEN, Special Assistant.

Estimates of the loss to States under section 208 of H.R. 18515 of Federal share of State and local expenditures for income maintenance administration, social services, and general local government services.

(From information provided to HEW in August 1970 and in the case of some States as indicated* estimates made by States in November 1970)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Loss Estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>$1,449,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>566,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>78,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>826,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>4,597,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>5,012,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>96,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>1,237,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>376,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>7,419,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>906,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>1,129,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>2,929,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>5,589,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>15,374,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>2,557,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>2,884,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>81,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>870,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>591,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>534,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>3,113,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>16,516,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>1,623,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>2,274,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>28,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>686,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>2,304,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>6,102,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>8,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>4,249,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>2,189,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>7,074,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 211,478,000

Examples of Social Service Programs That May Be Cut Under Section 208 of H.R. 18515 is hecho en Missouri.

Section 208 would mean the complete elimination of several large proposed day care projects under Model Cities and other
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National League of Cities,
U.S. Conference of Mayors,
November 18, 1970.

Hon. Alan Cranston, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Cranston: On behalf of the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors, we urge the deletion of Section 208 of the pending Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Bill (H.R. 16815). This section would limit increases in Federal payments for certain administrative and social services (Public Assistance Titles I, IV-A X or XIV of the Social Security Act) in fiscal 1971 to 115 percent above the amount allocated in fiscal year 1970. Presently these Titles have “open-end” accounts which are a source of funds for vital ongoing programs within our cities providing for: the treatment of alcoholics and narcotics addicts; services assisting the mentally ill and retarded to their homes from institutional care; payments for elderly citizens finding housing, Medicare and other community resources. These Titles also provide funds for other human resource services including health planning, day care, and childhood educational services. In addition, these Titles provide the only funds specifically targeted for programs which are designed to preserve social welfare—since the funds are directed toward securing employment for those individuals who are about to be added to the welfare rolls.

Another potential impact that has caused concern to be expressed by many mayors throughout the country is the adverse effect the proposed limitation will have on the Model Cities Program. You are no doubt aware that the limitation came up in the House and was rejected by that body due to concerted action on the part of local officials and other concerned groups. The threat to the Model Cities Program is one that I believe compelled HUD Assistant Secretary Floyd Hyde to write to Patricia Hitt, Assistant Secretary for Community and Field Services for HUD, to express her “grave concern over the adverse effect Section 208 would have on the Model Cities Program.”

With best wishes,

John J. Gunther,
Executive Director, National League of Cities.
matter, but in view of the fact that the Cotton amendment was rejected I am going to vote for this amendment. We could have accepted it and the Senator could withdraw the request for a roll-call vote, but I think some Senators would like to vote against it.

This is a little difficult for me, after the committee worked long and hard, and I did not particularly favor this ceiling. As a matter of fact, it was 110 percent when it started out.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Washington for expressing his willingness to support this amendment. I appreciate what is attempted to be accomplished by this provision we hope to have to stricken.

I repeat on the floor of the Senate what the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance said earlier. The committee that has jurisdiction over the substantive law in this field. The chairman of that committee said that we will be interested in any statement from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. I am a member of the Committee on Finance. If there is need for additional help to cut costs, it is felt are unnecessarily high costs in these areas, we will be open to any suggestion he has, but as of now the case is unproved and this is not the way to go about it.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment is agreed to.

The Senator from California addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT OFFICER. Who yields time, Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield the Senator such time as he may require.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Washington for his very helpful approach on this amendment and for his willingness to accept it. I am very grateful. I, too, Mr. President, I thank the chairman of the committee for his thoughtfulness and for his courtesy throughout the day even when we have been on opposite sides. He has been thoughtful. I also thank the Senator from Oklahoma for his help and his cooperation throughout this effort. Actually, a team of us worked together on this matter, including Senators MONDALE, TALMAGE, BROOKE, JAVITS, RUMCOFF, and others. The Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. Harris) who had a similar amendment, in which he was joined by the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Rumkowski) was generous in merging his amendment in his.

Many people around the country have joined in this effort, and it is most satisfying that we are now about to have this amendment adopted.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this amendment by any distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from California, and others.

I can certainly appreciate the concern of the administration and of the Appropriations Committee that the costs of administering welfare programs are increasing, and in advance—as to their size and character and as to the Federal financial participation for the fiscal year. As it stands now, the Federal Government does not exercise this control—it merely pays the bills as rendered by the States. This is what section 208 was intended to correct.
Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I think the limitation on day-care and related social services which is proposed by section 208 is most unfair and unjust. I understand that the administration exerted heavy pressure in support of this provision. But there seems to be no justification, on the merits, for this unprecedented ceiling on Federal matching of State welfare services. It is simply another case where the administration is attempting to cut costs.

So it comes down to a matter of priorities. What are the announced priorities of the President, himself, that affect this issue?

First, the President proclaimed a strong national commitment to the first 5 years of a child’s life. Second, he recommended a new family assistance program with the emphasis on “workfare, not welfare.”

But here we are, trying to put a lid on the day-care services which the children so desperately need. And which make it possible for their mothers to work. I admit that I am somewhat confused by the administration’s support for this provision, which undermines two of its objectives.

It is certainly clear that we are experiencing great growth in day-care services under the welfare program. Apparently, the administration supplied the Congress misleading data which understated this growth. But the hard work which was put into gaining acceptance of the provision suggests that the administration really knew that the costs were growing more rapidly. For example, HEW told the Congress that Minnesota would not lose any funds under section 208. But estimates by outside experts show that my State would lose $6 million. The estimates for many other States show the same disparity.

Mr. President, I strongly protest the attempt by the administration to pull the wool over the eyes of the Congress. I object, particularly, because these programs are so valuable and so necessary. I hope the Senate will strike the provision.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I will
oppose the pending amendment to delete section 208 of the committee bill and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to also oppose this amendment.

The Appropriations Committee is greatly concerned about the spiraling costs of welfare services and welfare outlays in general. There have been some who have stated that the administration of welfare services is costing too much. The Executive and the Congress should be able to make deliberate choices—in advance—as to the size and character and as to the Federal financial commitment for any given fiscal year in the area of welfare services administrative costs.

As I understand it, Mr. President, the executive and the Congress make such choices in relation to other Government programs—the administration of the social security program, for example. The social security money comes from a trust fund, yet the items dealing with administration, cost restriction bills, any Government Congress sets these amounts. Why should it be that different for the administrative costs of the welfare program?

Let us take a close look at what the deletion of section 208 of the committee bill would mean.

First, it would add $183 million to a bill that comes out of the Senate Appropriations Committee $311,587,000 over the President’s budget request for 1971. Without the limitation of section 208, the States automatically have the green light to spend $183 million more than is appropriated in this bill. Under the public assistance legislation, the expenditure of this amount becomes automatic unless we indulge the section 208 limitation.

Second, without the section 208 limitation, the States would be free to hire staff—and I emphasize again that is essentially what is involved here, staff working for State welfare agencies—without any regard to what has happened and, for that matter, without the Federal Government even knowing why they might have hired the staff in the first place. The staff in question are welfare administration costs. The funds also include the cost of their training and, in some cases, even advancement of their basic education.

Without the section 208 limitation, the Federal Government has no choice but to match 75 cents of every dollar that the States choose to spend for this kind of staff and staff training. I know of no other case where the Federal Government has permitted such an open-ended and unlimited opportunity to add to the payroll of State and local agencies as exists in this one case. We certainly would not allow it in the agencies operating at the Federal level. Why should we place no restriction or limitation on the number of people and on the amount derived largely from Federal funds? I point out—again—that staffing in this area has grown over 300 percent during the last 5 years.

We are trying to hold down a runaway expense. While cutting $183 million from this bill, we are cutting away expense. While cutting $183 million, we are cutting away the opportunity to do cash assistance to the poor, the aged or the disabled. It does nothing to control these costs— which, as I have already shown, are also rising, but at a lower rate.

Again, I urge my colleagues to defeat the pending amendment which would delete section 208 of the committee bill.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, at the annual New Jersey Conference of Mayors in Atlantic City yesterday, Gov. William T. Cahill announced that New Jersey faces an imminent crisis in its welfare system as the result of a very sharp rise during the past few months in its welfare caseload.

If this rate of increase continues, as seems likely, New Jersey’s welfare budget is estimated to go up next year by approximately 30 percent. Currently approximately 6,000 cases per month are being added to the State welfare rolls, according to the State welfare director.

The imposition of a limitation on the costs of administration, services, and training in public assistance programs at a time when caseloads are rising so rapidly I cause severe financial problems to New Jersey and other States faced with similar problems, many of whom are already halfway through the fiscal year which the limitation would affect.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter I received from Governor Cahill this morning concerning the effect of the section 208 limitation on New Jersey.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATE OF NEW JERSEY, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. President, I am understanding that the Senate is currently considering H.R. 18515, the Labor-HEW Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1971. This measure, as reported by the Appropriations Committee, contains a provision, Section 208, limiting the federal reimbursement to 115% of what a State received during fiscal 1970 for administration, services, and training in the public assistance programs. As you know, the House passed this bill on July 23rd with out such a limitation.

We are now nearly midway through the 1971 fiscal year which this 115% limitation would affect. Due to rapidly increasing caseloads, costs of welfare services have been rising proportionately, thereby making such a limitation completely untenable. The situation becomes even more infeasible when program enhancements, as well as the cost of inflation, are also taken into account. Current estimates show that this limitation would cost the State of New Jersey an additional $6,159,000 by July 30, 1971.

As I pointed out to the New Jersey Conference of Mayors today, New Jersey is faced with an imminent crisis in its welfare system. Our state cannot continue to maintain its present level of services nor expand under the existing mandates. Elimination of the 115% limitation would have a crippling impact on our state. I therefore urge you to support the effort to delete Section 208 during the debate on the Senate floor.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM CAHILL, GOVERNOR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do Senators yield back their time?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.
Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to. Mr. HARTKE. I move to lay that motion on the table. The motion to lay on the table was agreed to. Mr. JAVITS, Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated. The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment. Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be waived.

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

Mr. JAVITS' amendment (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. BAYH, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CASE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HART, Mr. MCCORMAN, and Mr. GRIFFIN) was agreed to by the following vote: yeas, 57; nays, 20, as follows:

[No. 392 Leg.]

YEA—57

Aiken
Butler
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Case
Church
Crandon
Eagleton
Eastland
Ellender
Evans
Fulbright
Gibbons
Gravel
Gurney
Harris

Hart
Hartke
Hogans
Hughes
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy
Magnuson
Mansfield
Mathias
McClellan
McCoy
McIntyre
McCaflf
Mize
Mondale
Montoya
Moss
Muskie

Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Packwood
Pastore
Pell
Pryest
Promo
Ribooff
Schweiker
Scott
Spong
Stevens
Stevenson
Symington
Tawes
Williams, N.J.
Yarbrough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—20

Allott
Anderson
Anderson
Angell
Cook
Cox
Cotton
Cox

Dole
Dominick
Domenici
Fadness
Griffin
Gurney
Huntsman
Hunt
Huskia

Jordan, Idaho
Pearson
Russell
Thurmond
Williams, Del.
Williams, Del.

Nobj

NOT VOTING—23

Allen
Bai
Bellm
Bennett
Burgess
Cannon
Cassidy
Dodd
Fong
Goldwater

Gore
Harrell
Inouye
Leach
McCarthy
McGee
Moynihan

Randolph
Saxbe
Sparkman
Sensenig
Towler
Tydings

Mr. HARRIS' amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to. Mr. HARTKE. I move to lay that motion on the table. The motion to lay on the table was agreed to. Mr. JAVITS, Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated. The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment. Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be waived.

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

Mr. JAVITS' amendment (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. BAYH, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CASE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HART, Mr. MCCORMAN, and Mr. GRIFFIN) was agreed to by the following vote: yeas, 57; nays, 20, as follows:

[No. 392 Leg.]

