

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 115—PART 28

DECEMBER 5, 1969, TO DECEMBER 11, 1969

(PAGES 37183 TO 38620)

the Communist guerrillas in Malaya. Sir Robert has now reported to President Nixon, and his assessment, according to Alsop, is that the Vietcong is in bad shape.

As I say, this is one of the most intriguing and exciting developments of the war in Vietnam.

I would hope that the peace-at-any-price activists both in and out of Congress would make it a point to read Sir Robert Thompson's report carefully. A few voices, which have received little attention and have been overwhelmed by the din and clatter of "get out now," have made the point that the turning-point of the war has been reached and that if the United States has the fortitude and foresight to stick it out for a while longer, and continue on its job to effectively turn over the war to the South Vietnamese, our goal of containing communism in Southeast Asia will be reached.

I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITON'S REPORT ON VIETNAM MUST HAVE
HEARTENED NIXON
(By Joseph Alsop)

Within the U.S. government, there is still an enormous diversity of viewpoint, and even of factual reporting, about the present stage of the war in Vietnam. Some time ago, this drove President Nixon to adopt an expedient without past American precedent, so far as is known.

To get a more solid feel of the real situation, and more particularly the situation in the Vietnamese countryside, the President asked Sir Robert Thompson to go to Vietnam on his behalf. One may guess the President chose this distinguished Englishman as his on-the-spot observer for two linked reasons.

On the one hand, he wanted a man who was free of all entanglement in the debates of our bureaucrats, analysts and policy-makers, which so often reflect the debaters' vested interests. And on the other hand, he had to find a man with the solid experience to compare past and present, and therefore to measure progress—or the lack of it.

Sir Robert's qualifications were obvious. He was one of the masterminds of the successful British effort to defeat the Chinese Communist guerrillas in Malaya. In addition, he had intimate knowledge of Vietnam, where he served, from 1961 to 1965, as head of a British advisory mission. And his freedom from any optimistic bias had recently been proved by his decidedly gloomy book, "No Exit From Vietnam."

As an unobtrusive presidential emissary, Sir Robert therefore undertook a long journey in South Vietnam, covering key provinces from northern I Corps to the Delta in the south. As one must do to find the rice-roots realities, he did most of his investigating at the district level, where the rice-roots war is fought. And he took along expert assistants, well qualified to check upon and also to amplify the facts that he gathered.

Sir Robert then returned to Washington a few days ago, and "The Thompson Report," officially so-called by the insiders, was formally delivered to the President on Wednesday. What he heard from Sir Robert must have encouraged the President very greatly.

The truth is that Sir Robert found a situation so radically changed that he largely abandoned the pessimism implied by the "No Exit"—that ominous phrase—in the title

of his recent book. He did not paint a purely rosy picture, to be sure.

He was far from satisfied, for instance, with the effort made to date to track down and eliminate the higher command groups of the Vietcong. And he warned that if peace came with these command groups still in being, though in refuge, they might later attempt to regenerate a Communist resistance movement.

On the other hand, Sir Robert also found that the entire Vietcong structure was being powerfully and quite rapidly eroded, all over South Vietnam. The rates and degrees of erosion naturally varied from province to province, and even from district to district; but the main features were everywhere the same.

The guerrillas and local force soldiers, who are the "enforcers" of the VC bosses, are everywhere defecting or falling in battle in great numbers; and they are not being successfully replaced. The VC recruiting base is everywhere shrinking drastically, owing to the solid extension of government authority. And in these ways, the VC are progressively losing their former authority over the people of the countryside.

What this means to Hanoi can be gauged from a remark that Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap made to a European correspondent some time ago. "I am not concerned," said Giap, "with the military successes of the US/GVN. I would only become concerned when the US/GVN began to destroy the VC political infrastructure."

That grave cause for concern now stares Gen. Giap in the face. For the command group, in their mountain and jungle refuges, are no more than the brains of this political infrastructure that Giap spoke of. Without their former apparatus of control of the countryside—above all, without guerrillas and soldiers to impose their will—the VC party secretaries are like Mafia bosses with no gunmen under their command.

