

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 15398. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide more efficient job counseling and employment services for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 15399. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide that where violations are corrected within the prescribed abatement period no penalty shall be assessed; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GRASSO:

H.R. 15400. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide income tax simplification, reform, and relief for small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 15401. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide minimum monthly benefits thereunder at age 72 for all uninsured individuals, without regard to the time at which such age is attained; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 15402. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase from 60 to 120 the number of "lifetime reserve" days for which inpatient hospital benefits may be paid under the medicare program, to reduce the coinsurance payment required of the beneficiary with respect to those days, and to provide a similar 60-day lifetime reserve for posthospital extended care benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 15403. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the computation of the benefits payable to a married couple (or to the surviving widow or widower) to be made on the basis of their combined earnings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLURE (for himself and Mr. HANSEN of Idaho):

H.R. 15404. A bill to provide for a comprehensive analysis of the means for providing public use and enjoyment of the outstanding recreation and scenic values of the public lands adjacent to the Middle Snake River to assure the preservation of these values until analyses are completed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 15405. A bill to provide that time spent by all American civilians in enemy prisoner-of-war camps shall be creditable (as though it were military service) toward pensions, annuities, or similar benefits under various Federal retirement programs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15406. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that where a person in good faith went through a marriage ceremony with an insured individual, but (because of a legal impediment) such marriage was invalid, such person (if living with

such individual at the time of his death or of application for benefits) shall be considered the wife, husband, widow, or widower of such insured individual for benefit purposes notwithstanding the existence of another person who is the legal wife, husband, widow, or widower of such individual; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 15407. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that any individual age 55 or over shall be considered disabled for purposes of entitlement to disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze if he meets the more liberal definition of "disability" presently applicable only to blind individuals at that age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 15408. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to provide for the regulation of networks; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 15409. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to provide for the regulation of networks; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 15410. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REID:

H.R. 15411. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act to prevent excessive rent increases; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 15412. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to World War I veterans and their widows, subject to \$3,000 and \$4,200 annual income limitations; to provide for such veterans a certain priority in entitlement to hospitalization and medical care; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 15413. A bill to prohibit the use of any nuclear weapon in Southeast Asia unless Congress first approves such use; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 15417. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes.

By Mrs. HANSEN of Washington:

H.R. 15418. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BADILLO (for himself, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. HALPERN, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. BURTON, Mr. PEPPER, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. DOW, Mr. SCHEUER,

Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. KOCH, Mr. KYROS, and Mr. BOLAND):

H.J. Res. 1222. Joint resolution directing the President to seek international agreements establishing uniform standards for the protection of persons utilizing aircraft and airport facilities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BADILLO (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. ADDABBO, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. REID, Mr. CELLER, Mr. PODELL, Mrs. MINK, Mr. NIX, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. WINN, Mr. PETTIS, and Mr. RODINO):

H.J. Res. 1223. Joint resolution directing the President to seek international agreements establishing uniform standards for the protection of persons utilizing aircraft and airport facilities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.J. Res. 1224. Joint resolution to mandate consideration of comprehensive legislation reforming and recodifying the Federal income, estate, and gift tax laws; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BADILLO (for himself, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. HALPERN, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. BURTON, Mr. PEPPER, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. DOW, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. BINGHAM, and Mr. ADDABBO):

H. Con. Res. 629. Concurrent resolution to protect airline passengers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BADILLO (for himself, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. REID, Mr. PODELL, Mrs. MINK, Mr. NIX, and Mr. RODINO):

H. Con. Res. 630. Concurrent resolution to protect airline passengers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. Res. 1013. Resolution relative to a transnational lunar expedition; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 15414. A bill for the relief of Raymond L. Wells; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 15415. A bill for the relief of Johnson S. Jordinano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 15416. A bill for the relief of Anastacia Romero Cabansag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

EVERYONE INVITED TO PITTSBURGH FOR JAZZ WEEK

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, Governor Shapp has proclaimed June 12-18, Jazz Week in Pennsylvania.

Several very industrious Pittsburghers have put their civic zeal and pride together to bring back to our town some

of the famous jazz musicians who were born in Pittsburgh.

Pittsburghers and their friends will, at various times and places during the week, be entertained by such Pittsburgh-born greats as Errol Garner, Billy Eckstein, Roy Eldredge, Ahmad Jamal, and many others.

Several more of the biggest names in the jazz world will visit and perform in Pittsburgh on June 17-18, when the festival committee sponsors two jazz concerts at the Pittsburgh Civic Arena.

Performing those nights will be such stars as: the Buddy Rich Orchestra,

Cannonball Adderley, Carmen McRae, Herbie Mann, Dizzy Gillespie, and many more.

Local jazz star Walt Harper and Roy Kohler, of Gulf Oil's Community Relations division, have made immeasurable contributions to our city's jazz extravaganza. I hope that my colleagues and their families will travel to Pittsburgh for some great music and good fun, when Pittsburgh celebrates Jazz Week, June 12-18.

I insert into the RECORD at this time an article from the New Pittsburgh

Courier telling of the activities planned for Pittsburgh next week.

The article follows:

TOP STARS TO PERFORM AT PITTSBURGH JAZZ FESTIVAL JUNE 17-18 AT CIVIC ARENA

Jazz lovers in the Pittsburgh area will jump for joy June 17-18 when the Pittsburgh Jazz Festival takes place at the Civic Arena.

Some of the top stars in the country will perform during the two nights of festivities which will get underway at 8 p.m. each night.

Billy Taylor, who has come into millions of homes via television's "David Frost Show" for which he, Taylor, serves as musical director, will emcee both nights. He will also perform with his well-known jazz trio on Saturday, the opening night.

Others slated to share the bill that night include: the great Buddy Rich Orchestra, everyone's favorite jazz singer, Carmen McRae; the Cannonball (Mercy, Mercy, Mercy) Adderley Trio and a popular local group called the Silhouettes.

An equally impressive group of artists will perform on Saturday night. B. B. King, otherwise known as "Mr. Blues" will be one of the headliners. Sharing the bill with him will perform on Sunday night, B. B. King, Mann, his flute and band; ever popular Dizzy Gillespie, Roy "Little Jazz" Eldridge, and the Walt Harper Quintet. Walt is director of the festival.

Governor Milton J. Shapp has declared the week of June 12 to June 18 as "Jazz Festival Week in Pennsylvania." He is encouraging all Pennsylvanians to turn their attention during the week to Pittsburgh's first Jazz Festival.

In a recent proclamation, Governor Shapp stated that Pittsburgh, the home of such jazz greats as Erroll Garner, Billy Eckstine, Ahmad Jamal, Mary Lou Williams, Henry Mancini and Roy Eldridge, should be commended for initiating a Jazz Festival.

Programs including concerts, art exhibits, special events for schools, college and youth groups, will bring national focus to Pittsburgh and to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and will honor one of the jazz greats of all time, Roy Eldridge.

One of the highlights will be two nights of Jazz at the Civic Arena on June 17 and 18.

The governor praised Carnegie Institute and the A. W. Mellon Educational and Charitable Trust for sponsoring the event. Proceeds from the festival will go to the Selma Burke Art Center, which draws students from nearby neighborhoods for instruction in the Arts.

LIMITATION OF TENURE OF MEMBERS OF THE JUDICIARY

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, on April 15, the Bar Association of Parma, Ohio, adopted a resolution in favor of limiting the tenure of members of the Federal judiciary.

The Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Judiciary Committee on May 19 held a hearing on my proposed amendment to the Constitution, Senate Joint Resolution 196, which would require reconfirmation of Federal judges by the Senate every 8 years.

The Parma Bar Association resolution is one of many expressions of dissatisfaction with actions by some Federal judges

that go beyond interpreting the laws and into the realm of making new laws.

The bar association resolution recommends a term of 6 years for Federal judges, as opposed to 8 in my proposal, but the fundamental reason for the action of the bar association is the same as my own reason for introducing a constitutional amendment. Basically, the goal is to bring a degree of accountability to Federal judges. They are appointed for life and accountable to no one.

Why should any public official in a democracy have life tenure?

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution of the Parma Bar Association be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

RESOLUTION OF THE PARMA BAR ASSOCIATION

Whereas, the founding fathers sought to preserve our democratic republic by a system of governmental checks and balances and acknowledged, as stated in the Declaration of Independence, that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed; and

Whereas, the United States Supreme Court has received criticism in recent years from knowledgeable citizens, constitutional lawyers, and even associate justices of the Court for its alleged assumption of powers beyond Constitutional limitations; and

Whereas, at present the federal judiciary, once appointed, are thereafter no longer answerable directly or indirectly to the people, and in this respect are unique among the three branches of government; and

Whereas, such foresighted exponents of American democracy as Thomas Jefferson warned against allowing too much power to, and of the dangers inherent in, and advocated eliminating the virtual life tenure of, the federal judiciary;

Now therefore, be it resolved, that the Parma Bar Association urges the amendment of Article III, § 1 of the United States Constitution to read:

"The Judges both of the supreme and inferior Courts shall hold their offices for a term of six years."

Be it further resolved, that this Association urges consideration of new methods of selecting such judges, either by direct election by the people of each circuit and district, by nominating commissions, by judges of the various states, or other proposed changes in the present appointive system.

Adopted this 15th day of April, 1969.

MAKE POLICE SLAYING A FEDERAL CRIME

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I called the attention of my colleagues to the tragic shooting death of a Rockford, Ill., policeman, Patrolman Charles J. Williams. That same day, I introduced H.R. 15265 which would provide a \$50,000 Federal payment to the survivors of policemen, firemen, and corrections officers killed or totally disabled in the line of duty. The previous week

this proposal received the endorsement of the administration in the testimony of LEAA Administrator Jerris Leonard before the House Judiciary Committee.

Today I am introducing another bill related to this same subject, a bill which would make it a Federal crime to use interstate or foreign commerce to avoid prosecution for the killing of a policeman or fireman in the line of duty. The tragic spiral in police slayings over the last few years must be halted and reversed. These senseless acts of violence have reached national proportions. Last year, 126 policemen were murdered, a 46-percent increase over 1969 when 86 were slain. Since 1961, 759 law enforcement officers were killed on duty. It is no longer enough for us in the Federal Government to say we stand behind our local public safety officers; the time has come for us to get out front with the Federal shield and let these insane assassins know we mean business.

The bill which I am introducing today would make it possible for the FBI to assist State and local law enforcement officers in apprehending these killers almost immediately after the crime has been committed. I think this will serve as a deterrent to such heinous crimes and as a means to insure the swift apprehension of those who commit them.

Under this bill, a person alleged to have committed such an offense shall be presumed to have taken flight in interstate or foreign commerce to avoid prosecution if he is not apprehended and taken into custody within 24 hours. At that time, the resources and manpower of the Federal Government would be made available to assist State and local officials in the apprehension. I would emphasize that nothing in this bill is to be construed as preventing States from exercising jurisdiction over offenses for which they now have jurisdiction. The principal thrust of this legislation is to provide local law enforcement arms with this extra Federal tool immediately if they need it.

Mr. Speaker, similar bills have been introduced in this and the other body by other Members of Congress, the notable leader in this field being the gentleman from New York (Mr. BRAGER). I wish to join with them in urging the appropriate committees of Congress to give serious attention and consideration to this legislation.

FOOD PRICES DECREASE BETWEEN FEBRUARY AND APRIL

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, this year we have heard that food prices are rising and there are no bounds in sight. Newspapers and magazines have all dramatically told of the plight of the American consumer, and every congressional office has been flooded with letters from concerned constituents.

Because of the alarm, the administration promised to consider action to halt

the rise in food prices. Officials met with grocery store executives from 12 major food chains in March, and a decrease in food prices was promised "through natural market forces." Immediately thereafter, six chains announced voluntary freezes or reductions.

Also of encouragement is the April Consumer Index which showed that prices for grocery store purchases dropped 0.2 percent, the first decrease in this component since October of last year. Beef and veal prices were lower, and pork prices were reduced substantially. The prices for fresh vegetables declined sharply also, as did prices for eggs and poultry.

A further encouragement were some specific price decreases between February and April which officials at the Labor Department made available to me. They are as follows:

Percent down between February and April
Product:

Flour	0.5
Round steak	2.3
Sirloin steak	.9
Rump roast	1.4
Chuck roast	1.4
Pork chops	6.7
Pork roast	4.6
Frying chicken	1.6
Butter	.1
Oranges	3.9
Potatoes	1.0
Carrots	9.7
Celery	27.2
Lettuce	24.3
Tomatoes	7.2
Salad oil	.8
Canned chicken soup	.3
Instant coffee	.4

The American consumer should be relieved by this trend. I am hopeful that such decreases in food costs continue.

TELEPHONE PRIVACY—XXIII

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I have recently reintroduced the telephone privacy bill with 49 cosponsors.

This bill would give individuals the right to indicate to the telephone company if they do not wish to be commercially solicited over the telephone. Commercial firms wanting to solicit business over the phone would then be required to obtain from the phone company a list of customers who opted for the commercial prohibition. The FCC would also be given the option of requiring the phone company, instead of supplying a list, to put an asterisk by the names of those individuals in the phone book who have chosen to invoke the commercial solicitation ban.

Those not covered by the legislation would be charities and other nonprofit groups, political candidates or organizations, and opinion polltakers. Also not covered would be debt collection agencies or any other individual or companies with whom the individual has an existing contract or debt.

As I noted in a statement on March 9,

I have received an enormous amount of correspondence on this legislation from all over the country. Today, I am placing a 21st sampling of these letters into the RECORD, since they describe far more vividly than I possibly could the need for this legislation.

These letters follow—the names have been omitted:

STANFORD, CALIF.,
June 2, 1972.

HON. LES ASPIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASPIN: This is to say how keenly I support your effort to regulate the abuse of telephone privacy. I would appreciate receiving a copy of the bill HR 13267, and other information on its legislative status.

This is not a peripheral issue of minor personal irritation. The telephone system is central to the whole network of inter-personal communication in our culture. We will see many further technical advances that will doubtless reduce its costs—and make it ever more attractive to unsolicited intrusions. It is insufferable that this instrument of personal conversation should be abused to the extent it already has; and if unchecked, this trend will surely become ever worse. Even unlisted numbers are not a sure protection. And before long, telephone salesmen will have recourse to computer-mechanized dialing, which can automatically scan through every possible telephone number, whether in the directory or not, in the search for sales prospects.

I may have some technical comments, if I may have the opportunity to peruse your bill; but I have no doubt of being an enthusiastic supporter of your initiative.

Sincerely yours,

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
May 27, 1972.

DEAR REP. ASPIN: This clipping was a joy to read. I haven't any more about this legislation but I sincerely hope you did introduce such. As a college teacher I am home during parts of the day and get bombarded with these obnoxious calls.

Onward!

CONGRESSMAN WOULD CURB PHONE
SOLICITORS

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Rep. Les Aspin, D-Wis., proposed Sunday that individuals be allowed to place "No Solicitors" signs on their telephones.

Aspin said he plans to introduce legislation in Congress today that would give persons the right to indicate to the telephone company if they do not want to be commercially solicited over the phone.

OXON HILL, MD., May 19, 1972.

DEAR SIR: Re your Unsolicited Phone Call Bill. I am behind you 100 percent. God or Congress protect us from the real estate and phony charity calls. Good luck.

The phone company is 90 percent to blame for selling our names.

Yours truly,

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA SENATE,
May 23, 1972.

Congressman LES ASPIN,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASPIN: I understand that you have recently introduced a bill which would limit telephone solicitations by requiring phone companies to indicate in their directories which subscribers do not wish to get calls from salesmen, etc.

My wife and I get many of these nuisance

calls, and I want to commend you and wish you good luck in obtaining passage of this bill. Perhaps I should put in a similar bill at the State level.

Sincerely yours,

P.S.—Would you be kind enough to send me a copy of your bill?

IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO,
May 6, 1972.

HON. LES ASPIN,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: You can insert this letter into the record with my name attached.