YEA—57

Aiken
Butler
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Case
Church
Crandon
Eagleton
Eastland
Ellender
Evans
Fulbright
Gibbons
Gravel
Gurney
Harris

Hart
Hartke
Hogans
Hughes
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy
Magnuson
Mansfield
Mathias
McClellan
McCoy
McIntyre
McCaflf
Mize
Mondale
Montoya
Moss
Muskie

Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Packwood
Pastore
Pell
Pryest
Promo
Ribooff
Schweiker
Scott
Spong
Stevens
Stevenson
Symington
Tawes
Williams, N.J.
Yarbrough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—20

Allott
Anderson
Anderson
Angell
Cook
Cox
Cotton
Cox

Dole
Dominick
Domenici
Fadness
Griffin
Gurney
Huntsman
Hunt
Huskia

Jordan, Idaho
Pearson
Russell
Thurmond
Williams, Del.
Williams, Del.

Nobj

NOT VOTING—23

Allen
Bai
Bellm
Bennett
Burgess
Cannon
Cassidy
Dodd
Fong
Goldwater

Gore
Harrell
Inouye
Leach
McCarthy
McGee
Moynihan

Randolph
Saxbe
Sparkman
Sensenig
Towler
Tydings

Mr. HARRIS' amendment was agreed to.
Mr. JAVITIS. I thank the Senator.
Mr. MAGNUSON. So that we will have a firm policy down there and we will know what we are doing.
Mr. JAVITIS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts, at whose request I included in the amendment a provision for the legal services program.
Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor this amendment to add $2 million to special impact programs and $4 million to legal services. This will bring the appropriations level to $39.1 million for special impact and $53.1 million for legal services.
Special impact was initiated and added to the Economic Opportunity Act by Senator Robert F. Kennedy in 1966 and was cosponsored by Senator Jacob Javits. It is perhaps unique in the antipoverty effort through its creation of multipurpose community development corporations which are partnerships between the poverty and business communities. The corporations have involved local residents in their own economic development, reducing economic dependency, and lessening community tensions.
Special impact has benefited many in particular poor and geographically limited areas, attacking the problems of economic development as well as the social consequences of poverty.
Bedford-Stuyvesant has been the leading example of the potential of special impact funds for the poor in the decisions affecting their own future. More than 2,500 men and women in Bedford-Stuyvesant who were unemployed or severely underemployed have joined in the renovation of 45 city blocks in Bedford-Stuyvesant. These efforts have shown the tremendous possibilities which still exist to rebuild our cities' slums.
However, despite the response from virtually every State in the Union to the progress being made in Bedford-Stuyvesant, the administration requested only $32.1 million for fiscal year 1971. This was $4.7 million below the special impact appropriation for the previous fiscal year. I congratulate the Senate Appropriations Committee for agreeing to a level of $37.1 million; but I believe there is ample justification for further augmenting this program to bring 1971 funding to $39.1 million.
To fail to provide the necessary funding for this antipoverty program would be to fail in our commitment to the poor of this Nation. We must not permit that to occur.
Mr. JAVITIS. I thank the Senator. I think it is only fair to say, under these circumstances, that Robert Kennedy's initiative in Bedford-Stuyvesant, which goes on and prosper, was one of the highlights of the poor in the whole poverty field. I am honored to be able to help that program wherever I can, and I think the Senate really should feel the same way.
Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?
Mr. JAVITIS. I yield.
Mr. MONDALE. I was glad to hear the colloquy between the Senator from New York and the distinguished floor manager, the Senator from Washington, not only about the need for these funds but also about the solid opposition which the Senator has against the termination of the legal services program.
The Senator from New York participated in hearings in which we heard from the leadership of the American Bar Association, from the Federal Bar Association, and the representatives of the clients being served by the OEO legal services program and by the attorneys themselves. I have never heard such unanimity in any hearing we have held against the efforts to destroy the integrity and independence of the legal services program.
So I am hopeful that we will not only have this additional amount, which is needed, but also that the Director of the OEO will see how strongly the Senate feels in opposition to these reorganization efforts. Even with new money, these new arrangements could destroy the integrity and meaning of the program and, indeed, be contrary to the canons of legal ethics.
I am grateful to the floor manager for his response to the question posed by the Senator from New York, because I think it is an indispensable position, and one which I am sure I hope the Director of OEO will take.
Mr. JAVITIS. I thank the Senator.
Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?
Mr. JAVITIS. I yield.
Mr. GOODELL. I thank the Senator for yielding.
Mr. President, I strongly support this amendment. I commend my senior colleague for offering it. It is an excellent program.
For 6 years, I have maintained a deep interest in the national program of legal services for the poor. I have visited many legal services offices and talked with many people who have benefited by this program. Mostly, they said—in fact, less than 6 weeks ago—I visited a legal services office in Harlem, which is scheduled to be closed down shortly because of inadequate Federal financing. At that time, I met with representatives of Harlem Assertion of Rights, Inc., of Community Action for Legal Services, of the United Black Coalition, and the Harlem Tenants League. They told me how the legal services program had helped residents of their community. However, they were fearful that the Federal Government was about to pull the rug out from under them.
I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment and by so doing affirm the Federal Government's commitment to a program that seeks to improve their situation. In life by helping themselves. We must demonstrate with actions, not with words, that we are not about to pull the rug from beneath the feet of American poverty.
The situation facing the legal services program in New York City is particularly serious. An additional $500,000 is needed simply to maintain legal services in the city of New York at the current level offered by the Office of Economic Opportunity. Without these additional funds, seven of 26 legal assistance offices in the five boroughs will be forced to close down and 10 percent of the lawyers employed in OEO's legal services program in the city will be dismissed.
Ironically, the legal services program of OEO is one of the most vital Federal antipoverty programs. It provides free legal assistance to the indigent who have nowhere else to turn for help in the many complex actions, including landlord-tenant disputes, consumer fraud and personal-injury suits and marital and child-custody cases. The fact that the program reaches less than 17 percent of the 5 million poor nationwide who require legal assistance is inexcusable; the prospect of cutting back these legal services even further is unconscionable. The major means of lawfully airing grievances will be withheld from those who need it the most. In this period of increased alienation and violence, the result would be in the worst interest not only of the poor, but of the community as a whole.
I, therefore, urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.
LEGAL SERVICES FOR THE ELDERLY—WILL THEY END?
Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, attention to legal problems of the poor has increased dramatically in recent years with the establishment in 1964 of the Legal Services Division in the Office of Economic Opportunity.
Unfortunately, however, many low-income elderly persons have been forced to shift for themselves.
In far too many instances, they have become bogged down in a legal maze of intricate procedures which completely bewilders them.
Too often their claims have been trapped in a legal labyrinth.
And too often large numbers of older Americans have suffered needless anxiety, deprivation, and injustice simply because they do not know what help is available.
But, they should be entitled to the same competent counsel which is available to wealthier clients. Their needs are just as urgent. And their claims are just as meritorious.
Approximately 2 years ago the Office of Economic Opportunity funded a legal research and services program, called the Elderly program, sponsored by the National Council of Senior Citizens.
This is the only project in the Nation which deals exclusively with the legal difficulties encountered by the aged.
Moreover, this project has amply demonstrated the valuable assistance which can be provided elderly clients when competent and dedicated counsel is available.
At hearings conducted at an American Bar Association conference in August by the Senate Committee on Aging, we heard firsthand what can be done and what should be done.
We heard, for example, about disabled aged women who were unaware of Federal assistance. But with the help of legal advocates, they qualified for disability benefits. And now their financial independence is solid.
Yet, the very existence of this highly successful research and demonstration
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project is in doubt. Today LRSE staff members and elderly poor employees are working in uncertainty and perhaps in despair—not knowing whether their program will be continued or disrupted.

Instead of curtailing efforts on behalf of older Americans, OEO should be strengthening legal services.

Mr. JAYTS, Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1074

Mr. YARBOURGH. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1074. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 21, line 16, strike "$295,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$322,650,000".

Mr. YARBOURGH. Mr. President, this amendment, which has broad bipartisan support, is directed towards perhaps the most crucial problem in the health care crisis—medical manpower. It is perfectly clear that we must produce more doctors more efficiently and effectively if we are to have any hope of bringing rationality to the health industry.

In my extensive efforts to urge this country's medical schools to increase their enrollments, I have determined that the major obstacle has been the lack of resources on their part to respond to this challenge. If we are to reasonably expect them to fulfill these largely public responsibilities, we must insure that they have sufficient resources to do the job.

As I pointed out yesterday, the Senate Labor Committee attempted to do just that. We amended the Health Training Improvement Act, S. 3586, in order to authorize a 1-year $100 million disaster relief bill for public schools in financial chaos. That effort was halted, and the time S. 3586 went to conference with the House. However, with the efforts of the distinguished ranking minority member of the Labor Committee, Senator Javits, we did work out with the House a conference bill that program is subject to the 1-year limit of the President's budget for 1971, agreed to deal with this problem by seeking full funding under the existing authorities.

As I pointed out yesterday on the Senate floor, that action by the legislative committee occurred after the Senate Appropriations Committee had marked up the HEW appropriations bill and filed its report. Accordingly, the Appropriations Committee was not apprised of the manner in which we might have the opportunity to further assist these academic health centers.

I do want, though, to make a special point of complimenting the floor man-

agers of this bill—Senator MAGNUSON and Senator Cotton. They have done yeoman service in bringing out a comprehensive bill. I am not unaware of the great responsibility increases appropriations for a wide variety of health programs. Only by placing the health of all of our people above partisan political considerations could they have brought out such a good bill. I am confident that, given the fact that the Senate has recognized the need for agreement with the House conference in time, it would have recommended an appropriation substantially in excess of the level now in the bill. I am hopeful that this latter unique circumstance is possible for the distinguished Senators from Washington and New Hampshire to join with those of us who are attempting to prevent a national tragedy—the collapse of our academic health centers.

Let us be clear about the facts, Mr. President. That these institutions are on the brink of economic disaster is an established fact. Article after article has been published in the press, and I urge that you read the article written in the National Observer this past Monday, written by James Hampton. It is entitled, "Sick Medical Schools Seek Emergency Help." Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. YARBOURGH. In general, it makes the point that we are faced with a truly national problem and one of great magnitude. There are over 100 medical schools in virtually every State. Affiliated with them are almost 400 major teaching hospitals which provide about 25 percent of all the hospital care in the country. These institutions are beleaguered. As the Federal budget has shrunk, medical costs escalated, and as public and private agencies and organizations vacillated, these great institutions, on their knees, are being ignored.

Mr. President, we cannot have it both ways. We cannot expect that excellence will continue to be the hallmark of this Nation's medical education while we permit a profound funding crisis to cause medical schools to sacrifice quality or close their doors.

Mr. President, this amendment is no panacea. It is clearly a stopgap measure intended to stave off disaster for an additional year. The basic legislative author-

ization ceiling under which Federal Government assists medical schools, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, expires next June. The 92d Congress will, of course, have to extend and improve that authority. Already there is considerable, understandable bargain for the taxpayer to think in innovative and possibly quite different ways about updating this program. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education has just released a report entitled "Higher Education and the Nation's Health" which is both provocative and highly beneficial. I commend it to my colleagues. Furthermore, the Association of American Medical Colleges has recently published a paper called "A Bi-

centennial Anniversary Program for the Expansion of Medical Education." It, too, makes far-reaching recommendations which are for the most part parallel to this amendment. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the AAMC report be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. YARBOURGH. Mr. President, this issue here is clear. We need time to refashion this legislative instrument. And as each of us knows, time costs money. It is not hard to exaggerate the distress— or minimize the effects of the crisis could have on American medical education.

The immediate, most obvious problem is money. Medical schools have been badly battered by sharp cutbacks in Federal funds at a time when costs have been zooming. Sixty-one of the country's 107 medical schools (with 379 affiliated teaching hospitals) have received or are receiving Federal "distress" funds to help meet operating deficits.

A quick money transfusion would help; in fact, it may be the difference between life and death for some medical schools. The root causes of the distress go deeper. The schools are finding it increasingly difficult to keep up with demands being made upon them: more doctors, more and better health care, maintaining research on medical frontiers, and more effective methods of administering resources.

