By Mr. MONDALE (for himself and Mr. RIBICOFF):

S. 3639. A bill to provide for the development and implementation of programs for youth camp safety. Referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce today, for myself and Mr. RIBICOFF, the Children and Youth Camp Safety Act of 1974. This bill is identical to one previously introduced in the House by Representative DOMINICK V. DANIELS.

As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth, I have been troubled by reports of inadequate safety and health standards in some of the camps to which we entrust our children. No other government functionaries are available on the extent of accidents and illnesses incurred by youngsters while they are attending camp. But the most recent figures show that in the summer of 1973, 2,384 youngsters were injured, 1,223 suffered serious illnesses while at camp. Many of us have seen the disturbing and dramatic press accounts of some of these incidents.

Two years ago, the Congress defeated a legislative proposal to establish Federal standards for camp safety. Instead, Congress directed the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct a study to determine the extent of "preventable accidents and illnesses" occurring in camps, the effectiveness of State and local camp safety laws, and the need for Federal legislation.

Now that this study has been completed, we can no longer delay effective congressional action on this problem. I am introducing this bill today with the intention of holding hearings on it and on Senator RIBICOFF's Youth Camp Safety Act before my Subcommittee on Children and Youth. By approval of Mr. RIBICOFF's Youth Camp Safety Act in 1971, the Senate has already indicated its interest in and commitment to improving youth camp safety in this country. The purpose of my Subcommittee's investigations will be to develop the most effective measure for accomplishing that goal.

The subcommittee has scheduled a hearing on these bills at 10 a.m. on Monday, June 18, on which 15 states or congressmen who wish to testify are requested to contact the subcommittee at 225-8708.

I ask unanimous consent that a number of relevant documents be printed in the Record at this time. They are a legislative history of camp safety legislation prepared by the Library of Congress; two fine articles on the subject which have appeared in the "Potomac magazine," and "Remembering Children," from Potomac magazine; and "Protecting Children at Summer Camp," an editorial; and the text of the Children and Youth Camp Safety Act of 1974.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE

To: Senate Children and Youth Subcommittee.

From: Education and Public Welfare Division.

Subject: Youth camp safety.

In response to your request, the following is a summary of current legislation related to youth camp safety since the 90th Congress.

Since 1967, several bills have been introduced in each Congress to provide for some Federal role in developing and maintaining youth camp safety standards. The bills included legislation and grants and to the States for developing and implementing State programs for youth camp safety, and for a study of the extent and enforcement of State laws and regulations governing the operation of youth camps. In the 90th Congress, two days of hearings were held on such bills before the Select Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor on May 15, 1970.

In the 91st Congress, hearings were held before the Select Subcommittee on Labor on the same committee, and the full committee heard testimony on May 8, 1970. Both Houses adopted the Conference report (S. Rept. 92-618) which included (The "Youth Camp Safety Act") by Mr. Ribicoff, adopted by vote, authorizing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to award grants to the States to implement youth camp safety programs, including the development of standards for youth camp safety. The bill failed to pass the House by a vote of 151-152.

In the 92nd Congress, the Select Labor Subcommittee again held hearings on youth camp safety bills but no bill was reported. Nevertheless, the Senate, on August 6, 1971, passed the Education Amendments of 1971 (S. 659) which included the "Youth Camp Safety Act." In the 93rd Congress, a bill similar to the Ribicoff Youth Camp Safety Act was introduced in the House by Representatives MONTGOMERY H. CLARK and GUSTAVUS N. STUBBS.

In passing their version of the Education Amendments of 1971 (H.R. 7248) on November 4, 1971, the House voted 184-166 to adopt a floor amendment by Mr. Pickle authorizing Federal grants to States for youth camp safety programs. The amendment authorized Federal grants to States for the development of Federal standards for youth camp safety and allow camps certified by the States as being in compliance with those standards minimum standards to advertise that fact. An advisory council on youth camp safety was created to advise and consult on policy matters relating to youth camp safety and finally, appropriation of $3.1 million for each of the six successive fiscal years, beginning with FY 74.