I am not pestered greatly by advertisers but this magazine salesman calls me all the time when I am busy. Once this girl called me and talked for ten minutes before I got a word in. I should have hurry up, but I get amused easily.

I wish you luck in this vital legislation.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.,
May 18, 1972.

Congressman ASPIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASPIN: I am writing to you to express my strong approval of H.R. 13267 as originally written.

An informal survey taken among my friends and neighbors shows an overwhelming percentage of us, living in suburban Indianapolis, receive an average of one unsolicited telephone call per day. I, and they, feel this is abusing our rights of privacy. Knowing that you and others in favor of this Act will receive a lot of pressure from those groups using the telephone as a sales tool, I felt compelled to write to you indicating, that at least among my acquaintances, we favor enactment of this bill at the earliest possible moment.

Sincerely,

SPRINGFIELD, VA.,
May 15, 1972.

HON. LES ASPIN,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASPIN: In the past year or so I have become increasingly bothered by home telephone solicitations. I do not have the time for these calls and consider them an invasion of my privacy and a great inconvenience. I had thought there was no hope, but now I have heard about your bill to require the phone company to place an asterisk or other symbol next to a name in the phone book if the person does not wish to be bothered by solicitation calls. I am heartily in favor of this and every other measure to curtail this most annoying practice.

Also, please let me know if there are some interim measures that I can take when these people call. Presently I let the phone drop into the cradle from a height of about 12" or I just slam it down as hard as I can.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

THE JEANNE BUSSARD TRAINING
WORKSHOP

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. and Mrs. C. Lease Bussard and Director Helen Nussear have made the Jeanne

Bussard Training Workshop in Frederick, Md., a shining example of local initiative. Recently, Paul A. Haley, associate editor of the Frederick Post wrote an article on the workshop and its achievements. He described the beginnings of the project and the methods used to train retarded children.

After death of their daughter, Jeanne, in 1957, the Bussards organized the workshop. Since its inception the Jeanne Bussard Training Workshop has trained and found jobs for more than 250 retarded people. The workshop started with six students in the old South Street Elementary School, and presently has over 100 in its work force. The young retarded workers come not only from Frederick County but from Montgomery, Carroll, and Washington Counties as well as from Loudoun County, Va.

The workshop is about 37 percent self supporting. The rest of the funding comes from the Frederick County Commissioners and HEW, but additional funds are needed if the workshop is to continue serving the community to the fullest extent. The achievements of the Jeanne Bussard Training Workshop can best be summarized by this quotation from Mr. Haley's article:

... For the past few years the workshop has averaged an annual 50 percent graduating class who as a result of the skills taught them there, are today living happy, normal and fruitfully productive lives as workers in the business and industrial economy of Frederick and adjacent counties.

I would like to congratulate Mrs. Bussard and Helen Nussear and all those connected with the workshop for their outstanding service to the community.

McGOVERN HAD INSIDE TRACK

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the leading candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination, Senator McGovern, has been quite vocal in the past on the issue of "conflicts of interest," but as an editorial appearing in the June 5, 1972, edition of the Peoria Journal Star points out, it would appear that he is involved in a "conflict of interest" of his own.

The editorial clears some of the "mystery" as to why Senator McGovern has done so well by describing what a terrific advantage the Senator was given when he was assigned the task of "reforming" the structure of the Democratic Party and also writing the rules for this year's convention. He then proceeded to build a rule structure that would be most advantageous to himself and that was also quite intricate.

I insert the text of the editorial in the RECORD and recommend its message to any of my colleagues who may have ambitions for higher office:

McGOVERN HAD INSIDE TRACK

At this point, the primary campaigns of 1972 begin to look oddly like the primary campaign of the "out" party in 1964.

In both cases we goofed—and so did much of the "professional observers" in the early going.

In 1964, we didn't really believe that Senator Goldwater was a serious candidate until about a month before the convention, and many people couldn't believe it right up to the roll call vote.

In 1972, we simply never really thought that Senator McGovern could be regarded as a bona fide, serious candidate—and many people are going to have trouble believing it regardless.

What we overlooked in 1964 was the extent of home-work and preparation Senator Goldwater made so that his opponents discovered that by the time they "got going," it was already too late.

That happened largely because nobody believed the party could really launch Goldwater as the nominee—and they were jockeying for position. Much the same thing is true of the Democrats of 1972 as was the case of the GOP in 1964.

What slipped by us—and obviously slipped by the party leadership—was the unique opportunity given Sen. George McGovern when he was put in charge of "reforming" the party structure and writing the rules for this year's convention.

He was clearly given that task as a sop to the "radicals" by the party leadership, who thought they needed a gesture in the convention and wanted to avoid the kind of "moral" charges that the left-wing flung about so freely in 1968.

Obviously they intended to give the rule-making task to McGovern—and that was all the crumbs from the table he was expected to get.

Instead McGovern built a rule-structure that would be most advantageous to himself, and that was very intricate indeed.

It projected more states than ever before into primary elections. However, what was overlooked was that it still left half the states using a "caucus system" and other complications imposed on the older caucus system.

McGovern emerged from that task, without question, as the one man who knew most intimately the mechanics of choosing delegates in every State in the Union, and even more significantly how they had changed from previous habits.

This was graphically demonstrated in Texas, for example, where young McGovern people early in the game took the standard party leadership completely by surprise, reversed the time-honored (or dishonored) political gimmickry of the caucus system, and rushed in from nowhere to "pack" caucus after caucus—excluding many of the politicians of the party—and choosing McGovern delegates.

Those delegates may not even come close to representing the political sentiments of the majority of Texas Democrats—but they are there.

McGovern has clearly played his advance knowledge of the new systems, and quietly prepared people in many areas, to "get the jump" on others by a number of devices.

This is largely how Goldwater so quietly "sewed up" the convention of the other party in 1964. He did most of it while the other fellows were sleeping.

McGovern's heading the convention-planner commission enabled him to combine the "convention rules" control for the convention itself with his own aspirations to become the nominee of that convention.

One doubts if ever before a candidate, not sitting as incumbent president, ever had the chance to "set up" the rules for the game in which he was about to become one of the main contestants.

We should have taken notice of that unique situation.

Talk about a "conflict of interest!" Wow! Our only excuse is that the party leaders were presumed to know what they were

doing—and that isn't much of an excuse. They obviously didn't know what they were doing, and that shouldn't be so surprising.

Everybody missed, it seems, the significance of this dual-role of candidate and rule-maker McGovern in relation to the same convention.

We don't know if he will cut it or not. One disadvantage he has is the memory of everybody as to what happened to an "extremist" candidate who performed a similarly ingenious pre-convention preparation in 1964.

But we were innocent and naive—after all these years—in not thinking a man with such a radical program was a genuine possibility as his party's nominee.

It has happened.

It could happen again.

After it happens, of course, it creates a very odd political situation in the final election indeed.

But that remains to be seen.

HOMOSEXUAL TEACHERS LEGALIZED FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CHILDREN

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the District of Columbia government filed a stipulation in the U.S. District Court on May 31, 1972, agreeing that the District of Columbia sodomy statute "does not apply and can not be applied to private consensual sexual acts involving adults." I called the attention of our colleagues to this action in earlier remarks, page 19407.

Perhaps the District of Columbia city fathers felt this action necessary to bring the city government in line with the policy of the District School Board adopted on May 23, 1972, extending more job protection to homosexuals employed in the school system to teach the children. Board Chairman Marion Barry is quoted as saying that the resolution:

Reaffirms our commitment to nondiscrimination, but we need to go further—we need to open the schools to discussion of the realities of life.

The news article follow:

[From the Washington Evening Star, May 24, 1972]

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SCHOOLS ADOPT GAY RIGHTS POLICY

(By Lynn Dunson)

The District Board of Education last night approved what is believed to be the nation's first nondiscrimination policy which would extend more job protection to homosexuals employed in the system.

Franklin E. Kameny, the gay activist who ran for D.C. nonvoting delegate last year, was jubilant over the board's decision. "I feel it was the only action the board could have taken that would have been consistent with fundamental American principles," Kameny said.

By a vote of 3 to 4, a majority of the board present over-rode Supt. Hugh J. Scott's recommendation that the action was "unnecessary" since homosexuals are covered by the same equal employment and "affirmative action" policies that cover all employees in the school system.

Discussion of the resolution was brief, but sharply divided.

Strongly opposed to adoption of the resolution, Mattie G. Taylor, called the proposal

"almost absurd" and expressed fear that it would place the schools in an "advocacy role."

"At no time has there been any allegation, charge or finding of fact of any discrimination... based solely on the sexual orientation of an employee," she asserted.

But Hilda Mason reflected, "After my long struggle for the liberation of my (black) people, I cannot sit and deny any person his constitutional rights. When you deny a person the right to a job, you deny him the right to live."

There have been no reported cases of dismissal solely because of homosexuality.

Board Chairman Marion S. Barry said the resolution "re-affirms our commitment to nondiscrimination, but we need to go further—we need to open the schools to discussion of the realities of life."

Voting for the measure were Martha S. Swaim, Mrs. Mason, Kemp and Barry. Voting against were Mrs. Taylor, Evie Washington and Bardyl R. Tirana.

In other business adopted a report showing that all elementary schools were in compliance with the Wright equalization degree as of May 2.

LEGISLATION TO END TERRORISM AGAINST AIR PASSENGERS

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today, with cosponsors, legislation designed to end, or at the very least, alleviate the alarming threat of terrorist attacks against airline passengers. This legislation was drafted in the aftermath of last week's massacre at Lod International Airport at Tel Aviv, Israel and I am pleased that it has attracted the active, bipartisan support of more than 30 of our colleagues.

Last week's assault made it abundantly clear that the unending reign of terror against airline passengers, primarily by Arab terrorists, demands the sternest possible measures by the United States and the community of nations.

It demands concerted and coordinated efforts by all nations because of the tremendous variances in the degree of care taken by governments, airlines and airport operators to assure safety. In the case of last week's massacre, it is clear that incredible laxity bordering on criminal negligence by Air France and Rome airport authorities, made the attack possible. Strict uniform standards for all airports and airlines are needed to prevent future assaults.

That is the purpose of the House Joint Resolution I am introducing with 35 cosponsors. This resolution directs the President to seek, through the United Nations, the International Civil Aviation Organization or other suitable body, a conference of nations for the purpose of establishing uniform, stringent standards of security for the protection of human lives in and around aircraft and airports.

This step is long overdue. Aircraft hijacking and attacks on passengers are no recent phenomenon. Had the nations of the world been concerned enough to get together and develop a coordinated

policy, the 26 lives lost at Tel Aviv last week might well have been saved.

The United States can and must take unilateral action, as well. We cannot justify continued foreign aid to any government which permits innocent civilians, or in some cases, openly encourage these barbarians. And so the second measure I am introducing, with 26 cosponsors, establishes the sense of Congress that the President "shall immediately curtail all forms of economic and military assistance to any nation which either fails to take or fails to require its air carriers and airport operators to take adequate measures to protect passengers and their property from terrorist attacks" and also "shall immediately curtail all forms of economic and military assistance to any nation which encourages, harbors, protects, assists, supplies or fails to take appropriate action against any revolutionary, anarchist or terrorist organization."

I want to make clear that this latter provision is not by any stretch of the imagination aimed at groups which might be termed "revolutionary" in the political sense but which do not engage in acts of violence or terrorism against innocent civilians.

I present for inclusion in the RECORD the text of the two resolutions and the list of their cosponsors. Our efforts to see that these measures are passed without delay could be the most fitting and lasting memorial to those who lost their lives at Lod International Airport.

The resolutions follow:

H.J. RES. 1222

Joint resolution directing the President to seek international agreements establishing uniform standards for the protection of persons utilizing aircraft and airport facilities

Whereas, political warfare through terror in the air against civilian carriers and passengers cannot be tolerated, and

Whereas, violence and murder in the air have proven to be so contagious as to constitute a world problem which, unless checked, will threaten the very fiber of communications between nations and the orderly transport of peoples and goods, and

Whereas, governments and airlines have it in their power to take the long overdue steps necessary to guarantee the safety of the international traveling community, on the ground and in the air: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is directed to seek at the earliest possible date, and through the United Nations, International Civil Aviation Organization or other suitable international body, a conference of nations for the purpose of establishing uniform, stringent standards of security for the protection of human lives in and around aircraft and airports.

Cosponsors of the House Joint Resolution: Ray Blanton (D-Tenn.); Seymour Halpern (R-N.Y.); Bella Abzug (D-N.Y.); Benjamin S. Rosenthal (D-N.Y.); William F. Ryan (D-N.Y.); Phillip Burton (D-Calif.); Claude Pepper (D-Fla.); Shirley Chisholm (D-N.Y.); James W. Symington (D-Mo.); Lester L. Wolff (D-N.Y.); James M. Hanley (D-N.Y.); Don Edwards (D-Calif.); Parren J. Mitchell (D-Md.); John G. Dow (D-N.Y.); James H. Scheuer (D-N.Y.); Donald W. Riegle, Jr. (R-Mich.); Edward I. Koch (D-N.Y.); Peter N. Kyros (D-Maine); Edward P. Boland (D-Mass.); Charles B. Rangel (D-N.Y.); Ralph H.

Metcalfe (D-Ill.); Jonathan B. Bingham (D-N.Y.); Joseph P. Addabbo (D-N.Y.); Louise Day Hicks (D-Mass.); Henry Helstoski (D-N.J.); Ogden R. Reid (D-N.Y.); Emanuel Celler (D-N.Y.); Bertram L. Podell (D-N.Y.); Patsy T. Mink (D-Hawaii); Robert C. Nix (D-Pa.); William D. Hathaway (D-Maine); John F. Seiberling (D-Ohio); Jerry L. Pettis (R-Calif.); Peter W. Rodino, Jr. (D-N.J.); Larry Winn, Jr. (R-Kans.)

H. CON. RES. 629

Whereas certain basic security measures must be taken to adequately protect the lives, property and general well being of national and international travelers; and

Whereas numerous countries have clearly failed to require their national airlines and airport operators to take adequate and effective measures to protect passengers from terrorist attacks, bombings, hijackings and air piracy and similar untoward acts representing serious threats to lives and property; and

Whereas various revolutionary, terrorist and anarchist groups dedicated to the willful and indiscriminate destruction of lives and property for their own ends, are freely operating within the boundaries of several independent nations; and

Whereas the continued activities and existence of such revolutionary, terrorist and anarchist organizations represent a clear and present threat to the maintenance of international peace and security and prompt and effective measures are warranted to end such ill-conceived and mindless acts of terrorism:

Now, therefore, be it *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That it is the sense of Congress that:

(1) the President shall immediately curtail all forms of economic and military assistance to any nation which either fails to take or fails to require its air carriers and airport operators to take adequate measures to protect passengers and their property from terrorist attacks or similar actions; and

(2) the President shall immediately curtail all forms of economic and military assistance to any nation which encourages, harbors, protects, assists, supplies or fails to take appropriate action against any revolutionary, anarchist or terrorist organization.

Cosponsors of the House Concurrent Resolution: Ray Blanton (D-Tenn.); Seymour Halpern (R-N.Y.); Bella Abzug (D-N.Y.); Charles B. Rangel (D-N.Y.); Benjamin S. Rosenthal (D-N.Y.); William F. Ryan (D-N.Y.); Phillip Burton (D-Calif.); Claude Pepper (D-Fla.); Shirley Chisholm (D-N.Y.); James W. Symington (D-Mo.); Lester L. Wolff (D-N.Y.); James M. Hanley (D-N.Y.); Don Edwards (D-Calif.); Parren J. Mitchell (D-Md.); John G. Dow (D-N.Y.); James H. Scheuer (D-N.Y.); Ralph H. Metcalfe (D-Ill.); Jonathan B. Bingham (D-N.Y.); Joseph P. Addabbo (D-N.Y.); Louise Day Hicks (D-Mass.); Henry Helstoski (D-N.J.); Ogden R. Reid (D-N.Y.); Bertram L. Podell (D-N.Y.); Patsy T. Mink (D-Hawaii); Robert C. Nix (D-Pa.); Peter W. Rodino, Jr. (D-N.J.)