Ironically, one reason for the upsurge in costs is that medical schools have been increasingly encouraged by Government plans for help in solving the nation's doctor shortage. It's figured the country needs 50,000 more physicians than it has today.

Among the schools hardest hit are:

Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, which dipped into endowment funds for $12,000,000 before being rescued—temporarily at least—for a $5,000,000 grant this year from the Ohio legislature.

St. Louis University, which is keeping its medical school afloat with funds freed up by closing its dental, aviation technology, and engineering schools. The 140-year-old school is also struggling, says Dean Robert B. Felix, that it may not be able to admit a first-year class in 1971.

St. John's Medical College, which required a $5,000,000 Federal distress loan to break even this year even though it mortgaged property for $10,000,000 and is spending $6,000,000 in endowment money.

Georgetown University and George Washington University, both in Washington, D.C., say their schools may close unless Congress funds a Distress Distress Education Assistance Program, "stays up money to cover Georgetown's projected $1,422,000 deficit and George Washington's $1,911,159 anticipated deficit.

Marquette University's medical school became the Medical College of Wisconsin after it was rescued from bankruptcy by a $3,200,000 emergency grant from the Wisconsin Legislature.

Financial anemia, respecter neither of age nor of reputation, threatens the Johns Hop-
The Federal Government gave medical schools about $85,000,000, approximately the same amount of current budgets, for research, training of specialists, teaching and the like. A decade later the Federal contribution was almost $200,000,000. Research grants had increased 428 per cent, training, and other grants had zoomed 616 per cent. The Federal share of all medical schools’ budgets thus rose to 53 per cent. At some schools—naturally the better ones, like Hopkins, with big-name faculty—it was somewhat higher. Moreover, at some schools—Hopkins included—the Federal Government was putting up $4 of every $5 spent for medical research.

A stringent anti-integration policy, a low federal unemployment rate, and a general deflation of educational endeavors, the Government dropped medicine’s priority several notches.

"SPECIAL GRANTS" KEEP DOORS OPEN

Last year HEW gave 72 medical schools 95 special projects grants totaling $5,000,000. These grants were conceived primarily for curriculum improvements, but 61 of the schools applied them to operating costs. Among the schools cited as having "substantial financial need." This year HEW spread a total of $15,000,000—about the same given the 33 schools last year—among 43 schools in similar straits.

NIH is the conduit through which most Federal money flows to medical schools. Congress has not yet passed this fiscal year’s HEW appropriation bill. The White House budget recommended $1.5 billion for all NIH purposes, which was $29,668,600 less than the current level. Congress added $73,600,000 to the White House and upped the NIH funds to $1.6 billion, and the Senate Finance Committee raised the total to $1.7 billion.

In its report to the Senate, where the bill awaits action, the Finance Committee said that "for the second successive year, the committee has been concerned about the apparent downgrading of health as reflected by the [President’s] budget request." The cutbacks are "tantamount to balancing the Federal budget by the sacrifice of human lives."

At Johns Hopkins in Baltimore, the effects of Federal cutbacks shows up dramatically. Hopkins included—the Federal Government contribute, as well as any one school can, what the reliance on Federal money has wrought.

"WE ARE PRETTY VULNERABLE"

Hopkins is spending $34,000,000 this year. Of that, $24,000,000 is from Federal funds, from NIH, mostly for research. "We’re pretty vulnerable," says Dr. Rogers. "The better the medical school, the higher the percentage of Federal support." If that support should be cut, Hopkins will be more vulnerable than most of the others.

Last year Johns Hopkins lost $1,600,000 in Federal money, including $600,000 for projects that were approved by NIH but never funded. But $1,000,000 was lost through "negotiated reductions."

In supplier days, NIH approved Hopkins’ grants at 70 to 75 per cent of the amount it asked for. This year, says Dr. Rogers, it now gets 30 to 40 to 50 per cent. This has two disturbing effects. First, it makes grants harder to get by young, unknown doctors. Second, it jeopardizes projects to which Hopkins has committed itself for years on the basis of previous grants.

"It takes 15 to 20 years to build up a top-flight biomedical team," Dr. Rogers stresses, "but you can destroy it in six months." That’s in danger of happening here now.

One professor has been working since 1950 on researching metabolism, heart disease, and other research.

But, so far, his NIH grant has been cut off. Several assistants have had to be dropped and, when the school’s emergency funds run out shortly, the grant will be. And the end.

FUTURE LEADERSHIP CRIPPLED

Training programs also are hurting. Last year Hopkins lost $375,001 in Federal training grants. This money would have supported 12 residents. Hopkins, in its usual educational philosophy, is dichotomous, involving, on the one hand, the formal academic qualification for the MD degree, and on the other, the graduate training, which is the principal determinant of the availability of physicians by function and specialty. Many of the other critical variables are in the social realms outside of the narrow confines of medicine. The objectives established by the American public for the quantity, quality, equality, and types of services it regards as indispensable, and by the geographic and other requirements of these services, have a tremendous influence. Increasingly, however, the priority of health services will be measured against other needs such as housing, nutrition, education, and recreation, instead of being measured against how well these services have improved health and the meeting of other important social goals.

In planning for medical education, there must be clear understanding of those factors that are involved in the diversity of the dimensions of the matter, the scope of the variables at play, and, most important of all, the specific area which is being selected for action in the context of the overall problem of the need for physicians. Otherwise, there will be confusion and failure. In the final analysis, the failure to provide a sound basis for cooperation among all the parties that must act to meet the pressing need to achieve better health for all Americans.

Thus, in the interest of clarity, it is to be emphasized that the purpose of this paper is to examine briefly the major considerations that bear upon the capacity, dimension, and distribution of institutions for the education of MD candidates as a significant and distinct one within the general problem of medical manpower and improving the health services of the nation. However, it is obvious that merely increasing the number of MD candidates, without taking into account the problem of a more even geographical distribution of physicians nor the adequacy of services in urban and rural poor. Neither can action taken to secure such an increase assure a more appropriate and rational pattern of specialty services or an immediate and direct improvement in health services.

Overcoming the limitations, the inadequacies, and the redistribution of the nation’s health services is dependent upon the development of some systematic means to mediate the whole process of investment and consumption of health services in some rational and purposeful way. The distribution of physicians by specialty and their availability is determined by the graduate training which is now somewhat haphazardly and regrettably acting forces, many of which are presently beyond academic control and unrelated to health service needs. Further stages in this development, however, indicate that the aca
demic medicine must engage these problems in a much more direct way.

Some medical schools have pointed out in this paper are those involved in the further development of national policy and programs aimed at a fundamental and predetermined seg
cment of the nation’s service, the availability of physician services; namely, the size of the annual cohort of entering MD candi
date.
dates and the actions supportive of that process.

THE BASES FOR PROJECTING THE CAPACITY FOR MEDICAL EDUCATION

There are two fundamental approaches for establishing the number of MDs to be educated in American medical schools.

1. The Educational Opportunity Basis. Providing an entering place for all qualified students who wish to study medicine.

2. The Health Services Needs Basis. Estimating the number of MDs considered necessary to meet the needs of the nation for physician services.

In a rapidly changing supply and demand system, the difference between the two dimensions of our medical education plant derived from these two bases would probably be small. However, as Feinberg and others has pointed out, supply and demand adjustment is sluggish and incomplete in medicine, so that in the short run, projections derived from these two dimensions may be substantially different. Some of the more important considerations bearing upon the results obtained from these different approaches are discussed below.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

In 1967, the Association of American Medical Colleges and the American Medical Association issued a joint policy statement recommending that a national policy should be adopted to provide a medical school place for every qualified applicant. (2) Although this is an aspirational goal, in the United States it is made available under the college entering class of every interested and qualified student, this policy has not been explicitly supported by medical education; in particular, the very high capital investment required, and in part because medical educators have attempted with considerable success to maintain a level of enrollment below that required by the policy statement. The result is that the number of applicants has varied in a narrow range around twice the number of places available over the last quarter of the century. This view that the size of the applicant pool parallels opportunities for admission is supported by the falling percentage of eligible medical college graduates applying to medical school. The number of medical school entering places has not kept pace with the growth in the number of college students. This cannot be explained entirely on the development of other opportunities for college-educated youth and probably represents the number of qualified students who entered medical school.

MEAL SERVICE DEMAND

It is even more difficult to project the number of MDs that should be educated to meet the needs of health services. This is due in large part to the fact that the number of health care needs of people in the United States is increasing at a faster rate than the number of health care providers. Changes in the size of the population and the changing population structure contribute to this demand for medical care. Changes in the health care system, such as the continuing rapid increase in costs, and the growing role of the Federal government in the payment for care, will be stimulated by the developing crisis in health care, the continuing rapid increase in costs, and the growing role of the Federal government in the payment for care. Changes in the health care system, such as the continuing rapid increase in costs, and the growing role of the Federal government in the payment for care, will be stimulated by the developing crisis in health care, the continuing rapid increase in costs, and the growing role of the Federal government in the payment for care.

On the other hand, some experts, including Ginsberg (4) and McNerney (5), have argued that the current number of physicians is sufficient to meet the expected demand for medical care in the future. However, maintaining the current level of medical care will require the development of new medical schools and the training of additional physicians. By the early 1980's, the physician population ratio would increase to approximately 1 physician per 1,000 people, which is still below the current ratio.

We think that expanding the total entering class size for MD education in the U.S. to 15,000 by 1978 would be an appropriate goal for the Bicentennial of the Nation. An increase of over 300% in medical education capacity would be needed to meet the expected increase in the demand for medical care. This increase would appear reasonable and realistic in terms of the processes of planning, construction, and program development that must be undertaken to assure the maintaining of adequate quality in the expanding programs.

THE BICENTENNIAL CHALLENGE PROGRAM FOR THE EXPANSION OF MEDICAL EDUCATION

We think that expanding the total entering class size for MD education in the U.S. to 15,000 by 1978 would be an appropriate goal for the Bicentennial of the Nation. An increase of over 300% in medical education capacity would be needed to meet the expected increase in the demand for medical care. This increase would appear reasonable and realistic in terms of the processes of planning, construction, and program development that must be undertaken to assure the maintaining of adequate quality in the expanding programs.
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our Bicentennial Celebration. We believe that a program with features described below will constitute such a challenge.

Before concluding our consideration of features of such a program, however, we must emphasize three important points:

First, any meaningful program for the expansion and development of academic health centers must take account of the difficult financial circumstances—desperate, in many instances—of the institutions of health personnel, as well as the conduct of biomedical research and the provision of health care. The costs of these interrelated services are not fully separable. Current public interest understandably focuses on the number of physicians produced. Thus, this number in itself may mislead the gauge for productivity and the sole measure of return for the public investment. It deserves emphasis, however, that amounts suggested for support of medical schools and hospitals, on this basis, are also productive of services, research, and other educational experiences that contribute to health care, with ultimate public good derived is the stability and vigor of a set of social institutions: the academic medical center.

Third, we believe that the best interests of the nation will be served if a portion of the required increment of production of physicians, is met by the development of new schools. Special attention should be given to the development of new schools in geographical areas that are at present without medical school facilities. One understands with graduate programs in the physical and biological sciences, in order that such resources could be used as the basis for the development of the new medical schools. The effective utilization of clinical resources already existing in such areas, with appropriate and necessary modifications, must be encouraged in a to minimize the gap for additional teaching hospitals and other clinical facilities, which are notoriously costly.

It is hoped that the development of a medical school in an area favorably influences the attractiveness of the area for physicians and the level of medical practice. It is for this reason to make this distribution of medical schools is stressed.

OBJECTIVES OF THE PROGRAM

The objectives of this program would be:

1. To increase the nation's pool of MDs by 50,000 per 1980 to permit achieving an overall physician-population ratio of 175:100,000 and make it possible for every state to have at least 100 MDs per 100,000 people.

2. To assist in achieving a better geographic distribution of medical capabilities by selecting several new primary medical schools in areas without medical schools or with limited access to academic medicine.

3. To diminish dependence upon the importation of foreign-trained MDs.

4. To provide an adequate annual cohort of MDs as a base for more rational distribution of physicians for graduate training in the various specialties and functional areas.