Control of the countryside and its population is in fact the primary, most vital mission of this political infrastructure. This is why the VC structure in South Vietnam is Hanoi's primary, most vital asset. And the progressive erosion of this structure, reported by Sir Robert Thompson, is therefore a desperate matter for Hanoi—which probably explains the new infiltration figures that are the second part of the story.

A PROGRAM TO ABOLISH POVERTY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, Dean Wilbur J. Cohen, University of Michigan School of Education, and former Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has prepared an excellent article entitled "A 10-Point Program To Abolish Poverty by 1980," which will be published shortly in the Information Please Almanac of 1970.

I have had an opportunity to read this series of wide-ranging and provocative proposals. They constitute a well-thought-out blueprint for a coordinated attack on the persistent problem of poverty in the midst of plenty. The proposals, which range from ending racial discrimination, expanding educational opportunities, and improving social security to upgrading our health system, reforming the welfare program, and providing family planning and other social services reflect the breadth and depth of knowledge Dean Cohen has gained from a lifetime of commitment to programs designed to meet human needs.

I commend this thoughtful article to

the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A 10-POINT PROGRAM TO ABOLISH POVERTY BY 1980

(By Wilbur J. Cohen)

The United States is rich in material and human resources. In 1971, the annual gross national product will undoubtedly exceed \$1,000 billion; the average annual income of families will be approaching \$9,000. Moreover, abundance is growing.

Historically, poverty has been the result of inadequate production of goods and services. This situation still exists in most of Asia, Africa, and South America. By contrast, the abolition of poverty in the United States is no longer a problem of productive capacity.

The Nation has the material resources to eliminate poverty. In recent years, remarkable progress has been made toward the twin goals of the abolition of poverty and the provision of economic security for all. In addition, there are sufficient resources to assure the overwhelming majority of Americans whether at work or retired, whether widowed, orphaned, disabled, or temporarily unemployed) continuing incomes paid as a matter of right—incomes sufficient to assure a modest level of living, not just enough to meet the low standard that is used today to define poverty.

Although there are different standards of poverty, the Social Security Administration index is the most widely used. For an urban family of four persons, the poverty level was \$3,412 for the year 1967 compared with \$2,974 for 1959. These figures are adjusted for family size and price changes on this basis. In 1959, there were about 39.4 million people living in poverty; in 1968 the number was down to 25.4 million—a decline of 14 million persons. In 1959, 22.4% of the U.S. population was below the poverty level; in 1968 this figure had declined to 12.8% (See tables.)

We have, however, not only the resources but also much of the institutional framework to build upon to make poverty a thing of the past and to better the economic security of all Americans. With a comprehensive and coordinated plan, the job of eliminating poverty can be accomplished.

During the 1960's improvements in the social security program have brought higher benefit payments to a great majority of retired older people, widows and orphans, and the long-term disabled. Twenty-five million people—1 out of every 8 Americans receive a social security check every month. Because of their social security benefits, about two-thirds of these beneficiaries are able to maintain a level of living somewhat above the poverty level. Nevertheless, about 8 million social security beneficiaries still live in poverty, even with their benefits.

Yet, substantial progress has been made in reducing the number of the poor, in improving the level of living for people whose incomes are just above the poverty level, and even in improving the position of those who are still below the poverty criterion.

The striking reduction of poverty during this decade is attributable to economic growth, to the various measures taken to make it possible for more people to participate in the economy through job training, rehabilitation, and improved educational programs and to the major improvements that have been made in the social security program.

Nearly 30% of the poor live in households with an aged or disabled person at the head. Most of these people could be moved out of poverty through further improvements in the social insurance and assistance programs.

One of the greatest challenges comes in finding solutions for the rest of the poor—those who lived in households where the head worked all year but was still poor or could find work only part of the time or had no job at all. We can find solutions to this problem by a ten point coordinated program.

First: A successful national attack on poverty is dependent on continued economic growth and economic development:

We could reduce the poverty group from 25.4 million to about 15 to 20 million in the next 10 years with continued economic growth, and the expansion of employment in areas where underemployment now exists. This involves changes in tax policies, housing, and other programs.