MEMORIAL DAY

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, Memorial Day is a day of remembering for all of us. On May 30 Mr. Foy Evans, publisher of the Daily Sun in Warner Robins, Ga., wrote in his daily column an especially poignant account of the deep per-

sonal meaning that Memorial Day holds for him. I commend Mr. Evans' sentimental and touching story to our colleagues.

The column reads:

Today is Memorial Day as far as I am concerned.

Congress may have changed our holidays around for the benefit of everyone who likes long weekends, but it seems that in doing so the real meaning of many holidays is lost.

Memorial Day has special meaning for me, anyway. It is my mother's birthday.

Not many days go by that I do not have occasion to recall some of the things she said or did, though she has been dead more than eight years.

I can recall some of the happiness I gave to her life and every instance that I caused her to shed a tear.

My father became ill and died before I became a teenager.

It fell on my mother's shoulders to provide for and mold the lives of three youngsters.

Looking back, I can see how bad it was not to have a father in my most impressionable years . . . it left memories and scars that never will go away.

Yet, looking at it objectively, I know that while fathers are important, children are better off in the hands of their mother, if destiny decrees that only one of them should survive.

I cringe when I hear young people . . . and sometimes older ones . . . speak unkindly to their mothers.

They really cannot know what they are doing.

Perhaps it does not bother them now. But the time certainly will come when it does. Perhaps she will be gone then, and it will be too late to let her know.

I was very close to my mother until she died. Yet I wondered after she was gone if I really got across to her how much I appreciated her. There is a tendency not to put into words such things, and for those whose mothers still live I would recommend that they spend some time on this important message.

I doubt that any child can ever comprehend what a mother goes through, what she gives to her offspring, until that child is grown and has a family of his or her own. This realization may come early or late in life. But surely it must come sometime to all except the most cold hearted.

These thoughts come to mind often . . . and especially on Memorial Day.

Few of us leave anything in this world physical to remind anyone that we have been here.

The living memory of someone who inspires you to succeed, overlooks your shortcomings and gives love without expecting anything in return is something all of us can cherish.

FACTUAL EVIDENCE THAT EDUCATION PAYS

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN
OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, many claims have been made about how education and training pay good dividends. Few have doubted these claims, but often we have lacked concrete evidence.

The U.S. Census figures serve a helpful purpose in many matters, especially in determining incomes and living standards in different areas of the country.

A study made of two census tracts in the Augusta, Ga., area reveals the tremendous difference that more scholastic preparation makes in family income and living standard. These facts stand out as indisputable evidence of the need for our Nation to push forward its educational efforts with all possible energy.

The Augusta Chronicle in an editorial quoted in the Savannah News of May 24, 1972, reviews the census figures, as follows:

MORE TRAINING PAYS

If any youngster is contemplating dropping out from further education at the end of the school term, a glance at just-announced U.S. Census figures should help him make a more realistic decision.

Take two census tracts here: Tract 101, just north of the city of Augusta, has a population with median school years completed being 12.7; while tract 3, on the Savannah River in the center of the city, has a median education level of 7.7 years completed.

It is more than a coincidence that the area with more scholastic preparation had an average family income in 1969 of \$1,689; average value of owner-occupied dwellings of \$19,400; median contract rents paid of \$120; and only 44 out of 2,779 housing units without basic plumbing facilities.

Tract 3 with the lower educational level, had average family income of \$5,932; average value of owner-occupied homes was \$7,000; median contract rents paid was \$43; and basic plumbing facilities were absent in 99 of 1,248 living units.

The benefits of education, of course, extend into areas of life that cannot be counted financially. Even if one's vision is limited to the materialistic, however, it is dramatically clear that more training means more money.

AMERICAN POSITION AT STOCK- HOLM CONFERENCE

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the Stockholm Conference on the Human Environment which will be meeting during the next few weeks, presents the world community with not only a great opportunity to study world environmental problems but the chance to begin to reverse our planet's deteriorating environment.

If this international effort is to be successful it must meet six requirements.

First, uniform standards to preserve the environment must be determined and observed worldwide.

Second, because of the particular economic situation of the lesser developed countries special compensation would have to be provided to enable them to comply with environmental standards.

Third, global monitoring of environmental conditions must be provided.

Fourth, an adequate and equitable means of enforcing these standards to assure their effectiveness must be developed.

Fifth, the coordination and financing of all these measures under the auspices of the United Nations is essential.

Sixth, the strengthening of the International Court of Justice to provide it

with compulsory jurisdiction over environmental disputes is a necessity.

The present draft proposals of the U.S. delegation to the Stockholm Conference are disappointing. They call for principally the creation of three new U.N. entities: an Administrator of United Nations environmental programs, a commission for the Environment, and an Environmental Coordinating Board.

In essence, the United States recommends an enlarged United Nations bureaucracy without seeking an agreement on standards, without offering a workable solution to lesser developed countries, and without suggesting any means for enforcing subsequent agreements.

We cannot expect to accomplish in one conference all that is needed to meet the crisis, but the present U.S. position on the world environment is shortsighted. The urgency of the international environmental crisis demands immediate action as well as long-range comprehensive goals, to be met.

The U.S. delegation to Stockholm must begin to lay the groundwork for efficient and effective international environmental arrangements.

First, by working for the immediate establishment of standards. Preliminary guidelines may not be as comprehensive as necessary, but as scientific knowledge on pollution develops more adequate standards must be adopted. The acceptance of standards provides us with a more precise definition of pollution problems and a definite idea of the environmental quality we wish to maintain. With this "international understanding" on standards, "environmental aggression" would be defined and outlawed multilaterally.

Also, uniform standards would help prevent unfair trade advantages that will occur as countries with lenient pollution regulations compete with countries which are attempting to eliminate their pollutants.

Secondly, the U.S. delegation should work for the establishment of an international régime to govern the high seas which lie beyond the various national jurisdictions. Such a proposal can be suggested by the United States at Stockholm as a solution to controlling pollution on the high seas. Later, at the 1973 Geneva Convention on the Law of the Sea, the United States can work out the details and support the creation of such an institution under the authority of the United Nations.

With the authority of the United Nations extended over international waters, environmental standards could be equitably enforced. Licenses could be issued requiring those nations exploiting the seabed, to take all the guards necessary for the protection of the environment. Accords should be reached governing the shipping of dangerous pollutants on the high seas. Standards for oil tanker construction and operation should be developed; the practice of permitting the discharge of oily bilge wastes into the oceans must be stopped. New ship construction should be reviewed to determine whether it is environmentally sound. For example, the Japanese have developed new iron-ore carriers in which the ore is loaded as

a waiting slurry and then the excess water is pumped out as the ship departs—leaving a "red sea" of unnatural contaminants behind. In short, the United Nations would thus be required to maintain a global monitoring network of environmental conditions.

Such an international system would operate under the principle of equal benefits and burdens to be borne by all participating states. This would mean, for example, the sharing of all proceeds derived from submarine exploitation. Several formulas for dividing up the proceeds among member states have already been developed by the United Nations. The key feature of this arrangement would be the distribution of proceeds on a basis weighted to the advantage of lesser developed countries. Direct distribution to governments, for instance, could be based on each country's percentage share of world population, adjusted to favor LDC's according to levels of per capita income. Funds, made available to developing nations in this manner, could be used to help lesser developed countries finance pollution controls without hindering the economic development these nations so desperately need if they are to provide for the stable, progressive, and democratic government of their impoverished people.

Eventually, as subsea exploitation progresses, this international system would be able to deny either a share in the proceeds or permits for resource extraction to those nations violating established standards, whether by their practices on the high seas or by their negligence in allowing polluted effluent to reach the oceans.

Besides protection of the marine environment, an international oceans authority could supervise an orderly development of mineral resources, share technology with lesser developed countries and even grant them preferential access to raw materials to aid their development.

Third the United States should begin action to strengthen the International Court Justice by granting it compulsory jurisdiction over environmental disputes. Aided by scientific experts on the environment, the court could facilitate a just and rapid settlement of such disputes.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that dealing with the world environmental issue in the manner I prescribe is a comprehensive, efficient, and reasonable plan of action. Those of us who feel a sense of urgency about the environmental threat anticipate a disappointing level of agreement to come out of Stockholm. Therefore, I urge the United States to join in organizing a coalition of environmentally concerned nations to lead the world in meeting the environmental crisis. We are the world's most advanced technological society. We consume a vastly disproportionate share of the world's resources and energy reserves. Frankly, we have probably been the world's major polluting nation.

Now, at last, we have begun to see what our development has done to our air, our waterways, and coastal waters.

We have begun to act to curb this pollution.

But the world is one world; it is one ecology. If we stop our pollution, but others continue theirs, in time we here in the United States will be no better off.

Perhaps the greatest contribution our Nation—the richest Nation in the world—can make to the rest of the world in the coming decades is assistance in providing the controlled, environmentally sound technology which will end human misery around the earth without destroying this, our only world.

We must, therefore, make a stronger commitment to the U.N. conferences and the problems of the earth's environment.

HYPOCRISY ON RHODESIA

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the hypocrisy mentioned in the headline of the New York Times June 7 editorial "Hypocrisy on Rhodesia" is the Nixon administration's. The White House's apparent failure to marshal support for Senator GALE MCGEE's effort to end U.S. violations of the U.N. sanctions against the racist Rhodesian regime seems to deserve the Times' severe judgment.

June 13 and 15, the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements will look at the effectiveness of sanctions as an international enforcement tool. As the Times editorial points out, the United States is an international lawbreaker and by its actions contributes to U.N. ineffectiveness. Our subcommittee is not prejudging the administration's role in this process, but there is a prima facie case against the administration and the Times has presented that case very well. The editorial follows:

HYPOCRISY ON RHODESIA

Forty Senators—only two-fifths of the membership but a slim majority of those present and voting—have dealt another blow against the credibility of the United States and the prospects for building an effective United Nations. On the spurious arguments of Senator Harry F. Byrd and others, they have voted in effect to require this country to continue to breach the sanctions invoked with American support by the U.N. Security Council against the white racist rulers of Rhodesia.

This makes the United States an international lawbreaker, an offender not only against a Security Council decision but against the U.N. Charter itself. Such an action will help propel the United Nations down the road to extinction taken by the League of Nations after its failure to halt Fascist Italy's aggression against Ethiopia in 1935.

The 40-to-36 vote, rejecting an effort by Senator McGee of Wyoming to return the United States to the side of international law, reflected racism, pique at the U.N. for ousting Taiwan, and clever lobbying by the Rhodesian regime as well as by Union Carbide Corporation and the Foote Mineral Company, both importers of Rhodesian chrome.

Most of all, however, the Senate behavior reflects a double game by the Nixon Admin-

istration. It tried to placate liberals, blacks, U.N. backers and African governments with a State Department letter supporting Mr. McGee while refusing the minimal White House initiative that would have brought him victory.

The letter to Mr. McGee from Acting Secretary of State John N. Irwin refuted all the arguments advanced by Mr. Byrd for breaking the sanctions to permit chrome imports: there is no shortage of chrome but 2.2 million tons of excess in the strategic stockpile; the Government hopes to sell off 1.3 million tons; the United States is not dependent on the Soviet Union for any of its chrome needs.

But especially in this Administration the lawmakers pay scant heed to the State Department; a White House follow-through was plainly required. Prior to the vote, Senator McGee telephoned Presidential assistant John D. Ehrlichman to report that six Senators in doubt on the issue had promised to support his amendment if asked to do so by the White House. But an Ehrlichman assistant later called back to say Mr. McGee could expect no further help in the matter.

After his amendment lost by four votes, Mr. McGee told the Senate of this exchange and warned of the high cost for America of a hypocritical stance on such matters of principle. "The time has come when the African nations no longer accept doubletalk and hypocrisy from this country as it concerns their vital interests and needs," he said. "Either we believe in their aspirations or we don't. Either we believe in the United Nations or we don't. We cannot have it both ways."

It would be comforting to be able to believe that these words had impact on forty Senators who had just voted to tarnish the honor of the United States for a supply of excess chrome and the preservation of white minority rule in Rhodesia.

PLOWSHARE PAYOFF?

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's AEC debates the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER) and others, debated at length the role of oil shale vis-a-vis the nuclear blasting of gas wells to increase production.

By a pleasant coincidence this morning's Wall Street Journal carried an excellent article on the present status of the art of plowshare and its effect on oil shale.

I believe this will be of immense interest in view of the current energy posture of this Nation and I know my colleagues will want to read it in full:

"PLOWSHARE" PAYOFF?: THE NUCLEAR BLASTING OF GAS WELLS APPEARS NEAR COMMERCIAL USE

(By Herbert G. Lawson)

Residents of the resort community of Aspen, Colo., and 17 other nearby towns soon may have a singular (some will say dubious) distinction: They could be the first to heat their homes and cook with slightly radioactive gas produced by a nuclear underground blast.

This pioneering consumer role now is being discussed by companies that hope to conclude the first commercial contract for sale of gas produced under the Plowshare program. Plowshare is the joint industry-federal effort to harness nuclear explosives for peaceful purposes.

The contract, it has been learned, is being discussed by the sponsors of the second and most recent nuclear test to stimulate gas production, Austral Oil Co. and Colorado Interstate Corp. The prospective buyer is a small gas distributor, Rocky Mountain Natural Gas Co. The parties hope to bring a contract, or at least an informal agreement, to the Atomic Energy Commission and other federal agencies such as the Environmental Protection Agency in order to force hearings and rule-making. "This will be a test case to prove you can market such gas under reasonable regulation," says Miles Reynolds, vice president of Austral in Houston.

The maneuvering under way on the gas contract is the most dramatic evidence to date that Plowshare's gas-stimulation plans are moving forward. Meanwhile, a third gas-well blast, a Colorado shot termed Rio Blanco that is far bigger than the earlier tests, could be detonated in December unless a legal challenge delays it. The first Plowshare tests, called Gasbuggy and Rulison, successfully released huge volumes of gas without dangerous accompanying radiation, the AEC and industry advocates claim.

"RUNNING SCARED"

The Plowshare program remains mired in controversy, however. "The AEC still is running awfully scared," says one industry source. Plans to use nuclear explosives for canal-building, excavation, carving of underground reservoirs and mining of everything from copper to shale oil have been quietly shelved or abandoned in recent years. Most companies say pressure from environmental critics and meager budgeting for Plowshare in the AEC are the chief problems.

But Plowshare's gas program, buoyed by an asserted nationwide gas shortage, has doggedly gone ahead, although at a slow pace. The AEC's Plowshare spending this fiscal year is only an estimated \$6.9 million, down from \$7.4 million last year. Next year, however, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is pushing to raise spending to \$10.5 million, largely for gas projects.

The natural-gas program seeks to prove that nuclear explosions can safely and economically jar loose the gas trapped in relatively impermeable rock. Most of the gas is in remote areas of Colorado, Wyoming, Utah and New Mexico. The Interior Department has estimated that nuclear fracturing could recover 317 trillion cubic feet of gas now beyond reach with conventional techniques. That's more than all proved U.S. gas reserves and could provide the nation with gas for 15 years at present rates of consumption.

"EXCEEDINGLY HOPEFUL"

There's no provision now in AEC rules for the sale of gas released in Plowshare tests. Thus, the negotiations that could bring such gas to the Aspen area, though affecting only 12,000 residential, commercial and industrial customers, "would be a milestone, a trial case," says H. H. Aronson, vice president of CER Geonuclear Corp. of Las Vegas, project manager for the Rulison test that would supply the gas. CER Geonuclear, which specializes in industrial uses of nuclear explosives, is largely owned by Continental Oil Co. and EG&G Inc.