5. To provide adequate financial stability for the continuous operating requirements of medical schools.

THE OVERALL PLAN

As indicated in introductory paragraphs, our overall plan is aimed at having 15,000 entering places in the nation's medical schools by 1976. At present, there are 11,000 entering places, and 800 more are in prospect on the basis of currently planned expansion. The projected increment is 3,000 additional places. The additional expansion of 3,200 entering places by 1976. We believe that this increment should be met by:

1. The establishment of 12 new medical schools, with 100 students in the entering class of each; a total of 1,200 new entering places.

2. The expansion of the entering classes of existing medical schools by a minimum of 15 students each, up to a total of 2,000 additional entering places.

We believe that the development of the Health Professions Education Assistance Program utilizing the following approach and presented as a challenge to the nation's institutions of higher learning will bring about the realization of this objective.

PROGRAM TERMS AND CONDITIONS

Participating Institutions. Institutions and other public or private institutions, would be invited to submit proposals for Federal aid support for (a) the development of new medical schools and/or (b) the expansion of existing medical schools on a competitive basis. Proposals would be evaluated by site visiting teams and subject to judgment of the appropriate Advisory Council in procedures currently operated with respect to various Federal grants in the health fields. Judgments would be based on institutional achievement; facilities and faculty together with prospects for their further development, geographic location, the degree of innovation in the educational program, community interest and support, and rapidity with which the prospective program could be developed.

Successful applicants would be selected as indicated below, and would be expected to maintain the stated goal of entering class size within six years of the time the award was made.

Capital Costs. An institution approved for the development of a new school or a significant expansion of a new school would receive a Federal award of $300,000 per entering class place, in addition to Federal funds for capital costs, with the obligation to provide at least $50,000 per student or more from non-Federal sources.

Thus, a substantial but not extraordinary amount would be provided as a package to each participating institution, with the institution making a substantial contribution from non-Federal sources but with the opportunity to make a contribution as large as the institution in order to provide more elaborate facilities.

Start-up Costs. New or expanded institutions under this program would receive, in recognition of start-up costs inherent in the initiation of any new program, a one-time allocation of $20,000 per new entering class place, whether in a new school or in a program of expansion of an existing school. That would be made available as soon as firm arrangements for the new school or expansion program have been completed.

Operating Support of Existing Schools. As indicated in an earlier paragraph, stability and support of education is essential to the realization of a program of expansion. For this reason, we recommend that a program for the continuing operation of an existing school be inaugurated and that it provide to institutions currently engaged in education of physicians and nurses, and, in recognition of costs that rise 5%-9% per year, that this be increased gradually to $9,000 per year per student a decade hence. At

that point, then, it would equal the support level proposed for the new and expanded programs.

BASIS FOR PROGRAM TERMS

The recommendations for support of ongoing programs, expansion of existing schools, and establishment of new schools are based on costs of present programs.

It has been determined in the Cost Allocation Report that the marginal costs for undergraduate medical education are exclusive of research and patient care are about $4,000 per year. The costs of the total program required to support under the new plan has been estimated to be $15,000 to $20,000 per year. The Canadian province provides in excess of $13,000 a year per undergraduate medical student; it is the core operations of the medical schools.

The average costs of expansion under the Physicians Augmentation Program was $10,000 per student after an initial additional start-up cost which was given for four years. The expansion support of $9,000 after a one-time allocation of $20,000 to cover increased expenses attendant to the initiation of new programs is in keeping with this experience.

Although capital costs for new medical schools developed over the last decade or existing schools undertaking major expansion have substantially exceeded those recommended under the long-term proposal, is consistent with the growing recognition that existing clinical facilities and resources of the University can be used to a greater extent for medical education. These costs are in line with those envisioned by new schools adopting this philosophy.

RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING PROGRAMS

The provisions of the proposed Bicentennial Program for the Expansion of Medical Education would replace the existing provisions of the HPEA program for the expansion of existing medical schools. The program of construction funds for renovation, alteration, and replacement of existing facilities would continue.

In like manner, the provision of this new program for operating support would replace the formula component of the existing Institutional Grant program under HPEA. The expansion of support provisions in respect to innovation and program development. Projects in the expansion of enrollment would be largely obviated by the terms of this new program.

Programs for research, graduate training, and student assistance would continue as an essential part of the support structure for academic medical centers. Their funding requirements, however, would reflect the expanded institutional structure that this new program would bring into being.
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ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN MEDICAL COLLEGES—MEDICAL SCHOOL APPLICANTS AND FIRST-TIME ENROLLIES IN RELATIONSHIP TO BACCALAUREATE DEGREES AWARDED

**TABLE I A—ACTUAL 1960-68**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate degrees:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>365,337</td>
<td>410,421</td>
<td>492,984</td>
<td>562,369</td>
<td>734,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>223,427</td>
<td>238,108</td>
<td>275,777</td>
<td>325,236</td>
<td>412,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>141,910</td>
<td>171,313</td>
<td>216,207</td>
<td>237,133</td>
<td>321,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical school applicants:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14,397</td>
<td>15,847</td>
<td>19,168</td>
<td>18,250</td>
<td>21,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of baccalaureate</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>1,944</td>
<td>1,982</td>
<td>1,894</td>
<td>2,987</td>
<td>2,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>1,353</td>
<td>14,664</td>
<td>17,274</td>
<td>15,263</td>
<td>15,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of applicants</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>7,943</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,814</td>
<td>7,985</td>
<td>8,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>5,450</td>
<td>5,127</td>
<td>4,448</td>
<td>4,922</td>
<td>4,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of applicants</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st-time medical school enrollees:</td>
<td>8,069</td>
<td>8,242</td>
<td>8,567</td>
<td>8,775</td>
<td>9,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,788</td>
<td>11,885</td>
<td>14,376</td>
<td>13,688</td>
<td>15,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>10,055</td>
<td>10,984</td>
<td>13,078</td>
<td>12,416</td>
<td>14,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>1,298</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>1,573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE I-B—ESTIMATES 1970-80**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate degrees:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>764,000</td>
<td>819,487</td>
<td>885,312</td>
<td>951,138</td>
<td>1,037,424</td>
<td>1,049,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>435,480</td>
<td>467,107</td>
<td>506,628</td>
<td>542,149</td>
<td>574,232</td>
<td>598,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>328,520</td>
<td>352,379</td>
<td>378,684</td>
<td>409,989</td>
<td>463,192</td>
<td>451,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical school applicants (calculated at 1960 percentage of degree recipients):</td>
<td>28,429</td>
<td>31,960</td>
<td>34,527</td>
<td>37,094</td>
<td>39,290</td>
<td>40,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (2.9 percent of baccalaureates)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men (6.0 percent of baccalaureates)</td>
<td>26,129</td>
<td>26,026</td>
<td>30,278</td>
<td>32,529</td>
<td>34,454</td>
<td>35,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women (0.7 percent of baccalaureates)</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>2,467</td>
<td>2,665</td>
<td>2,863</td>
<td>3,032</td>
<td>3,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical school applicants (calculated at 1968 percentage of degree recipients):</td>
<td>22,156</td>
<td>23,765</td>
<td>25,674</td>
<td>27,583</td>
<td>29,215</td>
<td>30,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (3.9 percent of baccalaureates)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men (6.0 percent of baccalaureates)</td>
<td>20,932</td>
<td>21,487</td>
<td>23,213</td>
<td>24,979</td>
<td>27,158</td>
<td>27,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women (0.7 percent of baccalaureates)</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,187</td>
<td>2,466</td>
<td>2,703</td>
<td>3,062</td>
<td>3,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical school applicants (calculated at 1960 percentage of degree recipients):</td>
<td>23,504</td>
<td>27,722</td>
<td>29,719</td>
<td>31,740</td>
<td>34,095</td>
<td>36,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (2.5 percent of baccalaureates)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men (6.0 percent of baccalaureates)</td>
<td>19,597</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>22,709</td>
<td>24,397</td>
<td>26,841</td>
<td>26,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women (0.7 percent of baccalaureates)</td>
<td>2,307</td>
<td>2,467</td>
<td>2,703</td>
<td>2,703</td>
<td>2,703</td>
<td>2,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical school applicants (calculated at 1968 percentage of degree recipients):</td>
<td>16,749</td>
<td>17,965</td>
<td>19,408</td>
<td>20,853</td>
<td>22,085</td>
<td>23,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (2.7 percent of baccalaureates)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men (6.0 percent of baccalaureates)</td>
<td>15,024</td>
<td>16,114</td>
<td>17,410</td>
<td>18,704</td>
<td>19,811</td>
<td>16,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women (0.7 percent of baccalaureates)</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>1,999</td>
<td>2,147</td>
<td>2,274</td>
<td>2,369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Estimate.
2 U.S. Office of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics, actual figures from USOE publications; estimates from USOE personnel.
3 Study of U.S. medical school applicants for each year.
4 Estimated at 75 percent of total applicant pool for each year.
Source: Division of Student Affairs, Aug. 31, 1970.

**TABLE II—NEW SCHOOL PROJECTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Projected date of 1st class</th>
<th>Number in 1st class</th>
<th>Date of information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. East Carolina College</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>June 29, 1970; letter from Edwin W. Monroe, M.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Florida State University</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>July 13, 1970; memorandum from Dr. Nicholson,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Several schools (South Alabama in Mobile, Minnesota-Duluth, Tennessee-Knoxville, and the Ohio schools of Kent, Cleveland, and Akron) do not have definite projections of entrance of a 1st class and for the size of that class. Of the schools—Mayo, N.A.M.E., and Southern Illinois—have projected dates of 1972 as opposed to 1971.

12 for first 3 classes.
2 No number but will be clinical teaching only.
3 No projections to date.
Mr. COTTON informing them of our intention to offer this amendment to H.R. 18515, the Labor-HEW appropriations bill. The amendment increases by $37,- 050,000 the Senate's recommendation of $130,500,000 for institutional support—the appropriation for medical and dental schools and other academic health centers, institutions traditionally committed to standards of excellent in the care of the sick, in the training of new physicians, dentists and other health professionals, and in the expansion of medical knowledge.

At this time of a burgeoning health care crisis we cannot afford the loss of a single resource for training medical manpower. In response to this crisis, with the gravest humanitarian implications, the Senate, in passing S. 3586, the Health Training Improvement Act of 1970, included my amendment to establish a 1-year $100,000,000 disaster relief program for medical schools in financial distress. This was to be a special 1-year program of assistance. It was designed to enable them to survive for an additional year and to give them the renewal and improvement of the basic legislative authority for medical and other health profession schools. In conference with the House, that proposed authority was deleted. However, the Senate did make two very important provisions:

(1) The Congress finds and declares that Nation's economy, welfare, and security are adversely affected by the medical crisis which threatens the survival of medical and dental schools which provide the highest quality of teaching, medical and dental research, and delivery of health care for the Nation.

(2) Existing law authorizes appropriations up to $168 million for formula grants and project grants to health professions schools covering a wide variety of purposes. The budget submitted by the Administration calls for the appropriation of $13 million of these authorized amounts, leaving approximately $55 million in appropriation for fiscal year 1971. Among the purposes for which this appropriation may be appropriated pursuant to this remaining $55 million authorization, as described in section 725 of this act, are the appropriations for providing assistance to "any such schools which are in serious financial straits to meet their costs of operation or which have special need for financial assistance to meet the accreditation requirements."

The conference substitute would provide authority to meet the purposes of the Senate amendment by providing that funds appropriated for fiscal year 1971 to meet the needs of institutions of which the Senate appropriately quotes language are authorized to remain available until expended, or until June 30, 1972, whichever comes first. To the extent that funds are not used for the purpose for which this authority will permit added flexibility in the use of these funds. The managers on the part of the Senate also recommend that section 601 of the Hospital Construction and Modernization Amendments of 1970 will apply favorably to this authorization, and therefore are not subject to administrative cutbacks or withholding from expenditure, so that if appropriated, these funds will be used for aid to these schools.