Second: Opportunities for work—meaningful, productive, self-supporting work—must be expanded:

Economic security is perhaps best defined as a job when you can work and income when you can't. Most fundamental is the opportunity to work. Job opportunities must be made available for all who can work, and programs that improve the ability of the individual to earn must be expanded.

Well-planned and useful work, not made work, can be provided. There are over 5 million useful, public service jobs that could be developed—jobs in hospitals, and nursing homes, jobs that would contribute to improved roads, parks and recreation centers, jobs that would help relieve the pains and anxieties of children, the aged, and the disabled.

For those whose capacity to earn is low, and for those who have a potential capacity but are unable now to get a job, much can be done to improve programs that prepare them for full participation and full opportunity. Educational activities, job training, health and rehabilitation programs, manpower retraining and relocation, and special programs could enable the disadvantaged young to compete in the labor market.

Third: Racial discrimination—in jobs, in education, and in living—must be ended:

Justice and opportunity must become a reality for every American, regardless of race, creed, sex, or national origin. Every effort must be made to diligently carry out the constitutional obligations and statutory requirements of the Civil Rights Act so that equality for every boy and girl and every family in the Nation. In addition to its other insidious effects, discrimination is economically wasteful, costing the Nation about \$30 billion a year in terms of the gross national product.

People might be equipped for full participation in our economy and in all aspects of American life because this is the only worthy goal of a free and democratic society. We must not buy our way out of facing the tough problems of providing opportunity by the acceptance of a permanent class of the disinherited, condemned to live on a dole when they want to be a part of society and equipped to move ahead. Jobs are basic to economic security and the first task is to see to it that everyone is given the chance to learn and to earn.

Fourth: Family planning services must be available, on a voluntary basis, to those with lower incomes and less than a college education as they are to the higher-income, college-educated person in the suburb:

In the period from 1960 to 1965, low-income women of child-bearing age had an annual fertility rate of 153 births per 1,000 women. The rate for the rest of the female population was 98 births per 1,000. This rate of 98 per 1,000 is consistent with an ultimate family size of about three children—considered to be the size that most Americans, regardless of race, economic status, or desire.

Thus it is considered likely that the poor would bear children at the same rate if they had access to the same family planning serv-

ices available to the nonpoor. And, on that basis, it is estimated that in 1966, among 8.2 million low-income women of childbearing age, there were 450,000 births of what might be called unplanned-for children. Among these 8.2 million women, there were about 1 million receiving family planning services, and 4 million who were not but indicated they would if they were available. To provide family planning services to these 4 million women would cost about \$120 million a year. This is an investment we could afford.

Fifth: Opportunities for education at all levels must be expanded:

The vitality and economic growth of our society depends, to a major extent, upon the effectiveness of American education. We must assure equal access to high-quality education from preschool through graduate studies. The cost of educating every American must be recognized as an investment in a stronger, more vital Nation. To raise the necessary funds, the property tax must be eliminated as a source of revenue for education, and the Federal government must contribute at least one-third of the total cost.

Quality preschool opportunities, for instance, are essential for disadvantaged children if they are ever to have the hopes of succeeding in regular classroom studies. Less than one third of the Nation's 12.5 million children age 3-5 are enrolled in nursery schools or kindergartens. The proportion of children from low-income families enrolled is even less than the average.

The need for modern and effective technical and vocational education is also self-evident. We need a vastly expanded and a strengthened vocational education system, as well as imaginative new ties between school and the world of work in agriculture, commerce, and industry.

Unless children born into poor families have the opportunity to learn and develop skills, they will not only be poor children but will face the high probability that they will be poor adults they themselves will raise poor children.

Sixth: The social security program should be improved:

A job today not only provides current income but carries its own insurance against the loss of that income. This social insurance device is an institutional invention of first-rate importance. It is based on the idea that since a job underlies economic security, loss of income from the job is a basic cause of economic insecurity.

Under social insurance, while a worker earns he contributes a small part of his earnings to a fund, usually matched by the employer. And then, out of these funds, benefits are paid to partly make up for the income lost when the worker's earnings have stopped. Under this "income insurance," the payments made are usually related to the amount of the earnings lost and are thus designed to maintain in part the level of living obtained by the worker while he worked. Cash payments are made under social insurance programs to make up in part for earnings lost because of retirement in old age, disability, and the death of the family breadwinner.