Rocky Mountain Natural Gas is optimistic it can win government and customer acceptance for the gas sale. "We are exceedingly hopeful that the program will develop to the point where permission will be granted by the AEC," says William A. Newton, chairman and president. "All data indicate the gas is safe and marketable." But he figures it will be a year or more before any AEC approval is forthcoming.

Many AEC scientists are convinced that gas from nuclear-stimulated wells can be provided to consumers nearly free of radioactivity. For one thing, they argue such gas would be diluted heavily with gas from conventional wells; also, they say a new ther-

monuclear device especially designed for gas wells produces far less radiation than previous devices that were actually off-the-shelf "bombs" from the AEC inventory.

The new nuclear device, tested last year and called "Miniata," leads AEC scientists to predict that a 90-kiloton blast would result now in less than 3,000 curies of residual tritium in the blast cavity. (Tritium, an isotope of hydrogen, is the most worrisome by-product of gas-well explosions; the tritium unites easily with gas or water and remains dangerous a long time, losing half its radioactivity only every 12 years. A curie is the amount of radiation emitted by one gram of radium.) The 3,000 curies compares with 10,000 curies from the far smaller Rulison blast. "With twice the (blast) yield, we can get less than one-third the tritium," says Richard Pastore, head of Plowshare's field operations for the AEC in Nevada.

IS THE RADIATION HARMFUL?

Researchers at the AEC's Lawrence Radiation Laboratory of the University of California calculate that, in a metropolis such as Los Angeles where Plowshare gas would be diluted and come from wells stimulated by the "clean" Miniata device, the average gas consumer would get only one-half of a millirem yearly of extra radiation. The millirem (one-thousandth of a rem) is a standard unit for measuring body exposure to radiation.

This dose is indeed small, though some scientists argue that any amount of radiation must be considered harmful and capable of causing cancer and other disorders. The one-half millirem compares with the three to five millirems received merely by flying coast-to-coast on a jet and the 50 millirems received from living in a brick or stone house (which is more radioactive than wood). The Federal Radiation Council has set 170 millirems yearly as the recommended maximum exposure from all sources for the general population.

Many environmental critics have shifted their attack from the alleged hazards of gas piped from nuclear wells to the alleged dangers of massive seismic shocks and groundwater contamination that might follow Plowshare explosions.

David Evans, a geological engineer at the Colorado School of Mines and spokesman for the Colorado Open Space Council, a private environmental group, criticizes the AEC's claims about the proposed Rio Blanco blast. The commission asserts that most radioactivity would be confined to rocks deep underground in the blast area. Mr. Evans notes that, in the Cannikin blast in Alaska recently, the AEC admitted ground water would enter the blast cavity and carry away radioactive particles. "It is hard to see how the same organization could have written the Rio Blanco statement," he testified at a hearing on Rio Blanco.

He insists that the dangers must be viewed in the context of the countless explosions that nuclear proponents are urging. The Rocky Mountain gas-field area, he notes, covers the underground circulating waters of the Upper Colorado river basin. "Who will inspect the tens of thousands of nuclear gas wells 20 to 50 years from now when the gas is produced and the wells are abandoned?" he asks. "When corroded casings begin to leak radioactive water, some time during the next 400 years, who will stop these poisonous springs? The answer is no one. Nothing man can do will keep the radioactivity out of the Colorado River."

CONCERN ABOUT SHOCKS

Ranchers and other residents near the proposed Rio Blanco test site are more concerned about the shock of the blast than about radiation. Rio Blanco, sponsored by CER Geonuclear and Equity Oil Co., would involve detonation of three 30-kiloton explosives simultaneously in a single well shaft. The devices would be placed at different levels

roughly a mile below ground, creating three connected underground cavities.

After extensive hearings, AEC officials and industry proponents have concluded that the population near the sparsely settled Rio Blanco County site 52 miles north of Grand Junction is willing to accept the risks of the initial test. But development of the full field is another question.

"Most people here will go along with this first shot and then evaluate its effects," says rancher William Brennan, a county commissioner whose home on a 640-acre spread is only five miles from the proposed test well. "The biggest concern is over seismic effects. Everyone realizes there's going to be some."

While ground damage is likely to be limited (it totaled over \$100,000 in claims paid after Rulison but is forecast at only \$50,000 for Rio Blanco), critics of the Plowshare program say the gas industry has just begun to shake the earth. One rancher near the proposed test site, J. O. Welland, remarks, "I don't mind a single shot, but if they knock the house down 200 or 300 times, that gets kind of old."

Mr. Evans of the Colorado School of Mines visualizes over 13,000 nuclear wells, eventually, each using up to four or five "bombs" to liberate the total estimated reserves of 317 trillion cubic feet. This, he says, would require four blasts every working day for over 12 years. The alternative, he argues, would be a series of "nuclear stimulation days" when hundreds of blasts would be coordinated. "It would be a nightmare," he asserts.

ROLE OF OIL SHALE

The people who most vividly foresee such a nightmare aren't environmentalists but rather are the men who hope to mine the fabled shale-oil riches of the Rocky Mountain region. "Our biggest opponent," says Mr. Aronson of CER Geonuclear, "is the Oil Shale Corp.," or TOSCO.

TOSCO officials claim that tremors caused by Rio Blanco and subsequent blasts would damage tunnels and surface facilities, making it impossible to mine shale from which many companies hope to extract oil. The shale beds lie close to the surface and above the sandstone formations where natural gas is trapped. "We have conservatively calculated the value of the recoverable oil shale alone to be 100 times greater than the value of the gas which the Rio Blanco projects seeks to produce," says Louis H. Yardumian, TOSCO vice president. "When the associated minerals of nahcolite and dawsonite are included, the risk of damage is even larger."

"We're considering some legal action" to block the Rio Blanco test, says Mr. Yardumian, though no suit has been filed yet. He says TOSCO and its partners are on the verge of deciding whether to build the nation's first full-scale commercial plant to process oil from shale. It would be a 50,000-barrel-a-day facility that could be working by 1976.

AEC studies assert that the nuclear explosions wouldn't damage shale mines or interfere with shale-oil extraction. Some of TOSCO's partners take a middle position. Atlantic Richfield Co., a 30% partner with TOSCO and two other companies in the shale-oil venture, hasn't publicly opposed Rio Blanco. "I have a number of geophysicists available to me and, unfortunately, they don't agree as to the danger (from the nuclear blast) to the oil shale," says H. E. Bond, manager of synthetic crude and mineral operations for Atlantic Richfield.

OTHER RESEARCH

Meanwhile, research near Las Vegas at the AEC's test facility may be the key to rapid commercial development of nuclear explosives. Scientists there are working on Project Yacht, an effort to fire two or more nuclear devices in the same well but a few minutes apart. Such "sequential" firing is essential

if industry is to develop gas fields requiring hundreds of wells.

The reason involves the hazards of ground shock. An average well in the field might require 300 kilotons of explosives to exploit the gas around it. Fired all at once, such a blast could easily set up a damaging ground shock. But three devices of 100 kilotons each five minutes apart would set up three smaller ground shocks, each of which might be acceptable risks.

The problem is that protective casings and firing mechanisms to withstand the pressure of the sequential blast aren't available yet. But El Paso Natural Gas Co. and the AEC are so confident the technology can be developed that El Paso is planning a mighty 500-kiloton test shot in Sublette County, Wyo., called Project Wagon Wheel. It would use sequential firing of several devices.

**DR. RICHARD M. CYERT NAMED
PRESIDENT OF CARNEGIE-MEL-
LON UNIVERSITY**

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Carnegie-Mellon University of Pittsburgh recently appointed a new president. He is Dr. Richard M. Cyert, who currently is dean of the CMU Graduate School of Industrial Administration.

I would like to congratulate Dr. Cyert on his appointment and include in the RECORD at this time the news release from the university announcing his new post:

PITTSBURGH, Pa., May 10, 1972.—Dr. Richard M. Cyert, internationally known economist and behavioral scientist, and currently dean of the Graduate School of Industrial Administration at Carnegie-Mellon University, has been named as sixth president of the Pittsburgh institution.

Dr. Cyert succeeds Dr. H. Guyford Stever, who left the CMU presidency on February 1 to assume new duties as director of the National Science Foundation.

The announcement of the appointment, which will become effective on July 1, was made by CMU board chairman Fred C. Foy after a specially convened meeting of the CMU Board of Trustees approved the selection last night.

In announcing Dr. Cyert's selection, Mr. Foy said, "Search committees representing the faculty, students, administration, alumni, and trustees were closely involved in a joint and correlated search process. A list of more than 100 names was considered carefully and narrowed to a small number, some from outside the campus, and some from within. As the search evolved, it became apparent that Dean Cyert, because of his demonstrated management expertise and scholarly achievements, his knowledge of Carnegie-Mellon, and his own personal aspirations for the continued growth in the already high quality of education, research, and community service present at Carnegie-Mellon, was the best person to head the University."

At the same time, Dr. Cyert and Mr. Foy announced that Mr. Foy, as board chairman, will devote time to assisting the president in such matters as he may request during the transitional period. Mr. Foy has been on the CMU Board since 1958 and was elected chairman last year. He is retired chairman of the board of Koppers Company, Inc.

Dean Cyert, 50, was born in Winona, Minnesota. He joined the CMU faculty in 1949 after having served on the faculties at the

University of Minnesota and the City University of New York. The next CMU president received his B.S. degree from the University of Minnesota and his Ph.D. from Columbia University.

At Carnegie-Mellon, he was assistant professor of economics and industrial administration until 1955, associate professor and head of the department of industrial management until 1960, professor from 1960 to 1962, and has been dean of the Graduate School of Industrial Administration for the past ten years.

Dean Cyert has gained an international reputation in economics, behavioral science, and management. He currently serves as president of the Institute of Management Sciences, an international organization devoted to incorporating the techniques of science into the field of management. As a consultant to the Ford Foundation, he has played a major role in programs aimed at increasing international cooperation in management practices and business education, conducted with the U.S.S.R., countries of Western Europe, and Japan among others. He is scientific director for the European Institute for Advanced Studies in Management in Brussels, Belgium, and is on the advisory council of the International Institute of Management in West Berlin. Dean Cyert was instrumental in starting both schools. In 1970 he served as chairman of a committee of enquiry on graduate management education for the Australian government.

He is the co-author of four books and has contributed more than fifty articles in the fields of accounting, behavioral science, economics, and management to professional journals. In 1959-60, Dr. Cyert was the recipient of a Ford Foundation Faculty Research Fellowship. In 1967-68, he received a John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation Fellowship. In that capacity he spent a year in England as a visiting fellow at Gonville and Caius College at Cambridge University and served as university lecturer in the department of economics.

The new Carnegie-Mellon president is a director of the Pittsburgh Branch of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland, Gemini Computer Systems, Inc., and Koppers Company, Inc. He is a consultant to the Ford Foundation's Office for Higher Education and Research. Dr. Cyert serves as chairman of the Research Advisory Committee of the National Planning Association's study of national goals and is a member of the Research Advisory Committee of the Brookings Institution's study on government regulation. He is also a member of a committee formed recently by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants to study and reformulate the objectives of financial statements.

Dr. Cyert holds memberships in the American Economic Association, the American Statistical Association, and the Econometric Society.

He is married to Margaret Shadlick Cyert and the couple has three children, Lynn Cyert Aikin, Lucinda Carol, and Martha Sue. The Cyerts currently reside at 35 Chapel Ridge Road, Pittsburgh, 15238.

PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY SYSTEM NEEDS OVERHAULING

HON. MORGAN F. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as we near the end of the presidential primary trail, a course we travel every 4 years, I believe it is important to analyze this cumbersome system with the

hope it can be overhauled and made more responsive to the voters.

A great deal of time, money, and energy is expended during the individual State primaries with the result that some delegates attend party conventions committed while others are uncommitted.

This system tends only to confuse the selection process and at the same time is not a true picture of how the voters feel about a specific candidate.

It was recently pointed out by Mayor Richard Daley of Chicago that a system of regional primaries, held on the same day by both parties, would be a viable solution to the problem.

Mr. Daley added that convention delegates would be apportioned among the candidates according to the percentage of the vote they receive.

This, he said, would eliminate situations such as the California primary where a candidate received all 271 convention delegates although he received only 45 percent of the popular vote.

I think my colleagues would have to agree that a regional primary system would give candidates the opportunity to speak more on national issues so they in return could judge the voters' feelings about those issues.

As it is now, a candidate tends to speak on more localized items and while this may satisfy some voters, there are more extensive matters with which a President must concern himself.

I ask my colleagues to consider some of these comments and to also consider the possibility of changing the current primary system as soon as the opportunity presents itself.

CARNIVALS AGAINST DYSTROPHY

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, summertime is vacation time for schoolchildren throughout the Nation, a time for fun. But in my congressional district each summer, as in many American cities, children combine fun with a serious endeavor: raising money for the fight against muscular dystrophy by holding carnivals against dystrophy.

Last year, Dayton was among the 15 leading cities in raising money for the Muscular Dystrophy Association of America. Three hundred carnivals produced \$7,700.

The children plan and conduct the carnivals themselves, expressing their concern for less fortunate youngsters through their fundraising efforts. The kids do it all—or almost all. One adult in the Dayton area has been integral to the success of the carnivals against dystrophy campaign—Malcolm MacLeod, the host of the "Clubhouse" program on WKEF-TV.

On his television show, Mr. MacLeod invites viewers to write for free carnival kits, and he encourages the children to participate. Each year the children re-

spond with hundreds of carnivals against dystrophy.

The importance of Mr. MacLeod's promotion of the carnivals campaign is obvious: dollars are raised which are necessary to provide assistance to muscular dystrophy patients. However, the importance of Mr. MacLeod's work extends beyond the money raised for the battle against neuromuscular diseases. Children who watch Mr. MacLeod's "Clubhouse" program receive so much more than entertainment—they are encouraged to understand the problems of others, and to act on that concern by helping others. Mr. MacLeod is performing a public service for the Dayton area, and the citizens of the third district are justly proud of his work.

NATIONAL DEFENSE A PRIORITY

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, during the last few years we have heard and read a great deal about reordering our priorities by cutting defense expenditures and diverting the savings to such items as health, education, welfare, housing, and transportation. I for one am certainly in favor of cutting defense expenditures whenever and wherever the reductions can be made without jeopardizing the independence and security of our country.

I must, however, part company with those of my colleagues in this body who want to earmark the savings for more and greater spending on welfare and related programs. It would be much better, in my opinion, to curtail unnecessary spending, reduce the national debt, and cut Federal taxes.

When it comes to reordering priorities, the most extremist position is the one advocated by the leading candidate of the right to oppose President Nixon in November. According to this aspirant for the Democratic nomination, \$31 billion could be carved out of the Federal budget and reapportioned for other matters. He includes a billion dollars in allocations for supersonic transport and things like antiballistic missiles. Inasmuch as the SST was promoted primarily for civilian use, his total could be lowered somewhat, but the reductions he has proposed still total over \$30 billion.

State and local governments and private individuals and organizations can do a much better job when it comes to spending money for hospitals, schools, homes, mass transit, et cetera. Those who advocate the intrusion of the National Government into practically every phase of our lives are the same ones who are constantly discovering new constitutional rights. I wish these people would occasionally read and study our Constitution instead of merely talking about it. It would also improve their minds if they would read the great governmental classic that was written by James Madison,

Alexander Hamilton, and John Jay—"The Federalist."

Mr. Speaker, excerpts from three of the papers that make up this monumental work show that one of the principle reasons for establishing the Union of the 13 original States was to provide for the common defense. The arguments put forth for this priority by Hamilton and Madison are logical, coherent, consistent, and unanswerable.

The excerpts follow:

The principle purposes to be answered by Union are these—The common defence of the members—the preservation of the public peace as well against internal convulsions as external attacks—the regulation of commerce with other nations and between the States—the superintendence of our intercourse, political and commercial, with foreign countries.

The authorities essential to the care of the common defence are these—to raise armies—to build and equip fleets—to prescribe rules for the government of both—to direct their operations—to provide for their support. These powers ought to exist without limitation: *Because it is impossible to foresee or define the extent and variety of national exigencies, or the correspondent extent & variety of the means which may be necessary to satisfy them.* The circumstances that endanger the safety of nations are infinite; and for this reason no constitutional shackles can wisely be imposed on the power to which the care of it is committed. This power ought to be co-extensive with all the possible combinations of such circumstances; and ought to be under the direction of the same councils, which are appointed to preside over the common defence.

This is one of those truths, which to a correct and unprejudiced mind, carries its own evidence along with it; and may be obscured, but cannot be made plained by argument or reasoning. It rests upon axioms as simple as they are universal. *The means ought to be proportioned to the end; the persons, from whose agency the attainment of any end is expected, ought to possess the means by which it is to be attained.*

Whether there ought to be a Federal Government intrusted with the care of the common defence, is a question in the first instance open to discussion; but the moment it is decided in the affirmative, it will follow, that the government ought to be clothed with all the powers requisite to the complete execution of its trust. And unless it can be shown, that the circumstances which may affect the public safety are reducible within certain determinate limits; unless the contrary of this position can be fairly and rationally disputed, it must be admitted, as a necessary consequence, that there can be no limitation of that authority, which is to provide for the defence and protection of the community, in any matter essential to its efficacy; that is, in any matter essential to the formation, direction, or support of the national forces.

... The Union ought to be invested with full power to levy troops; to build and equip fleets; and to raise the revenues, which will be required for the formation and support of an army and navy, in the customary and ordinary modes practiced in other governments.

... Shall the Union be constituted the guardian of the common safety? Are fleets and armies and revenues necessary to this purpose? The government of the Union must be empowered to pass all laws, and to make all regulations which have relation to them. (No. 23, by Alexander Hamilton.)

If ... it should be resolved to extend the prohibition to the raising of armies in time of peace, the United States would then ex-

hibit the most extraordinary spectacle, which the world has yet seen—that of a nation incapacitated by its constitution to prepare for defence, before it was actually invaded. As the ceremony of a formal denunciation of war has of late fallen into disuse, the presence of an enemy within our territories must be waited for as the legal warrant to the government to begin its levies of men for the protection of the State. We must receive the blow before we could even prepare to return it. All that kind of policy by which nations anticipate distant danger, and meet the gathering storm, must be abstained from, as contrary to the genuine maxims of a free government. We must expose our property and liberty to the mercy of foreign invaders, and invite them, by our weakness, to seize the naked and defenceless prey, because we are afraid that rulers, created by our choice—dependent on our will—might endanger that liberty, by an abuse of the means necessary to its preservation. No. 25, by Alexander Hamilton. (The word denunciation meant announcement when *The Federalist* was written.)

The several powers conferred on the Government of the Union ... may be reduced into different classes as they relate to the following different objects;—1. security against foreign danger—2. regulation of the intercourse with foreign nations—3. maintenance of harmony and proper intercourse among the States—4. certain miscellaneous objects of general utility—5. restraint of the States from certain injurious acts—6. provisions for giving due efficacy to all these powers.

The powers falling within the first class, are those of declaring war, and granting letters of marque; of providing armies and fleets; of regulating and calling forth the militia; of levying and borrowing money.

Security against foreign danger is one of the primitive objects of civil society. It is an avowed and essential object of the American Union. The powers requisite for attaining it must be effectually confided to the federal councils.

Is the power of declaring war necessary? No man will answer this question in the negative. It would be superfluous therefore to enter into a proof of the affirmative. The existing confederation establishes this power in the most ample form.

Is the power of raising armies, and equipping fleets necessary? This is involved in the foregoing power. It is involved in the power of self-defence.

But was it necessary to give an Indefinite Power of raising Troops, as well as providing fleets; and of maintaining both in Peace, as well as in War?

The answer indeed seems to be so obvious and conclusive as scarcely to justify such a discussion in any place. With what color of propriety could the force necessary for defence, be limited by those who cannot limit the force of offence? If a Federal Constitution could chain the ambition, or set bounds to the exertions of all other nations; then indeed might it prudently chain the discretion of its own Government, and set bounds to the exertions for its own safety.

How could a readiness for war in time of peace be safely prohibited, unless we could prohibit in like manner the preparations and establishments of every hostile nation? The means of security can only be regulated by the means and the danger of attack. They will in fact be ever determined by these rules, and by no others. It is in vain to oppose constitutional barriers to the impulse of self-preservation. It is worse than in vain; because it plants in the Constitution itself necessary usurpations of power, every precedent of which is a germ of unnecessary and multiplied repetitions. If one nation maintains constantly a disciplined army ready for the service of ambition or revenge, it obliges the most pacific nations, who may be within

the reach of its enterprises, to take corresponding precautions. . . . (No. 41, by James Madison.)

(Emphasis in all three papers in originals.)

ATILLA THE TOURIST

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, now that the touring season is beginning to come into full summer flower, Americans who still regard some things, especially historical, as sacred, may well begin to cringe as acts of desecration begin to take place. Much has been said about the lack of regard for irreplaceable historical artifacts which are sometimes stolen or damaged by overzealous tourists, but the practice continues.

If, indeed, these tourists did these things because of genuine love for historical things, that would be one thing, but usually these people could not care less about the real historical values and have heard somebody talk about the objects as being valuable and simply want their share of the spoils.

Providing guards at every important place is expensive, and even with guards atrocities continue, as was proved by the hammering of Michelangelo's Pieta recently in the Vatican.

Saddest aspect of all is the fact that in many instances parents either assist their children, or permit them, to disturb priceless mementos. As long as this continues there can be no end to these mentally warped indulgers.

The Savannah Press of May 30, 1972, comments helpfully on this problem in an editorial entitled "Atilla the Tourist", as follows:

ATILLA THE TOURIST

The strange species known as Tourist Americanus "may be less dangerous to the civilized world than Atilla, but not much."

The charge is made by author John Keats, writing in Travel & Leisure magazine. In an article called "The Great American Vandal," he ticks off a list of tourist crimes committed by Americans. The samples include:

Partial destruction of the new John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts shortly after its opening in the nation's capital, where tourists dismantled the chandeliers, pried the faucets off bathroom basins, stole the silverware from the restaurants, paintings from the walls and cut swatches out of carpet and draperies for souvenirs and in all did some \$1.5 million worth of damage.

The irretrievable loss of several geysers and the Morning Glory Pool in Yellowstone Park because tourists could not resist the temptation to clog the vents with coins, stones and logs.

Graffiti at the Grand Canyon, where one ranger caught a family spraying their names on the rocks and was told, "We thought this was what everybody did. The rocks are for everybody, aren't they?"

In addition to our national parks, our historic sites and museums are particular targets of our touring barbarians, which accounts, says Keats, "for the fact that so much of our heritage is behind velvet ropes and iron bars or in glass cases and is only seen through a screen of uniformed guards."

It is bad enough that American tourists "foul their own nests," he says. "But worse, thanks to the creation of cheap jet travel,

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

that our affluent barbarians now commit their nuisances on a worldwide scale."

He admits that American tourists are not the only ones who can be indicted: "The German yields to no one when it comes to selfishness, nor is the Belgian far behind."

The British Lord Elgin, it will be remembered, sent home whole shiploads of marbles which once adorned the Acropolis in Athens.

But Americans are the worst of all, claims Keats, if only because there are so many of them.

FOREST HILLS RALLY FOR SOVIET JEWRY

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, on a warm Sunday afternoon more than 5,000 people gathered in Forest Hills tennis stadium to express their support for Soviet Jews. This outpouring of sympathy for the plight of Soviet Jews was a great tribute to the bond we in the United States should feel for oppressed people in other nations.

The June 4, 1972, rally was sponsored by the National Council of Young Israel and its purpose was to raise approximately \$100,000 to help those Soviet Jews who are able to emigrate to Israel. The funds will be used for religious and spiritual aid for refugees, to purchase prayer books and to support religious schools and houses of worship in Israel.

Mr. Speaker, the rally was entitled the "Miracle of Return" and spotlighted the refusal of the Soviet Government to recognize the basic international human right of emigration. There can be no freedom without the freedom to leave or move and that is the tragedy of the oppression of the Soviet Jews.

I am pleased to place in the RECORD at this point the program of the Miracle of Return Rally in Forest Hills and to commend the more than 5,000 persons who took part in that impressive expression of support for Soviet Jews:

MIRACLE OF RETURN—TO SUPPORT THE RELIGIOUS NEEDS OF OUR RUSSIAN BRETHREN

Sponsored by National Council of Young Israel.

Nash Kestenbaum, President; Rabbi Ephraim Sturn, Exec. Vice Pres.

Endorsed by U.O.J.C., R.O.A., SSSJ, Center for Russian Jewry.

YOUNG ISRAEL

ISRAEL PROJECTS COMMITTEE

Rabbi Marvin Luban, Chairman.

SOVIET JEWRY COMMITTEE

Dr. Moshe Tendler, Dr. Samuel Korman, Co-Chairmen.

MIRACLE OF RETURN COMMITTEE

Alex Friedman, Chairman.
Heshie Baron, Assoc. Chairman.
Rabbi Zevulun Charlop, Program Chairman.

Gil Pollinsky, Legal Chairman.
Herman Klein, Publicity Chairman.
David Lewin, Ticket Chairman.
Herbert Willig, Coordinator, Yerusha participation.

David Wachtel, Pre-Collegiate Chairman.
Alan J. Gerber, Collegiate Chairman.
David Willig, Public Relations.
Alan A. Mannheim, Administrative Coordinator.

The Star Spangled Banner, Hatikvah.

June 8, 1972

Rabbi Yaakov Pollak, M.C.
Rabbi Marvin Luban.
Message from Gadol Hador, Rav Moshe Feinstein by Dr. Moshe Tendler.
Clei Zemer Associates.
Rabbi Aaron Soloveitchik.
Rabbi Steven Riskin.
Professor Ishai Branover.
Cantor Sherwood Goffin.
Nash Kestenbaum.
Hon. Menachem Begin, M.K.
Jo Amar.
Or Hakeseif Band.

PETROLEUM: THE MOST POLITICAL OF ALL COMMODITIES

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, Under Secretary of State John Irwin warned the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee that petroleum "is the most political of all commodities." The recent Iraqi takeover of a major Western oil company underlines the importance of his warning.

The following articles from the Washington Post and the New York Times summarize current developments in the Middle East and the implications of these events for the United States. As Mr. Victor Zorza writes in his perceptive column:

In a world in which the importance of nuclear and military power is going to be greatly reduced, as it is almost certain to be by the middle 80's, the balance of power is going to be measured in economic terms. The physical and the commercial control of the oil supplies will come to constitute the greatest source of power.

The articles follow:

[From the New York Times, June 6, 1972]

OIL POWER REVERSED SINCE 1967 WAR

(By William D. Smith)

The six-day Arab-Israeli War, which began five years ago yesterday, set in motion forces that have sharply changed the international oil industry.

The changes are still occurring, as last week's nationalization of the Western-owned oil consortium by Iraq's Government shows. In the last five years the oil industry has lost some of its physical strength as well as emotional drive.

The most significant change has been a swing in the balance of power from the industrialized nations to the oil-producing states.

In 1967 the Arabs accused most of the Western nations of siding with Israel. During the war the Arab nations cut off supplies to Western oil companies. They quickly decided that this was counter-productive because the Arab cause needed money at least as much as the industrialized countries needed oil.

SUEZ CANAL CLOSED

Nonetheless, there remained a substantial residue of ill will toward the Western companies.

The war closed the Suez Canal, tightening the world's oil supply lines. Europe began counting more and more on Libya, just across the Mediterranean in North Africa, which now supplies almost 40 per cent of its oil.

A break in the Trans-Arabian pipelines in Syria further tightened oil supply lines, and the cost of tankers to carry oil rose sharply.

In the meantime, a 29-year-old militant Colonel, Muammar el-Qaddafi, had overthrown the monarchy in Libya.

He used the situation to ask for higher payments for Libyan oil, now vitally important to Europe. The oil companies initially responded with an offer he said was insulting. The revolutionary demanded sharply higher posted prices and tax payments.

The oil executives looked at the world supply situation and suddenly realized they were holding a weak hand. Colonel Qaddafi was just as surprised to discover that he, not the Western companies, held the trumps.

BIG GAINS ACHIEVED

The Libyans obtained a sharp increase in the posted price as well as an increase in the tax rate to 55 per cent from 50 per cent.

These gains did not go unnoticed by other oil-producing nations. Within months the other 10 members of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries had negotiated similar agreements.

The oil companies, even though they banded together to face the O.P.E.C. demands, submitted almost entirely to the demands of the producing nations. The once powerful international oil industry was virtually helpless in the face of what amounted to a cartel of oil-producing nations.

"The oil trade became a seller's market for the first time in its modern peacetime history," Prof. Henry Adelman of M.I.T. commented.

FINANCIAL POWER

The price increase will amount to almost \$10 billion for the oil-producing nations by 1975, when the present agreements were scheduled to run out. This money gives the producing nations considerable financial power, which is likely to increase as the years go by.

The contracts failed to survive one year. The O.P.E.C. demanded compensation for the devaluation of the dollar. It also called for 20 per cent participation by the producing nations in existing concessions.

[From the Washington Post, June 7, 1972]

SOVIET OIL MOVES THREATEN WEST

(By Victor Zorza)

The Kremlin's control of the life-lines that supply oil to the West, so often raised in the past as a remote specter, has once again become an issue.

The seizure of the western-owned Iraq Petroleum Company (IPC) by the government of Iraq may not be of great importance by itself. But if it shows to other Middle East governments that nationalization works, as the Kremlin has been telling them it does, the seizure of the IPC could change the balance of world power as effectively as some of the more spectacular achievements of summits.

The encouragement given by the Soviet Union to Iraq is not in doubt. The question is whether the Russians, who have their own lupe of fields, can help the Arabs get rid of their own oil. It used to be said that "the Arabs cannot drink it," and that they therefore had to accept the arrangements dictated by Western oil companies. Nor can the Russians drink it. But their own need for oil is rising rapidly, and so is the cost of production in inaccessible Siberian regions.

By 1980 the Soviet Union, which is now increasing its output by about 30 million tons a year, may be about 100 million tons short. The Russians are not the only ones who have to look ahead. The United States, which has relied largely on its own oil in the past, may have to import half of it by 1980-85. Moscow Radio says pointedly that up to a third of this "will be carried from the Middle East to the United States—but the scale of the national liberation movement of the peoples of Asia and the Middle East is inflicting blows on the predatory plans of the American monopolists."

The implied threat has not been ignored in Washington. Already, the Navy is using it as an argument for a "new" role for the U.S. fleet. Adm. Elmo R. Zumwalt, chief of naval

operations, has asked for more money this year than either the Air Force or the Army. He says that he needs it to build the ships to protect the 1,000 tankers that will be transporting oil to the United States by the mid-80s.

"The potential for coercion of the U.S., with or without allies, inherent in this situation, is ominous," Zumwalt says. Washington officials also argue for an increased U.S. presence in the Indian Ocean in order to be able to protect the flow of oil to Japan and other U.S. allies in Asia.

The Soviet press discusses the Middle East's stranglehold on the West in articles which point out that, without oil, economic life would come to a stop. Oil and oil products, it says, account for more than half of world trade in physical volume, and tankers already make up a third of the tonnage of world merchant shipping. Without oil, "all the arms accumulated by the motorized armies of NATO would be reduced to heaps of rusting metal."

What the Russians are saying to the Arabs is that those who control the supply of oil can also control the policies of the West. In urging the nationalization of the oil industries, the Russians are suggesting that the Arabs should use it as a weapon against the West for its support of Israel. They are also telling the Arabs that the West is not entitled to the huge profits it is making from Arab oil.