Mr. President, when I testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee urging increased medical manpower appropriation these facts were not available nor did the committee have these facts at the time it marked up the Labor-HEW appropriations bill. The Senate did not act on the conference report on S. 3586 until October 2, four months prior to its recess. The HEW appropriations bill had been reported out the day before. Had they had benefit of the action of the legislative committees earlier, they might very well have revised substanially the purposes of the bill under the existing authority. I am gratified to note that the Senate committee increased the appropriation for medical schools over the President's budget by at least $38 million. The circumstances now indicate that we should do even more. It seems reasonable that these changed circumstances justify a reexamination of the appropriateness of the recommended appropriation level as now contained in this bill.

The amendment now before this body is designed to make clear our commitment to stand behind these great centers of medical excellence. It raises the appropriation to the limit of the authorization of $13 million, and adds $38 million above the committee's bill. To do any less, amounts to nothing less than false economy. I imagine the costs associated with retaining these institutions after they have collapsed. The purpose of action is, therefore, sound and prudent. It gives us an additional period of time in which we of necessity must address this problem on a far more comprehensive basis. Until then, however, this amendment is required.

Mr. President, this amendment makes sense and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to overwhelmingly cast a vote of confidence for medical education in America and support this amendment.

Now, Mr. President, after a hard-fought conference, the House yielded and extended it $55 million in their conference report by pointing out that by really earmarking that much out of the budget at a time we could rescue the medical schools.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The reason for that is we did not have that evidence before us.

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly right. So it is appropriate and typical of the understanding of the members of the Appropriations Committee, that will accept this amendment. The situation is very grave and I am very much pleased that this has been done.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I strongly support this amendment to provide full funding for one of our most important Federal health manpower programs—the program of "institutional and special project" grants for medical schools, dental schools, and related schools of health professions.

The committee should appropriate a total of $168 million for this vital program—the full amount authorized to be appropriated. The figure is $38 million above the appropriation requested by the Senate committee, and $67 million above the amount requested in the administration's budget submission for the current fiscal year.
It is my understanding that the entire amount of the additional funds requested in this amendment will be used for assistance to medical schools in financial distress and other schools of the health professions in similar situations. I understand that it is absolutely necessary that these funds are urgently needed. The fiscal problems facing our medical schools are extremely serious, and it is vitally important that Congress act now to alleviate the difficult situation.

Of all the aspects of the health crisis now confronting the Nation, the most serious is the crisis of health manpower. The facts of the manpower crisis are well known. Today, we have a health gap of 50,000 doctors and 20,000 dentists in the Nation, and the gap is even wider in the case of nurses and allied health professionals. By 1980, the problem will be even more serious, unless we take the steps now that are necessary to insure a greater supply and better geographic distribution of our health manpower.

Yet, ironically, as our medical schools are responding to the need and are beginning to increase their enrollment, they are simultaneously faced with the challenge of their financial stability. Last June, the Appropriations Subcommittee was told that 61 of the Nation's 107 medical schools—more than half of the total—had already been awarded special project grants because of their condition of financial distress. A number of these schools are on the verge of bankruptcy. Indeed, the situation has deteriorated to the point where the loss of even one school might lead to the failure of the Federal funds available for curriculum changes, minority enrollment programs, and other innovative approaches to the problems of the health system.

I only through full funding of this critical manpower program—$168,000,000—can we minimize the inherent conflict in our existing Federal legislation between the qualified medical schools needing funds to lead the line against imminent financial crisis, and the imperative need to move forward to attack the overall problem of the Nation's shortage of health manpower.

Three weeks ago, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education released a major report emphasizing the inadequacy of our health delivery system and calling for an urgent 10-year program to increase the Nation's supply of doctors and upgrade the quality of health care in the entire Nation. Their recommendations is the medical school, which would play a central role in developing and providing high quality care in its surrounding geographic area.

I fully support the recommendations of the Carnegie Commission. By the same token, we have a health crisis today because we failed to act on such recommendations in the past. The graveyard of proposed health reforms is filled with the progressive recommendations of distinguished commissions, buried by apathy and neglect of the existing health system. The Carnegie report will suffer the same fate unless we take more effective steps today.

The problem is especially acute in the case of our efforts to upgrade the role of our medical schools. Unless we act now to strengthen their financial stability, many medical schools will simply be unable to function and maintain a strong health care program for the Nation.

Much of the impetus for the present amendment comes from our efforts on the Senate Health Subcommittee to alleviate this aspect of our national health crisis. The increasing number of medical schools in financial distress. As a member of the Health Subcommittee, I was pleased to support the proposal originally offered by Senator Javits earlier this year, to authorize $100 million in special emergency grants to such schools. Although the proposal was approved by the Senate, it was opposed by the House conferees, and was not included in the bill signed into law by the President earlier this year.

In large part, the objections of the House conferees were based on their view that such grants could already be made under the "institutional and special project" grant program in existing law. Yet, the fact is that the administration had not even requested full funding of this program. In light of this recent legislative history and the obviously grim financial plight of many of our Nation's medical schools, I believe that it is a strong case can be made for full funding of the program, as proposed by the pending amendment.

I would prefer, of course, that we deal separately with the special problem of the growing financial crisis in our medical schools, instead of requiring this difficult problem to compete for the same Federal funds with proposals for other program development in such schools. But at this late date we cannot afford the luxury of developing a separate legislative approach. We must work with the tools we have. The opportunity is at hand to make a major contribution to shore up the stability of our most priceless national health resource—the medical school. Most students depend so heavily for achieving our goal of improving the quality of health care in the Nation.

We simply cannot continue to ignore the crisis confronting our medical schools. We cannot wait for the tragedy of a bankruptcy or the death of a great medical school before we are shocked into action. The dollars we allocate today can give us the leverage we need to help. The cost of not acting is far greater. It is the only real cost we cannot afford to pay.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, because of the desperate financial situation now facing many of our Nation's medical schools, the School is indeed compelled to cosponsor this amendment. This measure would raise the amount available for aiding medical schools in financial distress. This increase can only be described as essential when, already, cuts in federal support have spelled death for two of the country's 55 dental schools. Many other medical schools are close to financial collapse. Unless met with quick and substantial relief, another six dental schools and 10 to 15 medical schools, now on the verge of bankruptcy, will soon be irrevocably doomed.

The crisis in medical education blatantly adds fuel to the fire of health-cost inflation. Higher education costs will level off only when we have an adequate supply of medical manpower and facilities to meet the burgeoning demand for health care.

In the State of Maryland the Johns Hopkins School of Medicine will alone run a deficit of $2.3 million. One of the Nation's leading medical centers, the school has lost $1.6 million in Federal support during the past year, either for projects unmatched or severely cut back. In addition, the school has lost about $440,000 in funding for postdoctoral medical training. This amounts to a lion's share since about 60 percent of the Hopkins' budget comes from Federal sources. Despite this, the school is striving to maintain and even to expand both its enrollment and its community services. This past summer it conducted a special program aimed at recruiting minority and disadvantaged students. It is now planning to construct a 328-bed community hospital in economically deprived East Baltimore, and is providing enormously successful with a pioneering group health-care plan in the new town of Columbia, Maryland. This experiment may well be the embryo for health care of the future, and yet it is being undercut at the roots.

At the University of Maryland, cuts in Federal funding are sharply curtailing and even forcing the dismantling of extremely productive biomedical research teams. The grant for an important cancer research involving six full-time researchers, for example, has recently been terminated.

At the District of Columbia, the Georgetown and George Washington University Medical Schools are facing enormous deficits—over $2 million per school for the current fiscal year. Both schools are having to eat into their reserves, and the State funds they have so far received these precious funds will in fact be completely exhausted. And yet both schools are making courageous efforts to increase their enrollment.

The District of Columbia is particularly fortunate in that the chairman of the Health Appropriations Subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSSON) has undertaken to see that funds are directed to the District government for the support of these schools. For this courageous and far-sighted action, the Senator is to be highly commended.

Also deserving of the highest praise for this is the ranking minority member of the Committee, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON), and the distinguished Senators from Delaware and Nevada (Mr. BOOCS and Mr. BIBLE) for their efforts in moving to cope with the crisis facing, these institutions.

At Howard University Medical School, where over 85 percent of the students seek financial assistance, officials be-
ing forced to deny it to an increasing number. Unfortunately also is the school's shortage of staff, the student-staff ratio being 20 percent below the national average.

As I stressed in recent letters to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and to the Director of the Office of Budget and Management, this dismal picture of blight is not limited to one area of the country alone. All across the Nation medical schools are being wracked by the spiraling erosion of their financial bases.

The 540-student school of medicine at St. Louis University in Missouri is very near insolvency, with a $750,000 deficit. Two New York schools are teetering on bankruptcy.

All across the country we are being swamped with a burgeoning health crisis. Skyrocketing costs, obsolete and inadequate facilities, and greatly increased health care expectations are threatening to deny proper care to millions of Americans. Particularly in jeopardy is the progress of plans to expand medical care to the countless disadvantaged persons in rural and urban areas.

What is required is a comprehensive approach to all the more is the critical shortage of doctors. With a present national need for more than 500,000 additional physicians and an annual output of but 8,000 or so, the economic stragulation of our medical schools—which surely rank as one of our most precious national resources—represents a bizarre form of suicide, fiscal as well as physical, since it blatantly adds fuel to the fire of health-cost inflation.

Statistics of the American Hospital Association show that the average cost of a day in a hospital went up more than 300 percent during the 1960's.

The most serious shortage of personnel in any major occupational group in the United States is in the health area. Recent comparative data shows that eight countries have higher ratios of physicians to population than the United States, including Czechoslovakia, Hungary, the Soviet Union, and Israel.

One study indicates that one American in six has never visited a dentist. And the ratio of dentists to population is getting worse: from one per 1,677 Americans in 1953 to one per 2,100 in 1970.

Medical schools are fighting to increase their enrollments. Since 1964 they have increased their capacity by over 32 percent. But further expansion is being constrained for lack of funding. Cuts in Federal student assistance are especially devastating to the attempts by schools to recruit minority students.

The squeezing of funds out of health education thus reeks of false economy. What is more, it is a transparent prescription—tantamount to balancing the budget by starving the patient.

I urge Senate support of this amendment for medical school rescue aid not as a final or long-term solution, but as an emergency, stop-gap measure. Indeed, there is a need to quickly and equitably provide something else, because I think that the amendment is out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Cook). The Chair would advise that he was about to advise the Senator from Minnesota that his amendment is out of order, unless he wants to ask unanimous consent.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the amendment that has just been agreed to previously goes from $295 million to $328 million. The amendment the Senator is talking about goes up to only $298 million, so the amendment that has been adopted is already more than what the Senator's amendment calls for.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am advised that the objective sought by the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. Inouye), who could not be here today, I call up amendment No. 1077.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Cook). The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment as follows:

AMENDMENT

On page 21, line 16, delete the figure "$295,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$328,000,000".

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, this amendment calls for $3 million additional to the funds to be made available for schools of public health. I believe the Senator from Hawaii has discussed this matter with the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. MONDALE. The Senator from Hawaii (Mr. Inouye) could not be here today and asked that I raise this issue with the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this covers some of the same programs for which the amendment just adopted. There is a great shortage of personnel in the health manpower field, particularly in the schools of public health and administration.

Mr. MONDALE. As I understand the Yarborough amendment, which was just adopted, it does, in fact, involve the same line item as does, the Inouye amendment. What the Senator from Hawaii wishes to assure is that public health training will be on a par with other medical professions such as nursing, dentistry, and other allied health professions.

In light of the fact that there have been two new schools of public health accredited in the past year, and adding to that the inflationary factors, this modest increase would seem to be necessary in order to maintain any kind of progress in the public health services field.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, a point of order. The amendment that was just adopted is identical to the amendment that is now being offered, except that it exceeds the amount. The Senate already has acted on this particular part of the bill by its voice vote.