In the United States, the largest and most important of the social insurance programs is the Federal system popularly called social security. This program insures against the loss of earnings due to retirement, disability, or death and pays benefits to meet the great bulk of hospital and medical costs in old age.

This year 90 million people will contribute to social security. Ninety percent of our population aged 65 and over are eligible for monthly social security benefits. More than 95 out of 100 young children and their moth-

ers are eligible for monthly benefits if the family breadwinner should die. And 4 out of 5 people of working age have income protection against loss of earnings because of the long-term severe disability of the breadwinner. When the Federal civil-service system, the railroad retirement program, and State and local government staff retirement systems are taken into account, nearly everyone now has protection under a government program against the risk of loss of earned income. In addition, many are earning further protection under systems that build on social security.

Social security provides a highly effective institution for income maintenance—one that is acceptable to the public, has a very low administrative cost, and is practically universal in application. But it needs improvement, particularly in the level of benefits.

Indicative of the need for higher benefit levels is the fact that the average social security benefit for retired workers is now about \$100 a month; for aged couples it is about \$170; for aged widows, \$86; and for disabled workers, \$112. Many people get lower amounts, and about 2.8 million beneficiaries get the minimum benefit. The minimum for a worker who goes on the benefit rolls at age 65 or later is only \$55 a month.

In September, 1969, President Nixon recommended important changes in Social Security benefit and contribution structure. His proposal included a 10 percent increase in benefits, and the establishment of an escalator provision which would automatically gear future increases to the cost of living. He asked Congress to make changes in the financial structure, the most important of which is to increase the maximum contribution and benefit base from \$7,800 to \$9,000 a year by 1972. In addition, he recommended a change in the retirement test by an increase in the amount a beneficiary could earn before a reduction in benefits would take place from \$1,680 to \$1,800 a year, he also recommended several other changes.

While President's proposal does represent a liberalization of the program, it is far from adequate. To bring benefits and contributions up to adequate standards, the following proposal should be adopted:

1. *An increase in benefit levels.* As a first step, Congress should increase all social security benefits by at least 15 percent this year, and another 15 percent two years later, with an increase in the minimum progressively to \$100 a month for the single retired worker or widow and to \$150 for the couple.

2. *A method of keeping the system in line with rising earnings.* Benefits should be paid based on average earnings over a worker's 5 or 10 consecutive years of highest earnings, rather than on his lifetime average, so that the benefits will be more closely related to the earnings actually lost at the time the worker becomes disabled, retires, or dies.

3. *A way to make the program more effective as the basic system of income security for those who earn somewhat above the average, as well as for average and below-average earners.* The present ceiling on the annual amount of earnings counted under the social security program should be increased from the present \$7,800, in stages, to \$15,000. Then automatic adjustment of the ceiling should be provided, to keep it in line with future increases in earnings levels.

4. *Provide protection against the loss of earnings that arises because of relatively short-term total disability.* Disability benefits should be paid beginning with the fourth month of disability without regard to how long the disability is expected to last. Under present law, the benefits begin with those for the seventh month of disability and are payable only where the disability is expected to last for at least a year.

5. *Improve protection for older workers by liberalizing the definition of disability for workers aged 55 or over.* The revised definition should permit benefits to be paid to a worker aged 55 or over if, because of illness or injury, he can no longer perform work similar to what he has done in the past. Under present law, the definition of disability requires that the worker be unable to engage in any substantial gainful activity.

6. *Improve work incentives by liberalizing the retirement test provision under which a beneficiary's earnings reduces the benefits he receives.* At the present time an individual can receive his full benefits if his annual earnings are less than \$1,680. This amount should be increased to \$2,400. The reduction also should be limited to one-half the amount earned above the exempt amount, regardless of the total amount of earnings.

The increase in the earnings-base ceiling proposed would result in higher income for both the cash benefits and the Medicare parts of social security and would go a long way toward financing the proposed reforms.

If the cash benefit program were to remain entirely self-financed, the ultimate contribution rate paid by employees and the rate paid by employers for the total social security program would have to be increased somewhat to meet the cost of all the proposals outlined. General revenue financing could be used to meet part of the increased costs.