In the Senate, after passing their version of the Education Amendments of 1971 (S. 659) on May 24, 1972, the Senate voted 92-3 to adopt a floor amendment by Senator RICHARD L. HOFSTETER, Jr., the Youth Camp Safety Act. Both Houses adopted the Conference report and S. 659 (by this time named Mitch Kurman). Handwritten, in private stationery, and without any financial or political benefit to him, a letter dated November 9, 1971, from a Westport, Connecticut, furniture salesman named Mitch Kurman. The letter was to a senator—Senator Mondale, a Democrat from Minnesota, who was running for re-election that year. The letter, written on plain stationery, and without any financial or political benefit to him, was a personal letter that was much more rare, more heroic—is to keep the tragedy from the mind, send it trackless into the darkness of unknown apathy, trying to focus on a major national tragedy but illuminating only small corners, not whole rooms. Who listens? Who cares?
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at camps where counselors have little knowledge of dangerous waters or trails, where safety equipment is not provided, and where safety and health inspections are rare or nonexistent. The statistical breakdown between safe and unsafe camps is not known. A possible guide is that out of 11,000 camps in the country, only 3,500 are accredited by the American Camping Association, and even though the A.C.A.'s inspections are not strict. Only two states have legislation concerning sanitation. About fifteen have safety regulations that would be meaningful. Only three or four make reference to personnel. Over the years, Congress had passed all kinds of bills to protect alligators, coyotes, birds, and bobcats but it was not yet concerned about the 250,000 children annually disabled from camp accidents. A week later, the House debated the youth camp-safety bills. It rejected the Daniels proposal and in its place approved an amendment offered by Representative J. J. (Jake) Pickle, a Texas Democrat. This called for a survey of the situation. Three Congresses—the 90th, 91st, and 92nd—had held hearings on summer camps. They told me, the people in Rockefeller's office, that the camps in New York have to comply with the sanitary code. I asked what that meant and they said that it simply means safe food and safe water. I asked, 'What about personnel?' and I was told they were not concerned with personnel. So I asked how are you going to determine if a camp is safe when I want to send a child to one? I was told, 'They print brochures, and if you read them, you will know if you do expect us to do? I said, 'There must be some legislation. There's a law for spitting on the sidewalk. There ought to be a law for spitting at kids.'

I thought it would be acceptable for keeping with a large paper mill in the area. They shoot on a riverbank and write out their cords of pulpwood logs to the mill. The Great Northern Paper Company has been one of lonely non-violent kids—keeping them safe. I'd lose my mind if I knew these numbers killed. •

I thought if you brought this to the attention of the officials the they'd do something. They would tighten up on the situation so I thought I could let it go. I did not expect to see my own boy alive again, but I felt why should this happen to someone else? It is an unsettling subject. On check­

A friend of mine, a biologist and if I was ever told to in­

I expected him to be paddling, and the water would not go into that water. When I went to the west branch of the Penobscot, I was not concerned with personnel. So I
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When he went to work on the Connecticut legislature, known as a stickler group, Kurman found that the editorial support of the state's newspapers was not to his liking. While he was being debated in committee, five teen-age boys in Fairfield County took a small sailboat into the Connecticut River. Two of the five boys and two life jackets were on board. The boat capsized, with three boys drowning and two surviving. The latter had on the life jackets.

Although Kurman had noticed there was a fickle group, Kurman from a legislative assistant) was not able to muscle or shuffle a paper off and his bill. There's nothing wrong with the bleak Boating Commission. Chalecki replied of a small and conservative to be put on before the danger area or a Richmond. He added, "There is perhaps the most precious commodity we have—the lives of our youngsters."

Although the hearings were a success and glowing statements of support were heard for the Daniels bill, nothing ever came of it in the way of legislation. Dan Krivit said it couldn't muster enough enthusiasm. Kurman warned the Congress did not act, particularly when the American Camping Association—which is not a militant group—endorsed the Daniels proposals. Although Kurman had been around politicians enough by now to know that most of them were banal lightweight, he still had a faith that change would come. At the hear­

ing, he finished his testimony by saying: "I want to thank you, Chairman Daniels. I think the ordinary citizen of this country can go before the representatives that we have and get a hearing such as I have had. It certainly does do a lot. It is this wonderful country we live in than anything I have ever read in textbooks or anything else, and I want to thank you very much." Daniel Daniels was present to hear that some of the politicians were touched by Kurman's sincerity. "He sounded almost corny, even a little pious. But nobody in the room moved a muscle or shuffled a paper when he spoke." 