I am not trying to be unduly technical here, but I think the Senator from Minnesota should redraft the amendment to provide something else, because I think that the amendment is out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Cook). The Chair would advise that he was about to advise the Senator from Minnesota that his amendment is out of order, unless he wants to ask unanimous consent.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this amendment be considered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the amendment that has just been agreed to previously goes from $295 million to $328 million. The amendment the Senator is talking about goes up to only $298 million, so the amendment that has been adopted is already more than what the Senator's amendment calls for.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am advised that the objective sought by the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. Inouye) can be met by the previous amendment offered by the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH).

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Cook). The Chair would advise the Senator that time is under control, and that time for the Senator from Michigan to speak will therefore have to be yielded from the bill or from the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield time to the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Harr) from the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I rise only to ask the Appropriations Committee and the Appropriations Subcommittee to consider the part of the Inouye amendment, to insure more adequate funding of Public Health schools, has been taken care of in the Yarborough amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The reason for a variety of reasons, but basically the University of Michigan School of Public Health is the largest in the country. There is great urgency that we insure adequate funding not alone for that institution but for the othertragically too few schools of public health in this country.

Are we certain that we have, indeed, made the provision intended by the Inouye amendment under the Yarborough amendment?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand that this would require the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) to agree. The problem we have here is that it is in the institutional support programs for schools of public health. The $3 million was not earmarked. It was brought down from institutional support for medical, dental, and related matters, and take $3 million out of that and bring it down to line C for schools of public health. That would pin it down.

Mr. HART. It was not earmarked in the $38 million that my amendment added. I will consent, hoping that we can hold that $38 million in the bill in conference.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Well, of course, I do not know what we can hold in conference.
Mr. YARBOROUGH. I agree to earmarking the $3 million.

Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

Mr. MILLER, Mr. President, could not this be taken care of by asking unanimous consent that the Senate express its purpose to do what the Senator is asking for? Then the conferences will know what we have in mind without going through the details of further amendments and purloining procedures.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. President, may we have order in the Senate? The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss). The Senate will be in order.

Mr. COTTON, Mr. President, there is no question in this country being more hotly contested and subject to sharper competition than this. We are being asked by the torturers of the department whether they are going to receive in assistance. I have one in my State that must either expand or go out of business. I find with respect to the allocation we had last year that practically all of it went to five huge universities. They are not doing much in the way of service.

When we start earmarking on the floor of the Senate, we must remember that the department has a backlog of applications far in excess of any money we have provided in the bill even if we were to add some more. When we start earmarking, we do not know what we are doing.

I feel very strongly about this matter. I want to see the money in here. I want to see it go to medical schools and I want to see more doctors. However, I feel that I must object to a haphazard, off-the-cuff earmarking of money for any particular schools or particular purposes on the floor of the Senate at the last minute, and that I object to the President, express my inquiry of the manager of the bill whether the objectives sought to be achieved by the amendment which I am offering on behalf of the Senator from Hawaii can be achieved without the necessity of pressing the amendment, so I understood him to say that it could be.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, it is my understanding that we could get a unanimous-consent agreement that we could take out of the addition for institutional support for medical, dental, and related items, the line item, item 1(a), take $2 million and place it under public health on line 1(c), page 90 of the report and under student assistance traineeships place an additional $1 million for public health traineeships.

We could so adjust it.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that change be made.

Mr. MILLER, Mr. President, without objection, it is so ordered; and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. MONDALE, Mr. President, without objection, it is so ordered; and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

Page 90, line 9 and 10, strike out the numeral and insert in lieu thereof: "$79,435,000".

Mr. MONDALE, Mr. President, amendment No. 1073 could not have been made without proper funds for the rehabilitation research program of the social and rehabilitation service by $2,000,000. This amendment is intended to provide badly needed support for the 19 rehabilitation research and training program.

The administration requested $81,435,000 for the program which includes these centers. The Appropriations Committee has recommended only $77,435,000, or $4 million less than the budget request. Thus, approval of this amendment would still leave the appropriation $2 million under the budget.

I urge that my colleagues are familiar with the great value of the vocational rehabilitation program. This program has restored many hundreds of thousands of badly injured persons to useful and happy lives. Last year alone, about 250,000 persons were rehabilitated and placed in jobs.

This is a program which pays for itself many times over by keeping the disabled from becoming welfare charges and by making taxpaying, productive workers of them. The vocational rehabilitation program, solely from increased Federal income taxes, is estimated at $7 to $10 for each $1 spent.

The research and training centers, which would be aided by this amendment, provide the medical and technological backup to the rehabilitation program. They also furnish a significant portion of the highly trained personnel needed to make the program work so well, providing rehabilitation services to many millions in the same manner that the research and training centers do for individuals.

I should like to point out that the rehabilitation research and training center program was actually initiated by the Congress in 1961 in order to achieve a very special purpose. At that time, we were concerned about the lack of integration and coordination among research, training, and service programs to individuals. Therefore we conceived a program of research, training, and community service to advance the cause of rehabilitation.

I am pleased to note that one of the first two centers supported under this program was in my State at the University of Minnesota. There was established an excellent collaborative effort between the University and the National Rehabilitation Institute. The objective of the center program was to cut the timelag between discovery or research and the training of future generations of practitioners through an improved and viable administration. The center project began less than 9 years ago this program has advanced to the point where there are 19 of our outstanding universities and rehabilitation centers participating in a joint and mutually enforcing effort.

We are all aware of the fact that there have been increases in costs on every hand and the research and training center program is no exception. Yet, the $10,276,000 allotted to this program has been the same as a center since the 1968 fiscal year. According to the participating institutions, inflation is starting the research and training center program on a precipitous downhill slide. Already I understand research activities in these programs have had to be cut back so that fewer research projects can be undertaken.

The number of participants in training has started to decline. In 1966, there were 63,000 participants in the training units; in 1969 it declined to approximately 22,000 by 1969. A similar drop appears to have taken place in 1970 and 1971. It would appear as though there would be no recourse for...
these centers in the 1972 fiscal year but to cut back further on their training activities if additional funding is not made available. Such an untimely retreatment in research and training exacts a heavy toll in future years.

One illustration of the serious shortage of trained personnel is that the State rehabilitation agencies have indicated a 1971 requirement for 12,000 additional counselors. At present, we have only 5,600 in the 2-year training programs. Thus, we are turning out each year less than one-fourth of those needed by the States.

The shortage of trained physicians is even worse. We have only 168 in graduate training programs, usually of 3 years’ duration. And yet the need for additional physician personnel is estimated at 2,300 for this year.

I am sure that none of us wishes to be identified with a diminutive effort in centers of excellence such as these. I feel that this program, which was created at the specific request of this body, is in serious jeopardy unless additional funds can be made available.

Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. President, this includes research which will have to be cut back is that of spinal cord injuries. About 9,000 individuals who have such disabilities are receiving services under the State-Federal vocational rehabilitation program. We have from 5,000 to 10,000 new cases each year and the majority of these are in the young adult age group, 18 to 25 years mostly because of accidents. A life of productivity lies ahead for this group, but if we continue to develop and expand the techniques and services needed by this group.

It has been well documented that such a program can save many times the cost of rehabilitation. We can ill afford to lose the potential of reaping this human and economic gain by reducing the capacity of our research and training centers to respond.

This is but one example of what may well happen without additional funds. Therefore, I strongly urge the approval of this modest increase in funding for the research and training center program of the Social and Rehabilitation Service.

I ask unanimous consent that a list of these centers be printed in the Record. There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

**Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers**

- University of Washington, Washington. University of Southern California, California.
- Emory University, Georgia.
- Tufts University, Massachusetts.
- Temple University, Pennsylvania.
- George Washington University, District of Columbia.
- University of Colorado, Colorado.
- University of Alabama. University of Wisconsin, Wisconsin.
- University of Texas, Texas.
- Baylor University, Texas.
- University of Oregon, Oregon.
- University of Arkansas, Arkansas.

*Center includes both a university and a State or non-profit, private component.*


I think the Senate is fully aware of the importance and value of the program. Two basic arguments justify the increase. First, the funding level for these 19 centers remained level for 3 years. Inflation has sharply reduced the value of these programs. Second, some new centers have been added in the interim. So, if we wish to keep the programs of these centers at their present levels, it will be necessary to increase the funding. That is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. President, this represents 11 regular medical centers, one development medical center, three medical rehabilitation centers, three vocational rehabilitation centers, and one center for the deaf.

They had to cut it back in 1970 due to the fact that, as we know, the Senate cut back the total budget. This was cut back.

Mr. MONDALE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This brings it up to where they can operate. The committee accepts the amendment.

Mr. MONDALE, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Texas, Mr. Yarbrough (Mr. Yarbrough) be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the enrollment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 18515) was read the third time.

Mr. JAVITS subsequently said: Mr. President, I would like to call attention of the Senate to a provision in the bill for a Cabinet committee on opportunities for Spanish-speaking people. This is a desirable activity. The Senate committee, indeed, increased the appropriation from $337,000 to $675,000 over what the other body did.

I want very much to express the need for seeing that, among the Spanish-speaking people who are recognized as being in the care of the committee, Puerto Ricans should be an important element. They represent a significant fraction of the Spanish-speaking people in our country. They are heavily concentrated in the New York area and other areas of the United States. They are extremely productive. Indeed, they are responsible for many industries, like the hotel industry, which, without them, could not function at all in my part of the country.

I hope that the Chairman, Mr. Martin Castillo, who has testified on this particular matter, and who has also testified before us in other respects, may have that fact very much in mind. He has put together a staff under the appropriation bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, may I say to the President from New York that when we heard testimony on this matter which we had present—and he also testified in the hearings—the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, who, as the Senator knows, is a very able and articulate person, whom the Appropriations Chairman and the other members of the committee, agreed that they would do exactly what the Senator from New York has said. So I hope there is no question about what our intention was.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk of the Senate be authorized to make any technical changes in the bill that are necessary. There are one or two typographical errors.

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

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I want to call attention, so that the Record will take notice, that the Senate committee added to the bill $218,661,278, and that on the floor of the Senate, the Senate has added $168,550,000, in addition to what the House added in addition to the President’s request.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I had intended to offer an amendment to H.R. 18515, the Labor-HEW appropriation bill, which would have recommended a $3.5 million increase for child development research under the Office of Child Development.

As a cosponsor of amendment No. 1068 offered by the distinguished senior Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) and others, and after consultation with other Senators I have decided to withhold the amendment because it appears that we have gone as far as we can this year to increase appropriations for the OEO section of the bill under which funds for child development research are provided.

At this time, however, I ask unanimous consent that the statement which I would have made in introducing the amendment be printed in the Record. I would hope that the Congress will give this matter serious consideration when subsequent appropriations are considered. At that time I intend to support such efforts.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement I had prepared for delivery on this matter may be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, Senator Harris’ statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

**Statement of Senator Harris**

Mr. President, at present there are more than 1 million children in the United States under fourteen years of age. During the decade of the 70’s it is estimated that there will be at least 4 million new births each year. Over 100,000 of the children under 14 years live in metropolitan areas. During the 70’s mothers of school and pre-school children are more likely to work than ever before. In 1969 twenty percent of the mothers of children under six years of age worked. In 1989 this number increased to thirty per-
November 20, 1970

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE 33851

cent. Consequently, it is expected that sub-
stantially more children under age six will be
enrolled in some kind of day care or child
development program during the '70s. Be-
tween 1968 and 1970, the number of
enrollments increased by 169 percent. More
public pre-school programs were started
during this period.

Partly as a result of the increasing en-
rollment of children in pre-school programs,
many significant and far-reaching discoveries
have been made about the learning, physical,
emotional, and social development of chil-
dren under six. This was especially true of
disadvantaged children participating in the Head
Start program. All of these activities led to
studies which have shown that there is a very signifi-
cant relationship between nutrition and pre-natal
care, and learning ability of a child. We have
learned that malnutrition in expectant mothers
results in retarded fetal growth. Studies suggest that
malnutrition, even in a mild form and for a short period of time,
if present during a critical period, may pro-
duce irreversible brain damage to an unborn
child.

During the pre-school years, the childecomes increasingly exposed to the com-
unity beyond the home. This is the critical
stage in his development. Place of residence
and family life all influence his health, cul-
tural enrichment, and learning.