Ways to relieve low-wage earners from the burden of the higher rates should be explored. One way would be to amend the income-tax laws so that, for low-income people, a part of the social security contribution would be treated as a credit against their income tax or, if no tax were due, could be refunded.

These benefit increases and the other program improvements would help all workers and their families. Their most important effect would be to reduce the number of poor in the future and to provide a level of living somewhat above poverty for most beneficiaries. But the effect of these changes on today's poor would also be very significant.

Seventh: Our health services must be improved:

High-quality health care must be available to all—in the inner city as well as the suburb. We must reduce the high toll of infant mortality: a more effective method must be found for financing prenatal and postnatal care for mothers and children. We should also:

1. *Provide under Medicare for protection against the heavy cost of prescription drugs.*

2. *Cover disabled social security beneficiaries under Medicare.*

3. *Put the entire Medicare program on a social insurance prepayment basis so that medical and hospital insurance both would be financed from social security contributions and a matching contribution from the Federal Government.*

Eighth: We must improve other social insurance programs.

Other social insurance programs—unemployment insurance and workmen's compensation—although not administered by the Federal Government, require Federal standards. Coverage of both of these programs should be expanded, and benefit levels in many States should be substantially improved.

The introduction of Federal benefit standards into unemployment insurance, where there is already a Federal-State relationship, would not be structurally difficult. In workmen's compensation, which has been entirely a State matter, it would be necessary to establish some new device, such as a Federal program providing a given level of protection, which employers would not have to join if they presented evidence of member-

ship in a private or State insurance arrangement with an equivalent level of protection.

Ninth: Our welfare system must be radically overhauled.

Drastic changes must be made in the existing welfare system—in the scope of coverage, the adequacy of payments, and in the way in which payments are administered.

Although work opportunities and improvements in social insurance can bring economic security to the overwhelming majority of people, they cannot do the whole job.

The Federal-State welfare programs have been confined to certain categories of recipients—the aged, the blind, the permanently and totally disabled, and families with dependent children when a parent is either missing from the home, dead, disabled, or unemployed. In addition, the States have been allowed to define the level of assistance provided in these programs, and many have set the level below any reasonable minimum, and payments vary widely among the States. General assistance for those not eligible under the Federal-State categories is entirely supported by State and local money and with few exceptions is very restrictive.

There are about 10 million persons receiving assistance payments—about 9 million under the federally aided programs, and about one million persons receiving general assistance not financed with Federal aid. This figure would be approximately double if the States took full advantage of the Federal eligibility standards and removed from State plans and administrative procedures the restrictions that now bar needy people from getting assistance. Moreover, because of the low level of assistance standards in many States a high proportion of those receiving assistance are still below the poverty level.

But criticism of existing public assistance programs is not confined to inadequate coverage or inadequate amounts. The list of criticisms is long, going to the nature of the program itself and its administration. The determination of eligibility for one is an unnecessarily destructive process, involving the most detailed examination of one's needs and expenditures and frequently prying into the intimate details of one's life. Moving from detailed budgeting to broad categories of allowances and to simplified determinations of income and resources would help to protect the dignity and self respect of the assistance recipient.

One problem that has haunted assistance and relief programs for years is how to provide adequate assistance without destroying economic incentive for those who can work. Reasonably adequate welfare payments, particularly to a large family, will sometimes turn out to be more than can be earned by a full-time worker with low skills.

Under aid to families with dependent children the Federal Government assists states to make payments to families with the father unemployed. In the 29 States that do not take advantage of this Federal offer and continue to provide aid only if the father is dead, disabled or absent from the home, the assistance program is correctly criticized on the grounds that it sets up an incentive for the unemployed worker to leave home.

Support for an assistance program that applies to all in need and that pays an adequate amount has been faced with hard going because of the incredible longevity of myths about those whom the programs are supposed to aid: that the poor live high on welfare handouts and that the poor are lazy and don't want to work.

The myths persist despite the fact that over 3 million of those on welfare are aged or disabled and over 4 million are children, and despite the fact that 80% of working-age men who are poor but not on welfare have

jobs, and about 75% of them are in fulltime jobs.