What is emerging more and more clearly is that the Russians would like a share in these profits. They see no reason why the West should have a monopoly of Middle Eastern oil. In a world in which the importance of nuclear and military power is going to be greatly reduced, as it is almost certain to be by the middle 80's, the balance of power is going to be measured in economic terms. The physical and the commercial control of the oil supplies will come to constitute the greatest source of power.

If the Kremlin can induce the Arabs to push the Western oil companies out of the Middle East, and to call in the Russians to redress the balance, it will have achieved more than it can do through military penetration. This is precisely what it is doing in Iraq, where it has already taken over some of the functions performed by Western companies. The nationalization of the IPC could be the thin end of the wedge.

EIGHTY-EIGHT FOURTH GRADERS PLEA FOR PEACE

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, more and more people are expressing their deep concern about the President's continuing policy of escalating the level of American involvement in Southeast Asia, most recently by mining Haiphong Harbor.

The American people have turned against the war. They elected the President on his pledge to bring peace to the American and Vietnamese people. Yet Mr. Nixon continues to pursue a policy of war, not peace.

In an effort to express their opposition to the mining of Haiphong Harbor and their fear over the consequences of such actions, three 9-year-old children in my congressional district—Rebecca Singer, Naomi Tzor, and Linda Hiniker—organized a petition drive among their fellow fourth graders. Their petition reads as follows:

We think Nixon should not mine Hai-

phong. If it is not stopped it might cause a world crisis.

Eighty-eight other children who share their convictions joined them in signing this petition.

Mr. Speaker, when a policy is so wrong that it brings fear to the hearts of our children, then that policy must be repudiated. I hope and pray that the President will listen to the words of our children, words informed by the purity of their hearts.

SERVICE, EMPLOYMENT, REDEVELOPMENT

HON. ELIGIO de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1972

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, one of our greatest natural resources is the potential of the Nation's untrained manpower and womanpower.

Ever since I came to Congress in 1965, I have been working to develop this potential, particularly among the Spanish-speaking populations of approximately 11 million. I have worked with two outstanding Texas-based organizations, the American GI Forum and the League of United Latin American Organizations, on a program to make the fullest possible use of our manpower resources.

This program is designated as SER.

SER is both an acronym and a Spanish word of great significance. The acronym stands for service, employment, redevelopment. The meaning of the Spanish word is "to be"—and that precisely expresses the aspirations and hopes and ambitions of America's second largest minority. They want to be better.

Fortunately, at the time we embarked on this program, President Lyndon B. Johnson was in the White House. He had a great understanding of the problems of the Spanish-speaking population. As a very young school teacher he had come in close contact with the Mexican-American youngsters of Texas. As a Member of this House and as a U.S. Senator, he worked hard for their interests. As President of the United States, he gave his personal approval to efforts to upgrade the provisions in the Government of this important minority. He instructed the Federal departments and agencies to hire more people from this group and to give them training for better jobs. President Johnson gave his personal approval to SER.

In my own south Texas area where we have many first, second, and third generation citizens whose origins were in the neighboring country of Mexico, we are seeing the fine results of the programs that have been developed in recent years.

Operation SER is giving direct service to people who need it most. The training they receive is qualifying them for better jobs and for more meaningful lives as Americans. Significantly, these job placements, almost without exception, are in semiskilled, skilled, or highly skilled occupations. The people involved are getting the kinds of jobs they want and for which their training has qualified them. Those who head SER are able,

conscientious, capable leaders of their own.

Local employers in my area, and elsewhere in the United States, are extending magnificent support to the program. They understand the value of having highly motivated employees, people who do not shy away from work ethic which made this Nation great and which, sad to say, is now held up to scorn in some quarters.

Mr. Speaker, whatever manpower legislation may be enacted during this session of Congress should and must take full cognizant of the SER program and its basic premise that a person who wants help to better himself has a right to expect that help. SER has a place, and an important place, in any manpower training program. It is my privilege to commend it to the attention of this august body as an organization which needs our support. To be self sufficient is every American's right and we in this House can rightly help this important segment of our Nation to achieve that goal.

GRASS IS THE BACKBONE OF BEEF OPERATION

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, to those who may think that making money in the cattle business simply involves buying cattle, waiting for them to grow and telling the buyers to bring a check, the following article on the skills and management involved in successful cattle operations will be of interest.

[From the Missouri Ruralist, May 13, 1972]
GRASS IS THE BACKBONE OF BEEF OPERATION
(By Larry Harper)

"Yearling country" is the term Bill Sidwell uses to describe grasslands in the Green Hills area of Schuyler County in extreme North Central Missouri.

Sidwell, who now serves as president of the Missouri Cattlemen's Association, has fitted his beef operation to the environment. He runs yearlings, but not in the traditional sense. His beef herd consists of young heifers grown out and bred for sale as replacement stock.

In Sidwell's area, around Queen City, the land varies from gently rolling prairie to steep brush-covered hills. Winter temperatures and snowfall often are the most severe recorded in the state. These two factors combined make yearling cattle a more practical enterprise. Cattle can be grazed in the hills during warm months, gathered and brought closer to home for winter feeding. With a yearling operation there is no problem with calving in the brush or moving young calves in hot weather. Yearlings, including replacement heifers, can be fed in closer quarters during extremely cold and wet months.

The decision to specialize in heifer replacements is perhaps a refinement of the "thinking" Sidwell has had since he began ranching after World War II. He always has been specialized. While most producers in his area had diversified farms Sidwell stayed with cattle. Before switching to a heifer operation four years ago he had a cow herd. For several years he managed a large cow herd for the Oppenheimer Corporation, plus some of his own. His heifers now are grown out on the 1,500-acre home ranch, which is mostly open land, plus about 4,000 acres of rough hill land which is leased.

While specializing in heifers, Sidwell has some built-in flexibility. He has three ways to go with heifers. Depending on market conditions or other factors, the heifers can be sold in August as feeder cattle. By December they will be ready for the bred heifer market. A third alternative is holding the heifers and calving them out.

Young heifers weighing around 500 pounds are bought during the fall and winter. Sidwell buys the stock himself, and "buys the best calves that walk in the ring." Most of the calves comes from the Nebraska Sandhills, and all are Horned Herefords.

When the heifers arrive at the Sidwell ranch they are branded, dehorned, vaccinated for leptospirosis, blackleg and wormed.

During the winter they receive a ration of whole corn and supplement that keeps them gaining at 1½ to 2 pounds a day. By spring they are in the "right" condition to go on grass which Sidwell says is the "backbone" of his operation. He aims for the cheapest gains without getting the heifers too fat. For this reason cattle are not fed on grass because they tend to stand around the feed bunks instead of utilizing the forage.

By the first of May the heifers go into the hill pastures where they run with Angus bulls during the summer. Sidwell uses yearling and two-year-old Angus bulls because they are the right size and weight for breeding heifers. And he watches his bull power closely. Yearling bulls are used at the rate of 18 heifers per bull, while two-year-old bulls may run with 22 to 24 heifers.

It is in this area of management that Sidwell believes many ranchers run into problems. They don't have enough bull power. He says most farmers carry a spare tire for their car, but won't invest in a spare bull. Even for small operations he suggests keeping a young bull for emergencies.

Another reason Sidwell leans toward heifers is plain economics. He can carry three heifers to one cow-calf pair. Because grass is his "backbone" he allows five acres per animal. With a heifer operation, he doesn't want to run short of grass during July and August when heifers are in the peak breeding season.

These summer months also call for careful attention to fly control. Cattle are sprayed before they go on summer pasture, and those that can be gathered in a "trap" are sprayed once during the summer. All cattle are sprayed again after the fall gathering. Also, cattle have access to high phosphorous mineral with Vitamin A, and backrubbers are scattered around the pastures.

Presently Sidwell is growing out 700 heifers. He has found a ready market for bred heifers, especially among Iowa farmers looking for cattle as a supplemental enterprise.

Bill Sidwell of Queen City, in Schuyler County in my congressional district, the president of the Missouri Cattlemen's Association, has considerable experience in this field, and is a leader in seeing that America has a sufficient supply of good beef.

BOOK ON BLACK PROBLEMS IN INDUSTRY HAILED

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, a new book has come to my attention which gives practical and constructive insights into healing the racial split that separates Americans from each other. This book, entitled "Blacks in the Industrial World, Issues for the Manager," co-authored by Theodore V. Purcell and

Gerald F. Cavanagh, examines one of our major social problems, the employment situation for blacks at all levels of industry.

The essential idea behind this valuable work is the concept of corporate social responsibility. Business managers are being asked to hire black workers, not for the sake of more efficient business operations—although that may be the ultimate result—but as a deliberate effort to change the forces that are dividing the country along racial lines. This new concern has led to the identity crisis of the corporation and a new rhetoric of "corporate social responsibility." The book attempts to advance the understanding of corporate social responsibility not so much by theorizing as by exploring the application of this responsibility to minority manpower policies and practices.

"Blacks in the Industrial World" is most interesting and informative reading as well as an important commentary on the hopes and problems of the black blue-collar worker.

WOBURN STUDENTS SUGGEST CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, all of us get petitions and all of us receive correspondence from young people in our districts. However, last month I was sent a petition signed by 168 young people who are students at Joyce Junior High School in Woburn, Mass. This was a special piece of correspondence for it was obviously the result of much effort and hard work on the part of these students.

They were petitioning me as their elected representative to remedy what they felt to be an inequity in the United States Constitution. They referred to article II, section I, clause 5 which reads in part:

No person except a natural born Citizen, or a Citizen of the United States at the time of the adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the Office of President. . . .

The concern which they voiced in their letter to me was that this provision prevents a naturalized citizen, who has all the other privileges of a natural born citizen, from running for President.

A check of the judicial and legislative history of this provision shows that it has been construed strictly to mean literally what it says and that it does seem to preclude a naturalized citizen from holding the Office of President of the United States.

I would point out to my colleagues that no similar prohibition exists with regard to the offices of Representative or Senator. Thus, naturalized citizens, being barred from the Office of President, are declared to be less than natural or native born citizens, and are denied the privilege of serving their adopted country in the highest office it holds open to native born citizens.

To demonstrate the extent of this

injustice, it is helpful to look at the number of naturalized citizens who live in the United States. While the 1970 census statistics are not yet final, the Immigration and Naturalization Office of the Justice Department has supplied me with some of the figures.

Since 1907 there have been over 8.8 million persons who have become naturalized citizens. Of these, nearly two million were naturalized within the past decade. In the last 2 years alone, 219,000 persons have been naturalized.

I feel that the students of Joyce Junior High School, in their studies of the Constitution, have uncovered a real inequity, and I hope that it can be changed. We should not allow artificial barriers to make naturalized citizenship in any way second-class citizenship. And we should not prevent a naturalized American from holding the Office of President and serving his country if he is the choice of the majority of citizens in the United States.

Consequently, I am today introducing a resolution which calls for an amendment to the Constitution and which would allow an individual who has become a naturalized citizen to be eligible for the Office of President if he has been both a citizen of and resident in the United States for 12 years.

I hope that the Congress and the necessary three-fourths of the States will take action on this measure, and I thank the students at Joyce Junior High School for their concern and for helping to bring this matter to the attention of the Congress.

JOINT RESOLUTION

Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that a citizen shall not be ineligible to the Office of the President by reason of not being native born if he has been a United States' citizen for at least twelve years and a resident within the United States for fourteen years.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by Congress:

"Article —

"A citizen of the United States shall not be ineligible to the Office of President by reason of not being native born if he has been a United States' citizen for at least twelve years on the date of election for such Office and if he has been fourteen years a resident within the United States on such date."

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

SECRETARY RICHARDSON'S REMARKS ON THE HIGHER EDUCATION CONFERENCE REPORT

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, as of this time the White House has not commented publicly on the conference report to S. 659, the Education Amendments of 1972. I personally feel that the President can take credit for many of the substantive provisions in this bill. President Nixon proposed some of the provisions and the administration has endorsed several others. Last Friday the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Elliot Richardson, spoke for the independent colleges of southern California in Los Angeles. He spoke in part as follows:

As I speak to you today, the Congress is in the final stages of deliberating major new legislation for higher education that would have an historic impact on the roles our colleges and universities will play in the last critical years of the 20th Century.

Passage of this legislation would provide an affirmative answer to one vital question: Can the Federal government contribute significantly to helping our institutions of higher learning become more effective and more responsive, without at the same time imposing unwarranted Federal control over the higher education process?

The bill passed by the Senate and now before the House is—and let there be no doubt about it—a major achievement. It is legislation which, in the finest traditions of American politics, members of both parties worked very hard to produce. Anyone involved in the two-year effort it took to get this legislation to its present stage learned something about the flexibility, the tolerance, the root strength of our legislative process.

The Secretary did raise some personal reservations about the busing amendments, explaining his feeling that the conference report falls short of the goals of the President's proposed Equal Educational Opportunities Act.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, the conference committee, of which I was a member, did not have before it the provisions of the President's most recent proposals on busing and, therefore, could not include them in the conference report.

But the Secretary continued in his speech to comment positively about the educational provisions of the conference report. The following is a further excerpt from his speech:

But, these reservations aside, I believe the legislation is truly a landmark in the history of higher education—and this Administration would welcome ultimate enactment of the higher education provisions. We must not fail to take this first, necessary step toward a new Federal role in aiding American higher education to prepare for a new age.

The bill embodies the heart of President Nixon's higher education initiatives, including his proposals for aiding students and institutions; his call for a National Institute of Education; his request for authority to fund innovation and reform in post-secondary education; his plans to create a secondary market for student loan paper, and to provide mortgage insurance for private college construction; and the President's proposed ban on discrimination against women in higher education.

The bill, in essence, would broaden access to higher education for every young man and woman in this nation; it would establish a workable framework for encouraging institutional self-study and reform; and it would, for the first time in history, provide institutional support to our colleges and universities.

Passage of this legislation would mean Congressional acceptance of the principle, enunciated by President Nixon, that opportunities for higher education shall be extended to all young people regardless of their financial position. As the President said, in his 1970 Higher Education Message to the Congress:

"No qualified student who wants to go to college should be barred by lack of money. That has long been a great American goal; I propose that we achieve it now."

To meet that goal, the bill would authorize a new basic educational opportunity grant program providing substantially increased benefits to students from families with annual incomes of up to \$12,000. This new aid would be in addition to all existing student aid programs in effect providing a new minimum floor of benefits to students whose families cannot afford to send them to college.

For the first time, a financially disadvantaged student would be able to determine clearly what kind and how much aid would be available. The new grant would be equal to \$1,400 a year, minus what his family reasonably could be expected to contribute—and would relate to the on-going grants, loan and work-study programs already on the books.

Obviously, this has many implications for private institutions. Such a student aid concept would improve opportunities for students to attend colleges of their choice—and thus widen access to a diversity of educational offerings.

The bill also would create a secondary market for student loans, thereby substantially increasing the availability of low-interest, guaranteed funds for students entering college. This program would particularly ease the burdens of middle-income students enrolled in the private colleges.

State legislatures and higher education boards and councils will play an important role in the application of this new legislation which, in essence, will work as major incentives to help higher education become self-sufficient. The bill contains a new program of Federal incentive grants to encourage the States to put more money into State scholarship programs—programs like those your organization has so strongly supported—and programs which have traditionally provided a means for students to attend the private college of their choice.

In addition, the bill would provide a new program of Federal insurance for private college expansion to help these institutions prepare for anticipated enrollment increases. This provision should have the effect of significantly lowering interest rates on construction loans, and make these loans much easier to maintain.

The institutional aid provisions of the legislation comply with four guidelines set forth by the Administration. First, additional aid would be related to the effort institutions themselves are making to fulfill

recognized national goals—such as equalizing opportunity, stimulating reform and innovation, and sponsoring research.

Second, additional aid would most benefit those institutions and categories of institutions experiencing the greatest financial distress.

Third, additional aid would not produce major reallocations of responsibility among the supporters of higher education—the Federal government, other levels of government, and private donors.