A child is constantly learning. Hopefully,
he is learning not only by his personal learning
experiences, but also by his participation in
educational programs. Unfortunately, many
children, particularly in low-income families,
are not receiving any educational services.

While we know that these disabilities are
greatest among poor families, we don't know
as much as we need to about overcoming
them.

One research project now being conducted
with funds provided by the Office of Child
Development is an attempt to measure the
distinctive effect of intelligence and achieve-
tment tests, which penalize children of poor
and minority backgrounds by testing not
their true capacities but their familiar-
ity with an American culture.

Another important ongoing research pro-
ject is testing the impact on children and
their parents of different types of day-care
centers, including industrial centers, institu-
tion where mothers can leave their chil-
dren nearby while they work; others located
in neighborhood centers near residences of
parents. The staffs of these centers care for
a number of children cared for in each, the
qualities of each center and facilities provided,
frequency of contact with parents during the
day, all have very critical implications for the
future of day care centers and child develop-
ment programs in this country. We simply
need to know so much as we can about the
effects on children of these new, experimental programs before we commit ourselves

to the large investment I think is necessary in
the child care and development field, and
that is what this research program is all about.

In its 1971 budget the Office of Child
Development is requesting a $2.1 million
increase over the 1970 funding. This is neces-
sary both to continue studies of the effects
on children of day care and child develop-
ment programs and to conduct a number of specific projects designed to study and
develop new techniques for improving
the learning process for our children.

The proposed appropriation Committee
would limit the

Loans for medical students: demand, $43
million; authorization, $35 million; budget request, $6 million.

Loans for student nurses: demand, $27
million; authorization, $21 million; budget request, $9.5 million.

Institutional support: authorization, $3
million; budget request, $11.3 million.

And here is what the Senate Appropriations Committee recommends: $33.5
million for medical student loans; $21 million for student nurse loans; and $127
million for aid to medical and dental schools.

Again, the committee in general and
Senator Magnuson in particular are to
be congratulated for acting to meet a
serious need.

In addition, I was pleased to note that
the committee recommended an increase
of $40 million over the budget request
for Community Mental Health Center
staffing grants. This will enable some of
the centers to be opened in the near fu-
ture to receive state money this year.
It is my hope that the Senate will give
strong support to these increases so that
our conference will be in as strong a posi-
tion as possible in conference.

This is one budget item under health
manpower which I believe should be in-
creased over the committee recommenda-
tions.

That item is the appropriation for
Federal support for graduate schools of
public health.

The administration requested and
the House approved a total of $16.4
million for public health traineeships and
institutional support, which is a cut of $1
million from appropriations for fiscal
years 1969 and 1970.

To put the situation in its correct per-
spective, not only was the budget request
for less than funding levels for the 2
previous years, but since 1969 two additional
schools of public health have been ac-
ccredited, and other new schools are
planned for Alabama, Illinois, Missouri,
and Ohio.

The need for new schools is clear, for
a shortage of trained public health man-
power exists. Congress recognized that
shortage when it increased authoriza-
tions for these items from $26 million for
fiscal year 1970 to $37 million for fiscal
year 1971.

Yet, in face of that need, the budget
request was for less than half the
authorization.

While the Senate Appropriations Com-
mittee has recommended an increase of
$1 million, I have cosponsored an amend-
ment to increase that recommendation
gold of $3 million to $20,471,000.

This increase is particularly important
in view of the likelihood that what the Senate approves will be reduced in con-
fere

I urge approval of this amendment.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I should like
to take a few moments at this point to
press my support for the appropriations
provisions of the Department of Health,
Education, and Welfare which have been
reported by the Senate Committee on
Appropriations in the Labor-HHEW bill.

Although this measure contains increases
over administration requests, it repre-

sent a determined effort to arrive at a reasonable balance between real and pressuring needs within the Department's jurisdiction and the equally significant requirement for fiscal responsibility in congressional action. In fact, it appears that this bill reaches the absolute limits to which the Committee can go in providing additional and desirable funding for the many worthwhile and highly valuable programs administered by the Department.

Of particular interest to my State is the section to provide nearly $9 million in support of new mental health hospitals and related facilities currently under construction or being modernized. More than $1.1 million of these funds will go for seven hospitals and health institutions in Kansas. It should be pointed out that the projects covered by this section were begun under previous Hill-Burton grants, and this appropriation is a recognition of the need to allow these projects to be continued.

Another aspect of the bill which stands out in its importance is the section providing for expanded Mental Health Center staffing which is of particular concern to many States which are implementing community mental health programs. This section recognizes the needs of the people and their citizens in this important field. The committee added more than $20 million to the House provision for this area. Also important is the provision for $5.9 million for the hospital improvement program for mental health institutions. An increase of $400,000 over the 1970 appropriation. In Kansas, the broad and widely acclaimed State mental hospital program would stand to benefit from this increase.

Mr. President, as the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. Corcoran) pointed out on Wednesday, this bill is not perfect. It is, however, the product of the best efforts of the committee to put together a workable and responsible program, under admittedly, severe budgetary restrictions.

It is indeed tempting to overstep financial limitations when dealing with programs to benefit the young, the old, the mentally and physically ill, and all those who suffer from the victims of accident, disease and misfortune. But in the best interest of all Americans, the resources of the Federal Government and the viability of the national economy, the line must be drawn firmly and held. The Committee's provisions, especially the Senator from Washington (Mr. Magnuson) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. Corcoran), are to be commended for their diligence and dedication in preparing this bill and attempting to see that the most equitable, effective, and appropriate allocating of funds have been made. I am pleased to support this bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to commend the chairman of the Labor-HEW Appropriations Subcommittee, the distinguished senior Senator from Washington (Mr. Magnuson), for his consistent dedication and service. As a member of the subcommittee responsible for this $18 billion appropriations bill, I continue to be impressed with our chairman's complete grasp of one of the most complex of all bills. His leadership was highly valued by all the subcommittee members, including the assistance of the distinguished ranking minority member, the senior Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. Cotton).

During the consideration of the entire bill, the members of the subcommittee always kept in mind the need for fiscal responsibility, especially during the current inflationary period. Yet, as the committee report indicates, we could not agree with the administration's limited budget request when the health and medical care of America is concerned. The Nation's biomedical research, health care, and health manpower programs must be properly maintained and funded.

Mindful of this goal, I supported the amendments recommended by the committee which increased appropriations in these areas, particularly for the research institutes of the National Institutes of Health.

The distinguished senior Senator from Nevada (Mr. Bowlby) and I sponsored two amendments. The first amendment increases the appropriations for the National Heart and Lung Institute to $203,479,000—$25 million over the House-passed bill, and $31.7 million over the administration's budget estimates. The second amendment increased the appropriations for the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke to $115,807,000—$15 million over the House-passed bill, and $18.8 million over the administration's budget request.

The increased funding for the National Heart and Lung Institute would allow the Institute to intensify its research activities for the prevention, early diagnosis, and treatment of acute and chronic respiratory diseases. This is of particular interest to West Virginia, because of the incidence of pneumoconiosis—commonly known as black lung—and silicosis. In addition, lung ailments in our urban areas are rapidly increasing as a result of air pollution and other environmental hazards.

The amendment offered by Mr. Birch and me would also provide additional funds for arteriosclerosis centers and programs for research on hypertension; for cardiovascular research; and for the improvement of transit, methods, storage, and utilization of the Nation's limited supply of human blood.

The amendment which Senator Birch and I offered to provide a $15 million increase for the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke would be used to develop 10 additional clinical stroke centers, expand the activities of the 17 existing centers, and support training programs. This additional expenditure is needed. It has been estimated that some 2 million Americans are victims of strokes annually, and that strokes prove fatal to about 200,000 Americans each year.

Additional funds would be effectively used in the study and treatment of disorders that attack the brain and central nervous system. Work is now being done in the study of head and spinal cord injuries, communicative disorders, neurological and sensory ailments, and L-Dopa followup treatment. Some 20 percent of all hospital admissions suffer from such ailments.

Mr. President, in addition to accepting these two amendments, the committee also recommended increased funding for many of the other NIH research institutes.

The National Cancer Institute continues to be the focus of intensive research on the early detection and treatment of various forms of cancer. Research into the prevention and treatment of this fatal disease should be made a primary national priority. The committee recommended an increase of $35 million over the budget estimate and $8 million over the House bill.

The National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences' purpose is to identify the health problems posed by our manmade environment, and to suggest preventive and therapeutic measures. One needs only to spend a day in any one of our major urban cities to realize the importance that this institute is to our future. The impending environmental health problems, and if we are to leave a suitable environment for our children, we must be well aware of the dangers of environmental toxicology, respiratory diseases, and aerosol pollutants posed by poor environmental management.

Mr. President, I have mentioned just a few activities funded by this bill. All of them are urgently needed. The importance of proper health must not be downgraded. These additional appropriations deserve the full support of the Senate.

COMMITMENT TO RESEARCH UNDER PENDING BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a most important aspect of the present bill under consideration is the amounts appropriated for medical research under the auspices of the National Institutes of Health. Over the past several years, I have taken part in the interest in the sponsorship of research by the various Federal agencies, but particularly the sponsorship by the Department of Defense. I have never questioned the caliber of the work being sponsored by the Defense Department; at times I have raised questions about the legitimacy of the sponsorship and have offered proposals that were designed to stimulate a shift of the sponsorship to a more appropriate government agency. In this case is the type of research mentioned in a letter I received from a member of the faculty of the Jefferson Medical College of Philadelphia. For many years his research has been sponsored by Defense, and I am sure it is research of the highest caliber. Recently, he has been informed that this research will be terminated.

I bring this case to the attention of the Senate to illustrate the very important need for the additional funds to assure the orderly transition from Defense to the civilian agencies. The amount of moneys appropriated to the Defense Department for basic research has been reduced over the past year, and I am sure will be reduced this coming
year. However, for the Federal Government to act in a responsible manner, the civil servants and Congress must recognize that basic research should have its budgets increased at least by an amount reduced from the Department of Defense. In fact, the amounts should also reflect the loss of the research purchased because of inflation.

I wish to commend the distinguished chairman (Mr. MAGNUSON) and the ranking member (Mr. CORRIN) and the members of the full Appropriations Committee in this matter for increasing the allocations for the NIH and above those originally budgeted so that research of this basic nature can be maintained under their auspices. I note that the committee has recommended $33 million be added to the National Heart and Lung Institute and that $8 million be added to the National Institute of Arthritic and Metabolic Diseases. At the various other Institutes, other specific additions are made. I believe the detailed, thoughtful recommendations for additional sponsorship of research under the NIH. At a time when we are hearing of increasing difficulties of the Nation's medical problems, the genuine threat that many might have to close their doors because of financial difficulties, this money is well spent. What the country needs is more doctors, more and better medical schools and better facilities for research. It is not the case that fewer doctors, less medical emphasis.

A few months ago I prepared a statement for Mr. DODD'S Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development, wherein I implied the New Office of Management and Budget's claim that $31.7 billion is a more rigorous responsibility for the viability of our research facilities. I believe that the additional recommendations in this bill for basic research at various Institutes at the NIH are perfect examples of this kind of change and that there is a perfect example of the reallocation of resources through the civilian sector which might otherwise have been channeled through the Defense Department.

I hope that the additional moneys recommended by our committee and earlier by the House of Representatives will be expended so that the current pressures on the research community in this country will be alleviated. This is not the place to save money. This is the money that will save lives.

Again I wish to commend the chairman and the ranking member and all Members of the Senate and the House who have supported these increases and impose the truth that budget bureaus must assume their responsibility for permitting expenditures of these moneys.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me made before the House Committee on Science, Research, and Development be incorporated at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:*

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MIKE MANFIELD

I have been asked to comment on the government's role regarding the support of research. I appreciate this invitation by the Chairman of the Subcommitte on Science, Research, and Development. Specifically, I suppose the question really is whether adequate government support of science can be carried on if there is a permanent shift away from research funded by the Department of Defense. What must be considered is the relationship of the Department of Defense and the National Institutes of Health to research; what part research plays in their overall functions and as a related matter, whether strong ties should be continued between the two. The answer to these questions by and large will determine this nation's entire science policy for the years ahead.