Daniels and Krivit, as disappointed as Kurman and agreed to hold the law, Kurman noticed there was still pressure to weaken it. Several groups, including the Boy Scouts and the National Rifle Association, were involved. Kurman wrote to the state's Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources in Hartford and found a sympathetic official in Bernard W. Chalecki, director of the Boating Commission. Chalecki replied that when the law went into effect many re­quests were received from the Boy Scouts asking for exemptions. The Boy Scouts said they could not afford to buy a sufficient number of life-savings devices, so the law should be changed. Kurman wrote to the commis­sion never granted the exemptions. An irony of the Boy Scout request is an article from a Boy Scout magazine that says: "If the 'life jackets or jackets should be standard equipment for every canoe trip—'one for every person in the party. These life vests are available in most stores, on all occasions when conditions of weather or water indicate there is any possibility of danger of upset or swamping from wind, waves, rapids or other causes. They are to be put on before the dager area or time is reached and kept on until after the time of hazard has passed."

Kurman says that the spark of contradiction flying off this flinty opposition, "There are the Boy Scouts—holy, pure and all-American, preaching safety for the public, and nearly all the representatives. One of those on the Hill visited by Kurman in the early days and who has stayed with him is Dan Krivit, chief counsel for the House Select Subcommittee on Labor. His subcommittee was the pad from which a youth camp-safety bill would be launched, if it came around," Krivit recalled. "He was emo­tion. He did all the talking. He made de­mands. He damned congressmen as do­

ments. The appeal of Kurman was that he was passionate for saving the taxpayers' money (though not on defense spending), spoke up. For a survey for $175,000, asked Gross. What was the result of watching the federal government set up one of the first of the 'nurse' to look out for the kids in camp. A columnist for the Washington Post, Douglas McKeilway, said, "Any bill such as this one is a step in the right direction. I hope the legislation will not be allowed to fall into dormancy."

Although the public argument against federal legislation for camp safety was that the states could and should do the job them­selves, Kurman believed another reason existed also—money. "Let's face it," he said, "All legislation is driven by the money for things like life vests, sturdy boats, qualified personnel, well, it means you have an expense account, not just a expense account of a camp is a business. There's nothing wrong with that. Profits aren't evil. They only be­come bad when you risk lives for the sake of making money."

Instead of being depressed by the brutal defeat he had taken, Kurman became even more dogged. He kept in close contact with Krivit and Nick Daniels. Both ad­vised Kurman that not much more could be done in the 91st Congress; let things ride. The only source of encouragement was in the press, as printed in the newspapers—"from the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act and the Occupational Health and Safety Act. Both required that standards be set and en­forced by the federal government. In Con­gress could approve of this kind of "federal interference" that would affect industries with earnings in the tens of billions, why couldn't a camp-safety bill—involving only one industry—be passed also? Even more compelling was another fact: if the employ­ers of camps were to fight back, they could pass a federal safety law why not the children? Yet even this encouragement had a bleak side to it. In 1969, Congress had passed a safety­ amendments to the law for 1968, but it had been considering the law since 1961—eighteen years and thousands of dead work­ers before. Camp safety had only an issue for six years and the total number of corpses was still only in the hundreds. Have a little patience, Mr. Kurman.

Going to the post for the third time, Daniels held hearings in July 1972. The same facts of tragedy and negligence came out, facts that by now were trotted out like tired dray horses. This time, the House was faced with the issue of a co-op. One of the bills the Senate had passed, the Ribicoff bill still stood. The scene was quiet until November. Kurman again campaigned for his bill. It was on the table because it was known that the House would soon debate the bill. Camp-safety bills as an amendment to the Higher Education Act. As late as June 1974 there was little fullness of hope, that he still talked as if he had discovered the outrage only that morning. "I have faith in Congress," he said. "The public pressure is just overwhelming. I've persuaded since the last session?" He ran off a few names, less known to most than the senators, makers of baseball's expansion teams. Yet they were people who had power over our lives. On November 4, the House, working well into the night, argued section by section of Title 19 of the Higher Education Act. Kurman had allies who knew their facts and argued forcefully.
Rep. John Dent of Pennsylvania: “Does anybody in this place really believe that these camps in America are all safe and quiet little havens? Let me tell you something. Anybody who has happened to have been around any of these camps, or have attended these camps, or have talked to children who have attended these camps, or who have been involved in any way, realize that these camps are not places of refuge, but places where the children will be hurt in some form or another. Some of these injuries may be minor, but some of them may be so serious that you can never see them. But they steal and rob from us all the same. They steal our sons’ and daughters’ youth and their health, and often their lives.”

Another vote was from a New York Republican, Peter Peyser. Referring to the arguments calling for inaction or delay, he said, “I must say I am a little amazed by some of the things I am hearing said about what has happened in these camps. I think the issue of camp safety is as important as the issue of training or safety in camps. Statistics are not very helpful. I have here a report of children killed this past summer, and this is one section of the country. They were all killed in camps; killed in accidents, for the most part, in the last few months.”

However persuasive these arguments were, Jake Pickle of Austin, Texas, would have none of it. His opposition remained firm: "I'm sure they will," he said with fervor. "I think the intent was that these camps exist, and that they be allowed to run them. This is the only place in the whole activity of youth in the entire country where there is not one single federal regulation, not even minimum requirements for safety.”
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is the main reason for bringing in federal standards, and there are no camp safety laws at all, and of the ones that do only a few enforce them to any meaningful degree. Thus, it is often left to the conscience or goodwill of camp owners to provide the most in safety. Many owners are strict and do all they can for the children, but some are not. Should they be allowed to set up a camp? How can parents tell the difference between safe and unsafe camps? By scanning the brochures? As for state inspection, only 3,000 of the nation's 10,500 camps are accredited by the American Camping Association. The proposed Youth Camp Safety legislation establishes minimum federal safety standards which the states can assume on their own—states that do not act will have a Federal structure, HEW paying up to 80 per cent of the costs. The Senate is considering a bill that is weaker, because it would only provide funds for states that wish to adopt a youth camp safety program, leaving unprotected children in states that refuse to comply. The weakness of this approach is the poor record of the states in adopting youth camp safety legislation. Since hearings began three Congresses ago, only six states have upgraded their programs, and four have been con­clusive. Hope is offered in the Senate, however, because Sen. Walter F. Mondale (D-Minn.) will soon introduce another bill, one as strong as the House bill, back in the House.

Too many children and their parents have learned the hard way that summer camp safety is a neglected issue. It is shameful that only Rep. Daniels and a few others—including private citizens using their own time and money—have been active in this lonely but important battle. We need a stronger commitment from HEW, the kind that has been lacking for so long and in part has been contributing to the many abuses within private camp safety.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have the text of the bill printed in the Record.

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

S. 3639

A bill to provide for the development and implementation of programs for youth camp safety

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Children and Youth Camp Safety Act".

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

Sec. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to protect and safeguard the health and well being of the youth of the Nation attending day camps, resident camps, and travel camps, by providing for establishment of Federal standards for safe operation of youth camps, to provide Federal assistance to the States in developing programs for implementing safety standards and standards for different types of camps, and to provide the Federal implementation of safety standards for youth camps in States which do not implement such standards and for Federal recreational camps, thereby providing assurance to parents and interested citizens that youth camps and Federal recreational camps meet minimum safety standards.

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 3. For purposes of this Act—

(1) The term "youth camp" means—

(a) any parcel or parcels of land having the facilities and equipment necessary for a camp as the term is generally understood, used wholly or in part for recreational or educational purposes and accommodating five or more children under 18 years of age, living apart from their relatives, parents, or legal guardians for a period of, or portions of, 5 days or more, and includes a site that is operated as a day camp or as a resident camp, and

(b) any travel camp which sponsors or conducts group tours within the United States, or foreign group tours originating or terminating within the United States, for recreational or purposes, accommodating within the group five or more children under 18 years of age, living apart from their relatives, parents, and legal guardians for a period of 5 days or more.

(2) The term "youth camp safety standards" means standards applicable to youth camps, and such operations of youth camps, in such areas as—

(a) minimal equipment which are free from recognized hazards that are causing, or are likely to cause, death, serious bodily harm, or personal injury;

(b) personnel qualifications and health, first aid, and medical services; food handling, mass feeding, and cleanliness; water supply and waste disposal; water safety, including use of lakes and rivers, swimming and boating equipment and practices; vehicle condition and operation; building and site design; equipment; and condition and density of use.

(3) The term "youth camp operator" means any private agency, organization, or person, and any individual, who operates, controls, or supervises a youth camp, whether such camp is operated for profit or not for profit.

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

(5) The term "State" includes each of the several States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

GENERAL DUTY

Sec. 4. Each youth camp operator shall provide to each camper safe and healthful conditions and personnel which are free from recognized hazards that are causing, or are likely to cause, death, serious bodily harm, or personal injury, as well as adequate and qualified instruction, and supervision at all times, wherever or however such camp activities are conducted and with due consideration of conditions existing in nature.

FEDERATION OF YOUTH CAMP SAFETY STANDARDS

Sec. 5. The Secretary shall develop, and shall by rule promulgate, modify, or revoke such standards applicable to youth camps in the United States for the development and enforcement of such standards and standards developed under paragraph (2) in any State which does not have such standards or does not have such standards which (and the enforcement of such standards) are or will be at least as effective in providing safe operation of youth camps (other than travel camps) in the State as the standards promulgated under section 5.

(2) provides for the development of enforcement of such standards which standards and the enforcement of such standards) are or will be at least as effective in providing safe operation of youth camps (other than travel camps) in the State as the standards promulgated under section 5,

(3) provides for the enforcement of such standards developed under paragraph (2) in all youth camps in the State which are operated by the State or its political subdivisions.
such plan is not supported by substantial evidence the court shall affirm the Secretary’s decision. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States. The Secretary shall make the necessary adjustments on the plans approved for carrying out the State plan. Payments under this section may be made in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement or in any other manner the Secretary deems necessary and proper.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1974, and each of the five succeeding fiscal years, such sums as may be necessary to make the grants provided for in this section.

ENFORCEMENT BY SECRETARY; CITATIONS

Sec. 8. (a) The Secretary shall be responsible for the enforcement of safety standards in States which do not have in effect a State plan approved under section 6, and the Secretary shall issue regulations, and promulgate rules, or order promulgated pursuant to section 5, or of any regulations prescribed pursuant to this Act, shall be assessed a civil penalty of up to $1,000 for each such violation.

(c) Any youth camp operator who fails to correct a violation for which a citation has been issued under section 8(b) within the period permitted for correction, or who willfully or otherwise be assessed a civil penalty of not more than $500 for each day during which such failure or violation continues, shall be assessed in its normal course of business.

(d) For purposes of subsection (d) a serious violation shall be deemed to exist in a reasonably foreseeable probability that death or serious physical harm could result from a condition which exists, or from one or more practices, means, methods, operations, or processes which have been adopted or are in use, in such camp, unless the operator did not, and could not with the exercise of reasonable diligence, know of the presence of the violation.

(e) Civil penalties owed under this Act shall be paid to the Secretary for deposit in the Treasury of the United States and shall accrue to the United States and may be recovered in a civil action in the name of the United States against the person who caused the violation to have occurred or where the operator has his principal office.

PROCEDURES TO COUNTERACT IMMINENT DANGERS

Sec. 11. (a) The United States district courts shall have jurisdiction, upon petition of the Secretary, to restrain any conditions or practices in any youth camp, or in any place where camp activities are conducted, which are such that a danger exists which could reasonably be expected to cause death or serious physical harm. And immediately before the imposition of such danger may be eliminated through the enforcement procedures otherwise provided by this Act. Any order issued under this section may require such steps to be taken as may be necessary to avoid, correct, or remove such imminent danger and prohibit the presence of any individuals in locations or under conditions where such imminent danger exists, except individuals whose presence is necessary to avoid, correct, or remove such imminent danger.

(b) Upon the filing of any such petition, the district court shall have jurisdiction to grant such injunction, preliminary or temporary restraining order pending the outcome of an enforcement proceeding pursuant to this Act.