President Nixon, in August, 1969, proposed a dramatic reform in the welfare system which included:

1. A federally financed and administered assistance plan to replace the aid to dependent children program which would pay each working and non-working family in the United States a minimum income. For a family of four without any income the amount paid would be \$1,600 a year with \$300 additional for each child.

2. States would be required to supplement existing Federal payments to families with dependent children.

3. A work-incentive provision which allows the family on assistance to keep first \$60 a month earned and also 50 percent above \$60 up to a maximum level set according to the size of the family.

4. A work component which requires all family heads to register with the state employment office and accept suitable jobs.

5. An expanded day-care program for the children of working mothers and a job-training program to enable the parents to prepare for full-time employment.

6. Federal minimum payment standards for the 3 million aged, blind, and disabled receiving welfare.

As in the case of Social Security changes, the proposal includes several needed revisions, but does not go far enough. For example, by maintaining some form of Federal-State cooperation in financing payments, the plan retains the state by state inequities prevalent under the present system. It does not include over one million poor people who do not have families and who are not covered under existing welfare programs.

Tenth: the services that will help people move out of poverty must be brought to the people—where and when they need them:

Family planning services, visiting-nurse services, day-care services for the children of working mothers, community action programs and consumer and legal aid must be available where needed. City Hall—and Washington—must be closer to the people they govern. There must be an adequate program of consumer and legal protection for the poor. There must be an end to practices that short-change the poor in the grocery store, in the welfare office, or the landlord, at the neighborhood department store, and in the courts—in short, in all the waystations that add up to life in the ghetto.

It is important, too, that credit union facilities be available to the poor and that credit unions take even greater responsibility for the consumer education of their members.

A DEMANDING TASK

The problems of poverty and economic insecurity in the United States do not lend themselves to easy, magic solutions. They require a combination of deliberate, carefully designed, wideranging approaches, for the problems themselves are not simple. Being poor means more than not having enough money. It often means poor in spirit, hope, health, and intellectual resources.

The abolition of poverty will require money—about \$15 to \$20 billion a year initially. This is only about 1½ to 2% of our gross national product. We can afford the money. But money must be accompanied by far-reaching, penetrating approaches, by bold and coordinated public and private programs that provide opportunities for the poor. For those who are able to work, greater emphasis must be placed on jobs, education, and training. For those who cannot or should not be expected to work, improvements must be made in the social security program, which, combined with private benefit plans constitute the most effective institutions for income maintenance. They cannot, of course,

do the whole job. The present welfare system must be drastically overhauled to adequately serve those whose needs are not met by other programs. Concomitant with improvements in existing programs, the search must continue for new and imaginative programs that will meet the demands of the decade ahead.

Setting the elimination of poverty as a national goal is a huge and complex undertaking. The nation has the economic capacity, the technological capability, and the intellectual resources to accomplish this goal before the end of the next decade. But the most difficult task will be sustaining the determined commitment of the nation to the American promise: Full and equal opportunity for all to share in the good life that can be offered by a dynamic, prosperous, democratic society.

TABLE 1.—NUMBER OF PERSONS IN U.S. BELOW POVERTY LEVEL, 1968

Characteristic	[In millions]		
	Total	White	Non-white
All persons.....	25.4	17.4	8.0
A. In families.....	20.7	13.6	7.1
B. Unrelated individuals.....	4.7	3.8	.9
C. Family members under 18.....	10.7	6.3	4.4
D. Adults.....	14.7	11.1	3.6

Source: Current Population Reports, Series P-23, No. 28, Aug. 12, 1969, U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

TABLE 2.—PERCENT OF POPULATION IN U.S. BELOW POVERTY LEVEL, 1968

Characteristic	Percent		
	Total	White	Non-white
All persons.....	12.8	10.0	33.5
In farm families.....	18.8	15.9	58.9
In nonfarm families.....	9.5	7.5	27.1
Family members under 18.....	15.3	10.7	41.6
Unrelated individuals.....	34.0	32.2	45.7

Source: See Table 1.