I do not believe that the quality of life on earth tomorrow will be determined in large part by the measure of the scientific resource unleashed today. There is thus a significant public responsibility to sponsor research in the various scientific disciplines and to keep the way clear to follow up on breakthroughs. Detractors of the country, however, is a more delicate responsibility. To a great extent this emphasis is determined by the size of the resource devoted to the various disciplines.

Since the end of World War II, the Government's contribution to research, development, and the supporting facilities has contributed to $20 billion and by whom that money was spent has determined not only the science policy of this nation but the educational level of our students and training. During this time we have had over $2 billion of the government's contribution to science has been channeled through the Department of Defense and that the bulk of this money purchased research of the highest quality. However, not nearly so clear is the rationale that dictated that the Defense Department be the principal sponsor of agency for this vital research.

For the past 25 years the Pentagon has sponsored research in almost every scientific discipline imaginable. From the most esoteric examinations of ornithology to the study of brain disorders. Detractors of the country, the Pentagon has run the gamut in its research endeavors. By necessity, therefore, the Pentagon assumed a significant role in determining science policy. The desirability of such a large role for this mission agency is the basic issue confronting us.

haustively considered. Perhaps the reorganized Office of Management and Budget can achieve more than its management functions. My experience in trying to get current information on research confirmed yet again that the need for organizations to keep secret how they operate often be kept from the public and that the administration of government-funded research is better left to the researchers than to the politically more necessary in a time when the dominant question has changed from: "What can we spend our increasing research appropriations on and find the available appropriations for research?"

In this connection, to overcome the inertia to get out of comfortable, well-worn rutts some effort was made to encourage more research. It was during the Senate's appropriation hearings in 1968 that I asked Dr. Foster of the Pentagon about the Defense Department's troubles with research. Some years ago, the Defense Department was adamant in its position that at any part of the spectrum of research then being undertaken, even though by definition the outcome of research is unpredictable, nor its possible relevance to military science known. This testimony reinforced the conviction that research done funded by the military appropriations has a momentum, and that only the most forceful efforts by Congress could effect change in the direction of rechanneling federal responsibility for research. At that time, it seemed clear that there was not a national policy that viewed the nation's long-term interests. What to do about it was another question.

During the floor debate on the military authorization bill (FL 91–121) for fiscal year 1970, I added a rider which appeared as Section 203. It reads as follows:

"None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act may be used to support any study, except those studies, unless such project or study has a direct or apparent relationship to a specific military function or operation."

I believe Section 203 is a necessary and practicable step towards the goals of reducing the heavy dependence of American science that has built up since the early 1960's. Properly and imaginatively administered, it can also lead to a strengthening and a rebuilding of the foundation for the future of our national security. The intent of the provision is clear. It is a mandate to reduce the research community's dependence on the Defense Department when it appears that the investigation under consideration could be sponsored more reasonably by a civilian agency. After all, the Office of Science and Technology has not decided what current information is available. However, more research projects should be collected, who should do the collecting, how it should be done, and how we can achieve approval. Perhaps we need some one to tackle this issue with the vigor of past efforts when the relat-1 question of cataloging and making available the results of research was already under consideration."

The addition of Section 203 to the military authorization law thus sought to set in motion a change in attitude that would appreciably and radically improve in an effort to afford the Executive Branch an opportunity to start a process that would lead to the transfer of responsibilities from the Defense Department to the civilian agencies—primarily to the National Science Foundation.

Clearly, Congress does not exist to operate in a vacuum. By law, however, Congress does have a responsibility, together with the President, to establish policies, approve budgets, and to assert a right to assume that policies so established will be followed. Much progress has already been made since Section 203 became law in the last year. In the latter part of 1968, the President's Office worked with some quarters. The authorization for NSF funding for the coming fiscal year has been increased by about $75 million over last year. The Senate Appropriations Committee endorsed the Defense Department's share of basic research funds will be $50 million less than that of the National Science Foundation. By 203, it is expected that the section 203 intend to cut off the Defense Department from research that it needs. It is neither necessarily nor anti-research. Whether the language will be interpreted strictly or loosely, it is hoped that the ultimate result of this whole endeavor will be a concept of a fundamental responsibility by the federal government. Hopefully, we will see in the near future that the civilian agencies under the leadership of the National Science Foundation try to take top as the primary source for these research funds. The responsibility of the civilian agencies to fund an appropriate share of basic research is set forth in the Senator Corporation section 203. The Pentagon will continue to have a responsibility for research—even basic research, one that allows those entrusted with the national defense the exchange with the agencies at the frontiers of science. The role of the Defense Department in research, however, is intended to be residual rather than predominant.

Turning now to the DoD response to Section 203, I believe that the review of research by DoD could have benefited from guidance and criteria issued by its top management. That did not happen. Instead, all that happened was for the Office to send a memorandum to its constituent agencies informing them of Section 203 and telling them to comply.

I believe DoD should do their utmost, and in the Secretary of Defense's annual report to the National Academy of Sciences directly in the review. He did volunteer to offer the Academy for any follow-up review. More important, he agreed to work with the Academy to do two things. First, to formulate principles which might guide the administration of Section 203. Second, to work on a basis for the consequences of Section 203 with respect to the future of federal research policy and the National Science Foundation. The Senate Committee of the National Academy to do so, then, experience with Section 203 indicates that it should do so now.

To date, there have been differences in application of Section 203. As we shall see, some agencies have made changes in their administrative practices. On the one hand, for example, the Advanced Projects Research Agency asserts that none of its projects fail the test of Section 203, and that the Office of the Secretary of Defense has singlet some as questionable in

---

the federal government for general-purpose research through contracts and grants. The continuing concern on the part of the Executive Branch regarding the adequacy of basic research in areas which are closely related to their missions is recognizable. It is a healthy and desirable, especially in the response to current national needs, and shall continue."

Second: "Mission-oriented governmental agencies long have done a range basic research, information from which is calculated to have a direct bearing on some aspect of their mission. . . . All mission-oriented governmental agencies are in close contact with the best and most advanced research which can apply to their problems."

The bill is from President Eisenhower's Executive Office, dated March 15, 1954, on scientific research. This order still stands. It was not rescinded by President Kennedy, upon luck, upon happen future. The second comes from the recent advice to the President by his Task Force on Science Policy.

Section 203 opened to the Administration a unique opportunity to set in motion a rebalancing of the responsibilities of federal agencies for the funding of basic research. The bill was signed into law on September 1, 1960. Yet the budget for fiscal year 1971 does not indicate that this opportunity has been taken. There is no indication of a shift of basic research unrelated to defense needs to the National Science Foundation or other agencies and, at the same time, a corresponding increase in funding for research in this category or their total funding. None-theless, in my judgment, such projects should continue to their normal expiration, which will provide time for coordinated review by the Department of Defense with the civil agencies and for leadership and initiatives from the Office of Science and Technology. Despite its limited reaction time, I still look to the Office of Science and Technology to provide the leadership necessary so that research affected by Section 203 which should be continued in the national interest will have a fair chance at the available basic research funds.

All that is required under Section 203 is relevancy, which is not a dirty word as some critics of the Section sometimes seem to suggest. Relevance does not preclude agencies from using funds from Section 203 to fund the Defense Department from funding any and all research at colleges and universities. Had that been our purpose, we would have inserted the amendment. What Section 203 does is to begin to close one second and a backdoor National Science Foundation which has grown up in the Department over the years.

It seems to me that the Defense Department can readily identify and justify many fields of fundamental research about which enough is known to judge their relevance to defense needs now and in the foreseeable future. Research funded in such fields as a result of announcement and publication of such a list may be devoted in part for research that would permit scientists to explore aspects of science which add to understanding in fields reasonably related to defense needs.

The idea of relevance is now new. I should think that the Science Adviser to the President would be well acquainted with the following sentiments that support the principle of relevancy.

First: "The Foundation shall be increasingly responsible for providing support by

2 In this letter to Rep. D'Addario of June 5, 1970, Secretary Seamans wrote of Section 203: "We have attempted to meet the intent, as we understood it, rather than merely the letter of Section 203. Accordingly, we made no distinction between FY 70 or prior year funded research in our review. . . ."

If the Executive Branch is thinking about policy in these terms, no evidence of it has yet been published. These recent inputs from the President's Task Force on Science Policy and the National Goals research staff.

We can look to the scientific community for advice. Yet I recall that this community speaking through the National Academy of Sciences, has been unable to answer the questions on how much money should be spent for research and how it should be divided up.

In assessing the risk of oversimplifying, it would be my judgment that we can no longer rely for guidance upon an uncoordinated, unplanned collection of laws, orders, statements, understandings, and conditions. These all have their place. But we must bring them together, which is what the inquiry of the Subcommittee is all about. I would hope that the Subcommittee on Science Research and Development will continue its role of Congressional leadership and stimulate enough interest so that our leaders of government and science will sit down together and work out the principal outline and content of the kind of policy that is needed, all that is heard and written must be a long-recognized responsibility and set forth a national policy for science. It is long overdue.

PROGRAM

Mr. GRIF|FFIN, Mr. President, before the vote, I would like to ask the majority leader, for the benefit of the Senate, about the schedule for the remainder of today and Monday.

Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. President, there will be no further business today after the pending business is disposed of. After the pending business is disposed of, it is the understanding of the majority leader that we will lay before the Senate the drug bill, Calendar No. 1355, S. 3562, which I think has been worked out all around.

That will be the order on Monday when we convene and we will be coming in at 12 noon.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR FANNIN ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the Journal on Monday, the distinguished Senator from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN) be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. President, that will be followed, beginning at 2 p.m., with debate on the television veto vote. It is expected—and this is tentative—that following that we will take Calendar No. 1259, H.R. 16306, the financing of international organizations, Calendar 1345, H.R. 6309, the large irrigation bill, and perhaps Calendar 1356, H.R. 471, the Taos Indian bill, and that also is tentative. Before Wednesday we hope to be able to finish all those bills. In connection with the class action for consumers, I would like to come up next week but it will probably come up a week from Monday.

Mr. GRIF|FFIN, I thank the Senator.
All Senators may share in this success. It represents an outstanding achievement. Especially am I grateful for the splendid cooperation exhibited by all Members.

Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

The PRESIDENT’S FAMILY ASSISTANCE PLAN

Mr. JAVITS, Mr. President, there have been reports as recently as today that the President is losing liberal support for the proposed family assistance plan, and that a number of liberal Senators may vote against the administration’s proposed program. Whether that plan may be considered on the floor.

Historically, the confluence of circumstances is such that it may prove to be a chance for putting a floor under welfare and making it a national responsibility, which if missed, may not recur again for a decade.

The family assistance plan, as proposed by the administration, clearly falls short of the fullest reform that may be accomplished, but we must not overlook its attributes while seeking to eliminate its shortcomings. It is, in fact, the first proposal to establish a basic Federal cash “floor” for substantial numbers of the poor, to extend coverage to the working poor, to alleviate the fiscal burden of the States and the cities, and to provide substantial amounts for child care.

Mr. President, it would be ironic, indeed, if at this historic moment those liberal forces that have brought us to the threshold of welfare reform were to fall apart, missing this, perhaps the sole opportunity in the coming years, to effect a basic and needed reform.

I cannot stand by and watch a proposal of such historic significance go down the drain either at the hands of those who regard it as providing too much or at the hands of those who view it as providing too little.

It is deplorable—but a reality nevertheless—that it appears easier to take a step on the moon than to take one solid, meaningful step on behalf of a 24.4 million poor, who through no fault of their own are unable to provide for themselves.

We must make every effort to make the step for welfare reform a big one—but we should take a first step this session, nevertheless.

As the somewhat more conservative Members of the Senate have had their opportunity to try to reduce the proposal to an experiment, so must liberals join together and correct the major inadequacies of the proposal; but not at the price of seeing it go under now.

I feel, at the very least, the administration reform proposal should be reformed: