UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 115—PART 16

JULY 28, 1969, TO AUGUST 4, 1969

(PAGES 20847 TO 22196)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1969

ventions or discoveries, whether or not subject to title 35.

The Congress in 1965 passed legislation revising the patent fee schedule. After a lengthy study there was general agreement that between 65 percent and 75 percent of the costs of the Patent Office operations should be recovered by patent fees. The Johnson administration recommended that Congress authorize the Department of Commerce to set patent fees so that the Patent Office would recover between 65 percent and 75 percent of its costs. The Department of Commerce this year suggested that the adjustment of fees should be considered in separate legislation, and indicated that they would later transmit their recommendations to the Congress. My bill retains the present fee schedule and provides in section 41(e) that the Patent Office shall normally recover 65 percent of its costs. It directs the Commissioner of Patents to transmit his recommendations for adjustment of the fee schedule whenever the recovery rate consistently falls below 65 percent. The current Commissioner of Patents in testifying before the subcommittee in 1965 as the representative of the American Bar Association said "that something of the order of two-thirds of the cost of operating the Patent Office would be a reasonable total amount of fees to be collected."

Too frequently in the consideration of patent legislation, the inventor—especially the independent inventor—is the forgotten American. The subcommittee has received testimony from the American Society of Inventors. This organization has proposed certain amendments to the patent law, such as a statutory prohibition on an employer requiring the assignment of rights in inventions as a condition of employment, and a prohibition on challenges to the validity of a patent more than 5 years after its issuance. A particular cause of concern to inventors is the legal costs involved in obtaining and defending patents. At the request of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT), the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the subcommittee has requested the American Patent Law Association, the National Council of Patent Law Associations, and the Section of Patent, Trademark, and Copyright Law of the American Bar Association to survey what legal assistance is currently available to indigent patent applicants and patentees, and to recommend what additional assistance, possibly with public funds, may be desirable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2756) for the general revision of the Patent Laws, title 35 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2757—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL RELATING TO POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I am introducing today legislation which would authorize Federal assistance to fight pollution caused by erosion of streambanks and roadbanks.

Each year erosion along the Nation's streams and rivers damages and destroys valuable land. Channels and lakes are altered or filled, fish and wildlife destroyed and water polluted. Erosion is nothing less than a form of vandalism of the American land that can and must be stopped.

Uncontrolled erosion is as expensive as it is destructive. Each year streambank erosion along 300,000 miles of the Nation's waterways destroys valuable land. The annual cost of removing sediment from channels, harbors and reservoirs is estimated at $250 million.

Each year we lose 500 million tons of soil from the banks of our streams and rivers. Unless preventive measures are taken immediately, we will see the rapid and substantial destruction of our beautiful rivers and streams.

In Wisconsin alone, 66,000 miles of streambanks are producing or have the potential to produce sediment. Twenty-four thousand miles of these streambanks have critical erosion problems. As much as 30 percent of the total sediment that pollutes streams, lakes, and reservoirs in Wisconsin comes from streambank erosion.

A study by the Department of Interior disclosed that erosion in the red clay area of northwestern Wisconsin has damaged valuable trout and recreational streams, discolored Lake Superior waters off the south shore of the lake and is damaging the lake's aquatic life.

Bank erosion control on large rivers is carried out by the Army Corps of Engineers. Although the Department of Agriculture provides some cost-sharing for streambank erosion control through the agricultural conservation program and the small watersheds program, it is impossible to undertake large-scale community erosion control projects. It is these extensive programs which can be carried out for the entire course of a river or stream which will be most effective.

The bill provides similar assistance for erosion control along the Nation's State and local highways, which needlessly destroys valuable land, defaces the landscape, causes excessive highway maintenance costs and pollutes many of our rivers and streams.

Roadside erosion control on the 875,000 miles of Federal highways is handled by the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads. Another half a million of city streets and roads are handled by municipalities.

This leaves some 2,125,000 miles of State and secondary roads—about 60 percent of the entire U.S. highway system—without adequate protection against roadbank erosion.

Studies have shown that silt losses due to roadbank erosion run as high as 356 tons per acre per year in parts of Wisconsin. An estimated 15 percent of the silt polluting Wisconsin's waters comes from this source.

Under this bill, the Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to cooperate with counties and local conservation districts in furnishing financial and technical assistance in planning and installing erosion control measures. Cooperating States, counties, and local public agencies would bear at least one-quarter of the cost of control measures, with the exception of engineering costs. Those agencies would provide land, easements of rights-of-way and would be responsible for maintenance of the roadside measures.

Mr. President, to consider such measures of minor importance or to ignore them in the name of economy is to be irresponsible and shortsighted. It is only sensible and economical to care for our natural resources and to maintain our highways.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2757) to provide for the control and prevention of pollution, deterioration of water quality, and damage to lands and waters resulting from erosion to the roadbeds and rights-of-way of existing State, county, and other rural roads and highways, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. NELSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 2758—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND SECTION 312 OF THE HOUSING ACT OF 1964

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 312 of the Housing Act of 1964. The purpose of the bill is to eliminate the provision in the 1968 Housing Act which imposes an income limitation on the use of section 312 rehabilitation loans.

The section 312 program, first authorized in the Housing Act of 1964, affects property owners in urban renewal and code enforcement areas. It provides them with 3-percent direct loans to finance the rehabilitation of their homes and businesses.

In 1964, section 312 represented a shift in the emphasis of our renewal programs. No longer would the bulldozer be the main tool of urban renewal. Rather, the emphasis would be on conserving and rehabilitating as much existing housing as possible. Since 1964, the section 312 program has been refined and expanded by subsequent legislation. The Housing Act of 1968 contains several useful new provisions which remove certain restrictions on the use of the 3-percent loans. At the same time, however, the 1968 act also restricts loans for residential properties to persons whose incomes fall within the income ceilings of the 221(d)(3) below-market interest rate program.

The 221(d)(3) limits vary significantly from one community to another. In general, the income limits for a family of four are in the $6,000 to $8,000 a year range. Local housing agencies throughout the country are finding that this restriction, which is just now taking effect for the section 312 program, is seriously impeding the operation of many projects. The National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials estimates that 40 percent of all rehabilitation activity will be affected by the new limits. The Minneapolis Housing and Redevelopment Authority informs me that approximately 50 percent of the people who had qualified for section 312 loans before the passage of the 1968 act will no longer be eligible.

Under current HUD regulations, those projects which received HUD approval for planning or operation before August 1, 1968, are not subject to the restrictive income limits. However, the cutoff date in this regulation will benefit urban renewal projects more than it does code enforcement projects. Since renewal projects received Federal planning grants, the regulation excuses them from the income restrictions if the project has received HUD planning funds before the cutoff date. On the other hand, code enforcement projects do not receive Federal planning grants and therefore are excluded from coverage by the income limits only if the project is approved for operation by HUD before the August 1968 cutoff date.

Thus, in a community where an urban renewal project and a code enforcement project become operational at the same time, the property owners in one project area will be affected by the income limits while the property owners in the other may not be affected. The Jordan code enforcement project in Minneapolis, Minn., is an example of the confusion caused by this new regulation. The Jordan project was funded in May 1969. No Federal funds were received for planning, but the city had been involved with local residents in planning the project 2 years before the enactment of the 1968 Housing Act.

When local planning activities were initiated, Minneapolis housing officials announced that 3 percent rehabilitation loans would be available to all area homeowners. However, since the project was actually funded after the passage of the 1968 act, Jordan residents found that they could not qualify for loans if their incomes exceeded the 221(d)(3) limits. If the Jordan project had involved urban renewal—and urban renewal planning funds—rather than code enforcement—the income limits would not have applied.

Even more significant than these administrative problems is the impact that the income limits will have on our future efforts to preserve older residential neighborhoods in the central cities. Up to now, rehabilitation and code enforcement has been used effectively to strengthen "tipping point" neighborhoods—residential areas that are not yet severely blighted but that may deteriorate rapidly unless preventive action is taken. The section 312 program has been an extremely useful rehabilitation tool in these areas. But now the income limits mean that the Minneapolis homeowners with an average sized family and an income slightly above the 221(d)(3) limits—say $8,500 a year—will no longer be able to qualify for a 3-percent loan if he lives in a code enforcement area, even though he may be required to make extensive improvements to his property. A family in this predicament would certainly not be enthusiastic about staying in the neighborhood, since they would be forced to take out a conventional loan at 8 percent interest—and higher—to fix up an old house. Indirectly, then, the income limits will encourage the exodus from the central cities of the younger, stable families we most need to provide leadership in our "tipping point" neighborhoods.

Legislation to remove these limits has been endorsed by a number of officials and residents in my own State, as well as by such national organizations as the Conference of Mayors—League of Cities, the National Housing Conference, and the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials.

The income limits have not improved the operation of our rehabilitation program in any demonstrable way. This unnecessary restriction should be removed as soon as possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2758) to amend section 312 of the Housing Act of 1964 to eliminate the provision which presently limits eligibility for residential rehabilitation loans thereunder to persons whose income is within the limits prescribed for below-market-interest-rate mortgages insured under section 221(d)(3) of the National Housing Act, introduced by Mr. MONDALE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2760—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE RELATING TO WORKING MOTHERS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code. My bill will allow parents to deduct the full cost of child care incurred as the result of working as a legitimate business expense.

In this day of spiraling costs of living, the limitations which prohibit women filing joint returns with husbands of combined incomes of $6,600 or more from deducting child-care expenses incurred as a result of working are not realistic. The present law imposes an inequitable tax burden on wage earners; particularly mothers, who pursue both a profession or trade and motherhood.

Certainly, the increased benefits to the family, derived from this income, should not be negated by an increased tax liability.

Mr. President, my bill will eliminate any limitations as to income level or amount of child-care costs that may be used as legitimate income tax deductions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2760) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the limitations on the deductibility of expenses for care of dependents incurred to enable a taxpayer to be gainfully employed, introduced by Mr. STEVENS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

S. 2422

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT), be added as cosponsors of S. 2422, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall prescribe the maximum rate of interest for the students insured loan program.

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

S. 2632

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from New Jersey, (Mr. WILLIAMS), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), be added as cosponsors of S. 2632, authorizing and requesting the President to call in 1970 a White House Conference on Population Growth and Family Planning.

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

S. 2722

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), be added as a cosponsor of S. 2722, to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a general increase of 25 percent in the amount of the benefits payable thereunder (with a minimum old-age benefit of $100), to provide for cost-of-living increases in such benefits in the future, to increase the amounts individuals may earn without suffering deductions from such benefits, and to amend title XVIII of such act so as to include eye care, dental care, hearing aids, and routine physical examinations within the services covered by the insurance program established by part B of such title, and for other purposes.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AMENDMENT

NO. 107

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the junior Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD) be added as a cosponsor of amendment 107 to S. 2546, the military procurement bill.

The amendment requires annual disclosures by former high-ranking civilian and military Pentagon employees who leave the Government and go to work for major defense contractors.

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