(c) Whenever and as soon as an inspector concludes that there is such a danger described in subsection (a) exist in any campsite or place of camp activity, he shall inform the operator and the supervisory personnel of the danger and that he is recommending to the Secretary that relief be sought.

VARIATIONS

Sec. 12. The Secretary, upon application by a camp owner showing extraordinary circumstances or undue hardship, and upon the determination of the Secretary that the conditions, practices, or activities proposed to be used are as safe and healthful as those which would prevail if the same conditions, practices, or activities were carried out, shall be allowed the use of such variations in the regulations prescribed pursuant to this Act:

(1) For purposes of this section, the Secretary may authorize the use of any of the variations in these regulations, as well as any other variations necessary to promote the health, safety, and welfare of the persons, regardless of the requirements of section 4, of any standard, rule, or order promulgated pursuant to section 5, or of any regulations prescribed pursuant to this Act.

(2) The Secretary may authorize the use of any of the variations in these regulations, as well as any other variations necessary to promote the health, safety, and welfare of the persons, regardless of the requirements of section 4, of any standard, rule, or order promulgated pursuant to section 5, or of any regulations prescribed pursuant to this Act.

(3) The Secretary shall approve all variations in the regulations prescribed pursuant to this Act:

(a) For purposes of this Act, the term ‘variation’ shall mean the use of any of the variations in these regulations, as well as any other variations necessary to promote the health, safety, and welfare of the persons, regardless of the requirements of section 4, of any standard, rule, or order promulgated pursuant to section 5, or of any regulations prescribed pursuant to this Act.

(b) Any youth camp operator who has received a second or subsequent citation for a violation of any of the provisions of section 4, any standard, rule, or order promulgated pursuant to section 5, or of any regulations prescribed pursuant to this Act, shall be assessed a civil penalty of up to $2,500 for each violation.

(b) Any youth camp operator who has received a second or subsequent citation for a violation of any of the provisions of section 4, any standard, rule, or order promulgated pursuant to section 5, or of any regulations prescribed pursuant to this Act, shall be assessed a civil penalty of up to $2,500 for each violation.

(b) Any youth camp operator who has received a second or subsequent citation for a violation of any of the provisions of section 4, any standard, rule, or order promulgated pursuant to section 5, or of any regulations prescribed pursuant to this Act, shall be assessed a civil penalty of up to $2,500 for each violation.

(b) Any youth camp operator who has received a second or subsequent citation for a violation of any of the provisions of section 4, any standard, rule, or order promulgated pursuant to section 5, or of any regulations prescribed pursuant to this Act, shall be assessed a civil penalty of up to $2,500 for each violation.

(b) Any youth camp operator who has received a second or subsequent citation for a violation of any of the provisions of section 4, any standard, rule, or order promulgated pursuant to section 5, or of any regulations prescribed pursuant to this Act, shall be assessed a civil penalty of up to $2,500 for each violation.

(b) Any youth camp operator who has received a second or subsequent citation for a violation of any of the provisions of section 4, any standard, rule, or order promulgated pursuant to section 5, or of any regulations prescribed pursuant to this Act, shall be assessed a civil penalty of up to $2,500 for each violation.

(b) Any youth camp operator who has received a second or subsequent citation for a violation of any of the provisions of section 4, any standard, rule, or order promulgated pursuant to section 5, or of any regulations prescribed pursuant to this Act, shall be assessed a civil penalty of up to $2,500 for each violation.
object thereon to religious grounds, except where such use is for the protection of the health or safety of others.

AUTHORIZATION

Sec. 17. There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this Act (as amended by this title) such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for each of the five succeeding fiscal years.

EFFECTIVE DATE

Sec. 18. This Act shall take effect 90 days after the date of its enactment.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 3640. A bill to guarantee to the civilian employees of the executive branch of the United States the right to have a counsel or representative of his choice present during interrogations which may lead to disciplinary actions and to prevent unwarranted reports from employees concerning their private life. Referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' RIGHT TO COUNCIL

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, this week, I introduced S. 3623, a bill to guarantee to Federal employees the right to a prompt evidentiary hearing prior to removal or suspension without pay.