TABLE 3.—POVERTY LEVELS FOR VARIOUS FAMILY SIZES, 1967

Size of family	Urban non-farm male head	Urban non-farm female head	Farm male head
	1 member.....	\$1,750	\$1,632
2 members.....	2,178	2,110	1,841
3 members.....	2,674	2,573	2,264
4 members.....	3,412	3,393	2,907
5 members.....	4,022	3,984	3,431
6 members.....	4,517	4,497	3,852
7 or more members.....	5,562	5,433	4,720

Source: See Table 1.

THE NEEDS OF EDUCATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my statement made on December 3, 1969, before the Subcommittee on Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations on H.R. 13111.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR VANCE HARTKE, DEMOCRAT OF INDIANA, DECEMBER 3, 1969

Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate your courtesy and that of your colleagues on the Subcommittee for providing this opportunity for me to speak with you about the needs of education and the imperative necessity of providing from federal sources a fair federal share of the funding necessary to accomplish the objectives which have been set forth in the historic educational statutes enacted during my tenure in the Senate of the United States.

INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Senate class of 1958, I take deep pride in the role that I have had an opportunity to play, in

bringing into being these commitments of the national purpose to meet the educational needs of American citizens of all ages.

I know the high hopes we all entertained during the enactment of the Vocational Act of 1963 and of Higher Educational Facilities Construction Act.

I recall very well our floor debates in 1965 when the landmark education measures—the Elementary and Secondary Act, the Higher Education Act, and the International Act passed the Senate.

Our work on the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, and the various extensions, improvement, clarification and expansion of these basic acts is still fresh in our memory. By these various measures, together with our colleagues in the House and the President of the United States, we have given a commitment of the nation's resources to this important area of our national life.

You have heard testimony, gentlemen, with respect to the need for the full funding of every educational statute on the books.

I would urge that you give heed to the voices that have been raised because I feel that the authorizations in these areas actually underestimate the needs that exist. The federal share ought to be more than the current 7% of an annual \$60 billion educational expenditure. The \$9 billion of authorized funding for education is a far cry from what we could and should in equity provide.

However, I know the pressure under which you must operate, and I realize that full funding is a goal that might not be reached this year. I hope, however, that we can come as close as possible to it.

FORWARD FUNDING

Mr. Chairman, as a beginning, I think it is beyond a doubt, that the floor of the Senate would support and accept, without decrease, the amounts for Office of Education programs now included in the bill you report. I present a table showing for the State of Indiana the effect of the House floor amendment.

The table referred to follows:

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF INDIANA

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House-passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants.....	\$15,973,503	\$15,013,815	\$16,019,525	\$16,019,525	\$18,664,129
State administrative expenses.....	159,736	150,191	160,195	160,195	0
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	2,534,729	1,286,642	1,080,789	0	1,282,958
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III).....	4,550,000	3,980,987	4,181,310	2,766,361	3,989,229
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	\$540,191	\$664,602	\$655,566	\$655,566	\$655,566
Grants for special projects.....	0	0	0	0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	1,946,443	1,950,699	0	0	1,941,848
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....	46,524	0	0	0	0
State administration.....	49,541	48,185	0	0	48,281
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V).....	622,990	431,016	299,860	0	431,892
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	26,377,133	23,572,661	22,397,245	19,601,647	27,013,903
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874).....	4,217,000	4,391,000	2,491,000	982,000	4,974,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....	0	157,900	0	0	0
Subtotal, SAFA.....	4,217,000	4,548,900	2,491,000	982,000	4,974,000
Education professions development: Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2).....	0	349,257	477,138	477,183	477,183
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C and D).....	3,286,966	0	0	0	0
Subtotal, education professions development.....	3,286,966	349,257	477,138	477,183	477,183
Teacher Corps.....	507,039	244,449	0	0	0
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA II).....	124,715	0	0	0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones).....	260,822	257,471	260,870	260,870	260,870
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources.....	363,716	360,578	0	0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103).....	2,991,611	2,031,939	1,050,631	1,050,631	1,050,631
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104).....	4,606,774	3,386,105	2,213,649	0	844,564
Graduate facilities (HEFA II).....	714,815	0	0	0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105).....	150,847	123,421	123,421	123,421	123,421

Footnotes at end of table.