And fourth, the additional aid would not impose upon institutions a uniform Federal bias as to how higher education should be provided. It would not, in short, impose unwarranted Federal controls over the higher education process.

The concept of the Federal government granting unearmarked funds to institutions means simply this: If the government is to encourage more students to go to college by expanding its aid to students, it must help these institutions meet the additional costs related to greater enrollment—and help institutions meet the costs of additional special programs geared to meet the needs of students coming in from disadvantaged backgrounds.

In a broader sense, direct institutional aid would help institutions of higher learning become more responsive to the existing and developing needs of the public it serves.

Related to this latter goal is the emphasis the bill places on education research as well as reform and innovation in higher education.

It would, for example, create a National Institute of Education, to be modeled along lines of the National Institutes of Health, the world's pre-eminent biomedical research center.

The purpose of the NIE, as set forth by President Nixon, "would be to begin the serious, systematic search for new knowledge needed to make educational opportunity truly equal."

Operating across the entire spectrum of our educational system, from kindergarten through graduate school, the Institute would concern itself with providing a research base for restructuring and improving the system for greater effectiveness: It would serve as a vital resource in the search for new ways to increase access to education; to broaden the age range of learning; to increase the relevance of learning; to design learning programs tailored to the specific needs of individuals; and to increase the range of resources available for learning.

The Administration's emphasis on reform and innovation also is carried out by language in the legislation authorizing the HEW Secretary to make grants to improve post-secondary education. This language would provide the Department with essentially the same authority to promote reform and innovation as the Administration had proposed for a National Foundation for Higher Education. And since private colleges traditionally have been the leaders in promoting higher education reform, I feel certain they would be major beneficiaries of this new program.

In large measure, this legislation attests to this Administration's belief that the best way to assure that higher education will respond to the developing needs of the public is to provide the means directly to higher education institutions themselves.

As I reflect on this legislation—and on its potential impact on higher education—it seems to me our feelings, in the event it is passed, should be not unlike those of a senior attending his college commencement.

The first thing to be done is to celebrate the achievement of what already has been accomplished. And graduating a bill from this Congress—let alone this bill—would indeed be cause for celebration.

MIRACLES COST MONEY—POWER IS A MIRACLE

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, serious problems face this Nation with the increasing demand for electrical power. All across the country more and more homes and businesses depend on the energy generated by electrical powerplants to run the innumerable machines and appliances now regarded as necessities by industry and consumer alike. However, the miracle of electricity involves costs.

Joseph W. Rittenhouse, group vice president for electrical products of the Joslyn Manufacturing and Supply Co., is a competent and forceful spokesman for the power industry. My lifelong friend, Mr. Rittenhouse recently spoke before an engineering foundation conference and outlined the costs to the Nation for increased power production to meet the expanding use of electricity. Rittenhouse believes that the costs to the United States in producing more electrical power may involve more pollution and more expenditures. In order to better inform the public and the Congress of the possible costs to the Nation of increased power production, I insert the following speech on this important subject in the RECORD:

MIRACLES COST MONEY—POWER IS A MIRACLE
(By Joseph W. Rittenhouse)

I'm sorry that I wasn't around when the first commercial installation of a power generator was accomplished nearly 90 years ago.

I wish I had been. I would have witnessed the birth of a miracle, a miracle that has spawned the greatest society in all of history, the American Way of Life.

Wouldn't you think that we would treat a 90 year old miracle with some respect? Wouldn't you think that we would recognize with appropriate accolades the amazing accomplishments of this industry?

At first I think we did, but the blush was barely off the first kilowatt hour before we began to demand more. The industry had to work like a Trojan to keep up with the demands. And the demands were directly related to the creature comforts of our people. By 1968, their residential needs had reached the fantastic levels shown in Table I:

TABLE I: Residential electrical appliances found in American homes—1968

Type of appliance:	Percent of homes containing appliances
Refrigerators	99.7
Radios	99.5
Black and White Television	98.1
Washing Machines	94.3
Vacuum Cleaners	92.1
Coffeemakers	79.6
Electric Ranges	47.0
Electric Blankets	42.3
Room Air Conditioners	36.7
Clothes Dryers	34.6
Freezers	27.2
Color Television	26.2
Water Heaters	26.1
Dishwashers	18.1
Food Waste Disposers	18.0

As a future bench mark for comparison with 1968 it has been estimated that by 1980, 83% of all residences will be fully air conditioned. This will not come about because some nasty, conniving, scheming

capitalistic, profit monger will cram it down the throats of a reluctant populace. It will come in direct response to the demands of you the people.

Epitomizing the insatiability of our thirst for the good life is the fact that mankind has consumed more energy in the past 30 years than in all of history before 1940. In the next 30 years, he will use far more than between 1940 and 1970.

More relevant to today's meeting is the fact that with only 6% of the world's population, we in the United States consume 32% of the total world's energy production.

It is a direct result of the unrelenting demands of a power-hungry society that our industry has swelled from a single generator 89 years ago to what may well be our largest producer of jobs, payer of taxes, investor of capital and server of the nation. Table II reveals a few of the facts for 1969 and 1970.

Table II: Electric utility contributions to our economy
1969

Investor owned utilities payroll, \$2.5 billion.

Investor owned utilities employees, 372,500.

Investor owned utilities investment in plant and equipment, \$94 billion.

Total utility industry number of generating plants, 3,490.

1970
Investor owned utility annual investments in plant (this is 12.5% of total for all of American industry) \$10 billion.

Investor owned utility tax bill (this is 19¢ out of each revenue dollar), \$3.51 billion.

Total energy delivered, 1.5 trillion KWH.

The raw statistics are, of themselves, most impressive. They assume an even more magnificent dimension when it is added that a kilowatt hour which cost about 2.09¢ in 1970 would have cost 11.2¢ in 1906 when Edison was shocking the world with the first trickle of the miracle that was to follow.

This accomplishment of more energy for less cost may well be history's most outstanding bootstrap operation; a miracle of self-improvement through technological advance. In no country in the world has the service of the electric utility matched the service in these United States.

With residential usage of electricity expected to more than quadruple between 1960 and 1985, and with industrial usage expected to double within the next decade, it has been projected that about \$350 billion will be required to finance new plants and equipment between now and 1990. Approximately one million megawatts of new capacity must be installed.

While these figures may seem astronomical, they are the price of progress, and unless you want to advocate retrogression through stagnation somebody is going to have to pay.

Contrary to the apparent view of many "do-gooders", there is no bottomless pit of diamonds and rubies down in Washington into which we can repeatedly dip to finance every crackpot idea that might glean a few votes. The American Way has always been, and God grant that it shall always be, that real progress is financed from return on investment, and the beneficiary pays.

The user of the electricity is the beneficiary; so in the greatest American tradition, either he must pay or the benefits must cease or never become available.

With existing technology there is no way to meet the growing demands of an electric energy hungry society without some pollution, and the irresponsible headline seeker who screams that anyone who pollutes must pay for pollution control would be well advised to consider carefully his logic.

He frequently is the one who finds a special enchantment in feeding at the federal

trough of sponsored research. He may be one whose perpetual search for the federal dollar has blinded him to the implications of the question: "Is the polluter the one who flips the light switch, or is he the one who supplies the electricity that makes the light switch work?"

There is no way of getting around it. In the final analysis, the culprit is Mr. John Q. Public, yet he is a most contradictory animal.

If we turn on his lights he screams about our stack plumes; if we turn them off, he belches fury at our lack of reliability.

It is ironic that his demands for comfort, convenience and the good life have simultaneously led to the giant that is American industry and all of the pollution thereunto appertaining. It does not seem incongruous, then, that it is he who must pay whatever the cost attached to both.

It is little short of miraculous that the electric power industry has carried its fantastic growth burden with so little inconvenience to you the consumer. Yet with all the ruckus over blackouts, brownouts, and ecology, it has been made to seem that the lights rarely come on when the householder flips a switch, or that if they do come on the resulting light is lost in a flood of scalding water saturated with dead fish and fly ash.

If you are interested in the facts, it would be most revealing for each of you to do a statistical analysis of the number of times that your household calls for electricity and fails to get it. I'll wager that the percentage of failures would defy the accuracy of all but the most capable calculators.

These comments on reliability are made with complete knowledge, from personal experience, of the implications of both a 15% and a 100% reduction of voltage. I have encountered them on both our coasts and in the midwest and I would not for an instant want to be interpreted as condoning either.

I simply insist that by comparison with all of the other systems that human beings are hooked on, I doubt that any can match the superb percent-defective performance of the electric power industry, and I think it's high time somebody challenged the voluminous contrary insinuations of the recent past.

It is astounding that the public which has been served so well has been so thoroughly aroused by the screams of the headline seekers and the vote hunters. The present furor over pollution would defy the imagination if our national history were not such a series of tempestuous situations.

One of the strangest of enigmas is the spectacle of perhaps our greatest industry striving desperately to disguise itself: making substations look like houses, transmission towers like modern sculptures, insulators and transformers like patches of sky and generating stations like almost anything that they are not. All this masquerading totally ignores the pragmatism that just as yesterday's beauty is today's congestion; so will today's be tomorrow's.

Nevertheless, we go on and on dissipating, in appeasement of the vote seeker and headline hunter, energy which unequivocally could otherwise hasten such real contributions as fast breeder reactors.

We have already spent a billion dollars for precipitators and another two billion is planned. We're working toward removing 5.6 million tons per year of fly ash, and 20 million tons per year of sulphur oxides from the air, and I have yet to be assured that we have unanimity on what is good or bad in either area.

Whatever the standards become, though, it is interesting that the U.S. Public Health Service tells us that our industry can't hold a candle to John Q. Public when it comes to air pollution.

John, by his use of the motor vehicle causes about 60.6% of the problem; our total industry contributes around 14.1% and the rest

of industry all together contributes about 16.7%.

By my reckoning, John's demands have put more than 100 million cars, taxis, buses and trucks on the road today, along with 2 million motorcycles, 30,000 railroad diesel engines, 120,000 aircraft and nearly 5 million farm tractors. This noisy congregation makes up the greatest portion of the 72 million tons of carbon monoxide which the U.S. Public Health Service rates as our principal air pollutant slightly more than half of the total pollutants emitted into the air each year.

Which of you will volunteer to walk or take a bicycle to fight pollution?

There is ample evidence to support a contention that our industry has always done and plans to do far and away more than its fair share of the work of cleaning up the havoc that people have wrought in this country. It is imperative though that it have more help than it has heretofore had in evaluating and defining acceptable pollution, and surely no self-respecting engineer will insist on zero pollution from our power plants as the only acceptable level.

Do the fish like the water hot or don't they? If they do, how hot is hot to a fish? Do our power plants make the water too hot, or don't they? There are areas where there are as many answers to such questions as there are regulatory entities having local jurisdiction. Yet in spite of such ambiguities the next five years will see some 30 billion dollars spent on water pollution control. That's not far from the size of our total federal budget in the 1940's.

The heritage of the electric utility industry is rich in the lore of the success of capitalism. From a smattering of tiny splinters remotely scattered throughout this vast land, it has risen like a gigantic monument to the creativity of man in the free enterprise system. Where it goes from here hinges greatly on what we allow our legislators to do to shackle it and on how we react to the do-gooders who would cripple it in the blindness of their intolerance for the success of a capitalistic institution.

Tragic will be the day if a Naderian type influence bent on protecting the "stupid" buyer so fills the kilowatt hour with regulatory seat belts and air bags that there is no longer room in the seat for the rider.

In some way we must free ourselves from the phobia that the universal ignorance of our people demands that each package on the grocery shelf be the same size, color, and price per pound. We must accept that Washington cannot protect each of us from everything. We do have common sense and all corporations are not out to cheat us.

Until we come back to the basic principles upon which this great nation was founded there will always be fertile soil on which the manipulators can drop their seeds of distrust. The big lie supported by inference and innuendo will continue to inflame the populace to rally to the polls for the slick-tongued orator, and rule by passion will replace the rule of reason that has been so beneficial to the endurance of our society.

Relative to the theme of this conference I believe our industry is reliable. About 99.98% would be my estimate of the overall process average.

Of course, we have some areas in which we must improve; a prolonged succession of northeast blackouts would indeed be intolerable. I doubt though that we need the help of a sanctimonious press to alert us to the mandatory necessity for excising such a performance from our normal regimen.

We are not helpless idiots!

We who operate businesses based on the principles of profit and loss know far better than any specious journalist or idle bystander that people will not buy what they cannot depend upon. We therefore have a far great-

er stake in putting our house in order than does any harbinger of doom whose future hinges on the size of the headlines he can generate.

With respect to regulation, I have little doubt as to our most dominant future need. Unfortunately, I cannot evoke a wildly enthusiastic optimism relative to the ease of satisfying that need.

We must find some way to enact legislation which is based on the long range best interest of the nation rather than on what will at the moment have the greatest transient appeal to the voters.

The spectacle of automobiles being designed by our legislators may seem far fetched and irrelevant to today's meeting. It certainly cannot be denied though that their legislation set the stage for all of the paternalistic trash which is now going into automobiles under the guise of protecting the public from itself.

We must somehow learn that we cannot pass enough laws, or if we could we couldn't enforce them, to protect every idiot from every potentiality.

I have little question of our ability to find conscientious and dedicated people to serve on our regulatory bodies, interpret with great wisdom the laws that are given to them, and judge carefully the facts that are presented to them. I wish I had equal confidence in our ability to guarantee wise legislation.

In the realm of research I have some optimism that a new era may be approaching. I was party to the first and second "Grinter" reports and I suffered many of the agonies of the more recent "Goals Study". I have an intimate appreciation of the experimentation that perpetually permeates the campus.

I believe it is from an enlightened vantage point that I see increasing evidence that the market for products of curricula of the past decade is not over taxing the college productive capacity. I cautiously express the hope that academicians will interpret this as a signal requesting increased pragmatism on the college campus.

Perhaps we have been so concerned with writing the proposal and getting the research contract that we have overlooked a basic principle: no matter how thick the volume, no matter how elegant its partial differential equations, no matter how lofty its title and no matter how prestigious its audience, a research report is worth just exactly what it can generate in net, after taxes, income.

It may rest on the loftiest shelves of the most elegant libraries in all the world, but until somebody removes it from its shelf and finds a way to convert it to profit it is pure waste.

Last year a publication of the Division of Engineering of the National Science Foundation listed 21 million dollars worth of grants and contracts awarded in fiscal 1970. A scanning of this list is a most revealing exercise. It reveals a \$186,000 grant for a work entitled "Heterogeneous Catalysis by Transition Metals", a \$125,000 grant for studying "Thermodynamic and Transport Properties of Non-Polar Compounds and Their Mixtures", a \$300,000 grant for "Plasma Dynamics", a \$147,000 grant for studying "Neutron Multiplying and Moderating Systems", a \$185,000 grant for studying "Large Continental Droughts", a \$156,000 grant for "Moire and Holographic Techniques for Experimental Stress Analysis", a \$160,000 grant for "Engineering Applications of Stochastics", a \$146,000 grant for "Coherent System Research", and so on and on and on to a grand total of \$21,000,000.

I am far from competent to judge the value of all these programs. In fact, I'm not even sure that I pronounced all the words correctly. With great authority, though, I can attest that \$21,000,000 is an awesome amount of money. I hope that at least a piece of it will shed some light on how to get rid of tin cans and beer bottles.

Research is an essential requisite to the healthy growth of a dynamic society, and I vigorously recommend that we do every penny's worth of it that we can afford. I hope though that we are not entrusting too many dollars to hands with too little of the hard experience of profit and loss.

Not for an instant would I challenge the fascination of "Limit Analysis of Cylindrical Shells with Mixed Boundary Conditions", even at a price of \$16,000, but, gentlemen, we don't even know how, economically, to get rid of the pickle liquor from our steel mills and galvanizing plants.

Senator Jennings Randolph (D-W. Va.) has expressed our industry's problem as follows:

"In the next 20 years, we must triple our national power capacity to meet projected population and industrial demands. This may require 250 new power plant sites with an estimated capital need of as much as \$350 billion. Such an expansion will require approximately eight million acres of land and may require over half a million miles of transmission lines."