Today I am introducing what I regard as a companion bill. This proposal would guarantee to Federal employees the right to counsel during interrogations which may lead to disciplinary actions and to prevent unwarranted reports from employees concerning their private lives. My congressional colleagues are well aware that I have always strongly defended the U.S. Civil Service. The Federal Government has made great strides since the days of the "spoils system," and today's Civil Service System stands as one of our Nation's great achievements.

But there is still room for considerable improvement. The vast majority of our Federal employees take pride in their jobs, and they are devoted to the service of their country, and I am afraid, however, that we have not yet provided these employees with all of the legal safeguards necessary to carry out their jobs with the steadfastness the Federal service requires.

There is no greater impediment to devoted, wholehearted service than the threat of unreasonable or capricious discipline. Unfortunately, we have yet to establish fully adequate protection against the threat of arbitrary suspension or removal. The legislation I am proposing would go a long way toward establishing this protection. The bill is part of the legislative program of the National Treasury Employees Union. I have found from working on legislation with this group, as well as other Government employee unions, that they are concerned not simply with improving the lot of their own members, but with improving the Civil Service System, and thereby strengthening our American system of Government.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

S. 3641. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to extend the authorizations for a 2-year period, and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee on Public Works and Economic Development.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Economic Development of the Committee on Public Works, I introduce today a bill to extend and amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended. The bill provides for continued authority of the Economic Development Administration and the seven Title V Regional Action Planning Commissions. Present authority expires on June 30, 1974.

I am pleased that Senator JENNINGS Randolph, chairman of the Committee on Public Works, is cosponsoring this bill. Senator Randolph has long championed economic development programs, giving critical support at all times but especially when the executive branch has been less than steadfast in its support.

The Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 finally, in 1965, became law in the same year of the Appalachian Regional Development Act. The Congress intended to bring Federal assistance to areas and regions suffering from high unemployment and underemployment. A partnership was established by counties, multi-county districts, States, and the Federal Government has resulted over the years from this legislation.

The purpose of this bill is to extend the authorization of funds and programs under the 1965 Act for a 3-year authorization period is necessary to build back stability into the administration of these programs. Congress is again telling this administration that it does not want to terminate these successful programs. We had to fight last year to continue the EDA and the title V Commissions for 1 year. The time for a substantial measure of permanence in these programs is now. The failure of the administration to submit for the appropria
tion of the 1975 act for a number of the programs.

I believe more money not less should be put into these programs. Unfortunately, the underfunding we have experienced in the past has had the effect of reducing the programs and reducing our feedback questioned whether the programs are working with their present capabilities. The bill I introduced today addresses the role of the States and moves to increase their capabilities, without in any way detracting from the role of development districts and local communities.

Mr. President, these programs have a great deal of support in Congress. The extension bill last year passed by a wide bipartisan margin. The need for Federal economic development assistance does not diminish. The economy is in trouble. Unemployment hits today like a hurricane, literally devastating communities. Inflation, of course, hurts everyone, but it hurts the unemployed and low-income families. Its evaluation programs are designed to reach the unemployed and underemployed through long-range efforts.

The need persists and is greater than ever to help the United States to the rural areas, and also in our cities—for the special kinds of tools provided in the Public Works and Economic Development Act. For this reason, I have proposed in this bill authorizations which are significant in comparison with the 1975 act for a number of the programs.

I believe more money not less should be put into these programs. Unfortunately, the underfunding we have experienced in the past has had the effect of reducing the programs and reducing our feedback questioned whether the programs are working with their present capabilities. The bill I introduced today addresses the role of the States and moves to increase their capabilities, without in any way detracting from the role of development districts and local communities.

Mr. President, the principal features of the bill are these: First, to extend the life of these programs for a 3-year period, to June 30, 1977. Second, to continue present program categories, with some amendments and additons. Third, to institute a broad new effort to increase the States' capabilities in economic development. And fourth, to establish a program specifically to deal with the severe economic consequences of base closings, environmental requirements and similar Federal actions.

The bill sets the title I public works authorization at a realistic figure of $300 million annually. The downhill sliding of the economy in recent years means the need for more and more funds. The bill continues the program to help the stabilization of the economy. The bill is designed to reach the unemployed and underemployed through long-range efforts.

Title II authorization which includes business loans and guarantees is increased from a very low $55 million for fiscal year 1974 to $100 million annually.