What the senator does not say is that this growth will be precipitated by the demands of a population that will reach about 265 million by 1990. We must find some way to do a better job of educating that population than we have done with previous ones.

I'm afraid that the average man, John Q. Public, is totally ignorant of the relationship between the stack plume and flipping the light switch. He thinks the electricity comes out of the wall. He doesn't understand that every time he turns on his air conditioner, each time he toasts a piece of bread, or irons a shirt, someplace some fuel must be burned.

Perhaps we should print in a prominent place on our routine electric bills how many equivalent pounds of coal were burned in order to supply the customers' electricity.

In summary, the challenge of the 70's is well defined. If we meet it we will have performed another miracle. Fortunately, we are blessed in our effort by a power industry which, contrary to a few reporters, is not some nebulous ogre exhaling noxious fumes and spouting fire and corruption; it is composed of the same concerned citizens that make up the rest of society. Its interest in the future of man and his planet is heightened by the services that it renders.

Given legislators who will legislate objectively and researchers who will be guided by the pragmatism of profit making business the miracle will occur.

The miracle will cost a lot of money, but with wise legislation and a successful job of educating the public, the beneficiaries will be happy to pay.

COST OVERRUN IN FORWARD AIR DEFENSE SYSTEM

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the General Accounting Office has uncovered \$377.6 million cost overrun in our forward air defense system. The portions of the GAO study which are unclassified provide a detailed examination of the problem.

The study follows:

CHAPARRAL/VULCAN AIR DEFENSE SYSTEM SYSTEM DESCRIPTION AND STATUS

The Chaparral/Vulcan Air Defense System (CVADS) consists of the Chaparral missile, the Vulcan gun and the Forward Area Alert-

ing Radar (FAAR). The Chaparral is a self-propelled, self-contained missile launcher and control system adapted to a modified, tracker cargo carrier. The Vulcan is a 20-millimeter, six-barrel, Gatling-type gun and a fire control system. The FAAR is a light weight, mobile aircraft detection and alerting radar system. (Unclassified.)

COMING EVENTS

The Vulcan gun is scheduled for Standard A classification (acceptable for Army use) during the first quarter of calendar year 1972. (Unclassified.)

The system has experienced cost growth of \$690.2 million from a planning estimate of \$58.2 million to a current estimate of \$748.4 million. The latter amount includes the current program acquisition cost and additional procurement cost of \$660.3 million and \$88.1 million respectively. Department of Defense officials have attributed this growth primarily to a change in program concept from an interim limited deployment system to a worldwide system which, among other things, substantially increased the quantities to be procured. Other reasons for the cost growth include environmental qualification of components and assemblies, redesign, modification, support changes, estimating changes, engineering changes, schedule changes and inflation. Funds appropriated for research, development, test and evaluation, (RDT&E), and for procurement as of June 30, 1971, amount to \$579.2 million. (Unclassified.)

CONTRACT DATA

Four contracts were identified as applicable to the Chaparral/Vulcan program. For the four contracts, there was a total of 45 definitized changes, costing \$12.4 million. In addition, there was a total of 7 undefinitized changes costing \$7.6 million. Contractor progress reporting systems for the Chaparral/Vulcan had not been validated to the requirements of DOD Instruction 7000.2. (Unclassified.)

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER SYSTEMS

The CVADS is part of a family of Army air defense systems including the Hercules and Hawk missiles which have already been deployed. The CVADS was needed because the Hercules and Hawk for tactical reasons are located back from the forward edge of battle areas and also have low-level limitations imposed by the curvature of the earth. (Unclassified.)

See Appendix I for photographs of the CVADS and the relative areas of coverage provided by various air defense systems. (Unclassified.)

SELECTED ACQUISITION REPORTING

The CVADS is not included in the SAR system because it was in the final stages of the acquisition process when the SAR systems was initiated. (Unclassified.)

AGENCY REVIEW

A draft of this staff study was reviewed by Army officials associated with the management of this program and comments were coordinated at the Headquarters level. The Army's comments are incorporated as appropriate. As far as we know there are no residual differences in fact. (Unclassified.)

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

The General Accounting Office, as part of its continuing evaluation of Department of Defense weapon system acquisition procedures, has reviewed the CVADS to evaluate the System Status Report issued as of June 30, 1971, and actions that have been taken since our previous review. (Unclassified.)

System history

In November 1964 the Secretary of Defense approved development of the CVADS (the Vulcan gun was selected in December 1965 based on tests of several guns) to provide, in combinations with the Hawk mis-

sile system, an interim capability for defending against aircraft in forward battle areas, pending availability of a more optimum air defense system. The CVADS evolved because preceding development programs had failed to provide an air defense system for forward battle areas—for which the need was recognized by 1948—and the more optimum Mauler system was under development and not available to meet the immediate requirements. (Unclassified.)

The CVADS concept was based on the assumptions that (1) Hawk units would be located to provide all-weather coverage for the area to be defended, (2) Vulcan would be located to provide point protection for front line infantry and high priority targets, and Chaparral would be located away from the front line but sufficiently forward to take advantage of its tail-chase capability with particular attention to areas that cannot be covered by the Hawk because of terrain radar masking. (Unclassified.)

In 1965, replacement of CVADS with a more optimum system was planned for accomplishment in 1975. The Army now estimates that replacement will not be accomplished until the mid-1980's, because the replacement system has not reached concept formulation. (Unclassified.)

CHAPTER 2. WEAPON SYSTEM STATUS

We have reviewed the first System Status Report on the CVADS which was issued by the Department of the Army as of June 30, 1971. Our objectives were to (1) verify historical data to source documents on a selected basis, and (2) ascertain the basic reasons for significant variances between the planning estimate, development estimate, and current estimates of cost, schedule and performance. (Unclassified.)

Each element of the System Status Report is discussed separately and is subdivided by the three main components of the CVADS—Chaparral, Vulcan, and FAAR. (Unclassified.)

System cost experience

The Chaparral/Vulcan System Status Report showed program acquisition cost and procurement quantities for the planning, development, and current estimates. The current estimate showed additional procurement cost which includes Chaparral modifications only. The cost information is divided into the planning, development, and current estimates which are discussed separately. (Unclassified.)

Planning estimate

The planning estimate shows program acquisition cost of \$58.2 million. These cost figures were taken from the Department of the Army study—Program for Air Defense—Field Army, dated September 30, 1964. We found no discrepancies in the cost and procurement quantity data shown for the planning estimate. (Unclassified.)

Development estimate

The program acquisition cost shown on the development estimate was \$438.4 million. The U.S. Army Combat Development Command Tactical Mid-Range Air Defense Program Study dated August 1965 and Summary dated September 1965 were used to support the development estimate. We found one minor discrepancy in the cost and procurement quantity data shown for the development estimate. However, this was explained by Army officials and did not change the total cost for the development estimate. (Unclassified.)

Current estimate

The current estimate of Chaparral/Vulcan program acquisition cost and additional procurement cost is \$660.3 million and \$80.8 million respectively. The additional procurement cost of \$80.8 million was verified to the Five Year Defense Program Procurement Annex dated June 25, 1971. This figure included only Chaparral modifications that had been ap-

proved for programing purposes by the Department of the Army. Department of Defense Instruction 7000.3—Selected Acquisition Reports—states that additional procurement cost should include, among other items, PEPA replenishment spares. CVADS Repair Parts Provisioning Schedule included replenishment spares of \$7.325 million, but this was not included in the additional procurement costs as shown in the Status Report. We believe that replenishment spares should have been included in the additional procurement cost and the total shown as \$88.1 million. (Unclassified.)

Vulcan

There were no significant differences between the data shown in the System Status Report and the source documents used by the Project Office for the three Vulcan estimates. Slippages in the milestones between the planning, development, and current estimates are discussed below. (Unclassified.)

By the time the development estimate milestone schedule was published, two of the five selected milestones had slipped significantly: completion of a test program (19 months delay) and equipping the first unit with the Vulcan gun (7 months delay). These slippages were due to the delay in selecting the Vulcan and the change in project concept. (Unclassified.)

Development Estimate to Current Estimate

In the current estimate, three milestones for the self-propelled Vulcan slipped, the estimated date for Standard A classification and the two which had slipped from the planning estimate. (Unclassified.)

Milestones slipped an additional 10 months to August 1968 for equipping the first unit and 11 additional months to May 1969 for completing the testing program (less environmental testing). On December 15, 1966, an Army Materiel Command Official stated in a letter to the Department of the Army that the original program called for bolting together existing components followed by limited testing and a concurrent industrial program. The objective was to provide early fielding of some air defense battalions as a short-lived interim air defense system. Approval of the TAMRAD and a qualitative materiel requirement appreciably expanded the program, service life, environmental requirements, and refinements of the weapon. (Unclassified.)

A Department of the Army review of the status of the system in December 1966 indicated that the testing program had to be rescheduled due to the late availability of prototype, missiles, and ammunition. The December 15, 1966, letter also requested a delay of 1 year in the activation schedule. (Unclassified.)

Chaparral

There were no significant differences between the data shown on the Systems Status Report and the source documents used by the Project Office for the three estimates. Slippages in the milestones between the planning, development and current estimates are discussed below. (Unclassified.)

Planning estimate to development estimate

Development began on the CHAPARRAL fire unit in January 1965. However, this phase culminated in the delivery of one prototype fire unit which was technically unacceptable. A second development contract was awarded in January 1966 which is considered the beginning of full-scale development. (Unclassified.)

Faar

In tracing the milestones included in the System Status Report to the source documents used by the Project Office, several discrepancies were found, particularly in the current estimate. Project Office officials said that they had shown the dates that the testing program and production resumed rather than the original dates. Testing and

production had been halted due to technical problems encountered. (Unclassified.)

Planning estimate to development estimate

Two milestones slipped significantly from the planning estimate. A development contract for prototype was to be awarded in July 1965 and a testing program was to be completed in April 1967. However, the development estimate showed delays of 10 months and 14 months, respectively in these milestones. (Unclassified.)

These delays were attributed to the Department of the Army's desire to issue bids on a world-wide basis for the development contract. The administrative process delayed the award of a contract until May 1966 which caused the development estimate milestone for the test program to slip until June 1968. (Unclassified.)

However, an in-process-review in April 1968 showed that some qualitative materiel requirements would not be met and that several requirements had not been tested or demonstrated. Even though these problems were recognized, the Army Materiel Command directed that a production contract be awarded by November 1968 because of an urgent need for the FAAR. (Unclassified.)

The testing program which began in early 1968 was halted in early 1969 because of major system deficiencies, but was resumed in January 1971. Also, a production stop-order was issued in July 1969 and production did not resume until April 1971. (Unclassified.)

The development problems of the FAAR component was the basic reason for the slippage in all FAAR milestones between the development and current estimates. (Unclassified.)

CHAPTER 3. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS TO IMPROVE THE CHAPARRAL/VULCAN SYSTEM

We made a review to determine what management improvements had been taken to upgrade the acquisition process, and to evaluate the degree of application of acquisition criteria as it applies to the CVADS. Our efforts included a follow-up on problems identified through previous work as well as other technical and management problems which arose in the interim. (Unclassified.)

Technical Status

We reported in our staff study of March 1971 that the CHAPARRAL and VULCAN were produced and deployed without the FAAR and with significant deficiencies and shortcomings that required improvement. The Army approved limited production of the CHAPARRAL, VULCAN, and FAAR, on the basis of urgency before completing all tests necessary for determining that the components would satisfy requirements for an interim air defense system. The Army intended to field the system with known limitations in the scheduled time and to engineer the necessary improvements as retrofit kits or other changes which could be made in the field. (Unclassified.)

There were some serious questions raised as to the sufficiency of testing completed at that time, which was for the purpose of determining the adequacy of corrections that had been made. Therefore, the Army was in the position of stopping production until the tests were completed, at a cost which they estimate at \$3.2 million, or resuming production on the basis of the information they then had with the risk that subsequent tests might prove the equipment was inadequate. The Army chose the latter route, and production resumed on April 4, 1971. The Army believes that the test results support their decision. These test reports are summarized below and leave some serious doubt in our mind as to the adequacy of the FAAR at this time. (Unclassified.)

Engineering Tests (ET) were conducted during the period January through September 1971. Three deficiencies were reported as a result of these tests. The Test and Evalua-

tion Command reevaluated and consolidated the engineering tests and service tests, and concluded that six deficiencies remained. (Unclassified.)

Production was restarted under conditions of some known risk which the Army believed was acceptable under the circumstances, and which they believe has subsequently proved justified. However, we believe that the results of the most recent tests leave serious doubt as to the suitability of the FAAR. (Unclassified.)

SILENT PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to speak in behalf of House Joint Resolution 981, and to urge that this House give favorable consideration to it. I hardly need emphasize the fact that growing numbers of our people are concerned—and deeply concerned—at the erosion of moral and religious values which have been the mainstay of our heritage throughout our national history. These are troubled times through which we are moving, times in which the values and ideals of our Judeo-Christian tradition are subject to severe challenge. Because of this, millions of Americans have supported various proposals to restore public prayer to our schools.

Unfortunately, these proposals, conceived with the noblest intent, have only served to rouse controversy regarding the legal, practical, and religious aspects of the whole question of authorized prayer in public schools.

The immense difficulty of formulating a "neutral" or undenominational prayer acceptable to all, the problem of reconciling our tradition of religious freedom with any officially prescribed devotional rite—these, and similar dilemmas, have led many to consider alternative possibilities which might commend themselves generally to all Americans by respecting the objections of those who in good conscience cannot support any form of State-authorized prayer.

House Joint Resolution 981, which would recognize and safeguard the practice of silent prayer in our public schools, is more than a compromise between contending views. Rather, it represents an ideal which is based firmly upon the fact of our religious pluralism and the diverse paths by which men seek communion with God. Silent prayer would mark official homage to the Divine Power who sustains both life and liberty, while respecting both the conscience of individual believers of every faith and creed as well as of those whose religious beliefs may be deeply personal and perhaps unorthodox. It provides for not the "lowest common denominator" characteristic of so-called nonsectarian prayer, but rather the highest common factor—the inner encounter and dialog of the soul with God, the fundamental reality of all high religion.

Even the nonbeliever may find in a moment of common silence that opportunity for meditation and reflection

which is essential to a meaningful life. Believers may rejoice in the opportunity to pray the prayers of their respective tradition without hindrance and without offense against the conscience of others. Moreover, House Joint Resolution 981 avoids that entanglement of State and prayer which so often in history has been unhappy in its consequences for freedom of worship and conscience.

Finally, silent prayer is very much in the spirit of the Bible, sacred to Jews and Christians alike.

A time of silent prayer at the beginning of the day can be a meaningful af-

firmation of the presence and providence of God within the life of every child and in the life of our Nation.

PUBLIC OPINION POLL RESULTS

HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, since 1965 I have sent an annual questionnaire

to all postal patrons in the Fourth Congressional District in Michigan asking for opinions on leading issues. The 1972 questionnaire was mailed in May and I have just received the tabulated results. More than 12,000 of the questionnaires were returned to my office. Because the form afforded space for husbands, wives, and 18- to 21-year-olds to respond, I received opinions from nearly 24,000 of my constituents. As in past years, the results were tabulated by an independent concern in the Washington area. Complete results of the survey follow:

1972 SURVEY RESULTS

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion		Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you approve of President Nixon's efforts to improve relations with mainland China?	79.19	17.60	3.21	7. Do you favor amnesty for Vietnam draft evaders?			5.36
2. Do you feel we should expand agricultural and nonstrategic trade with the Communist nations?	60.09	34.74	5.17	(a) Now	7.70		
3. Would you favor the "value added" tax, in effect a national sales tax, as a method to reduce property taxes?	35.20	56.29	8.51	(b) After alternate service	30.44		
4. Do you feel busing is a legitimate means to achieve racial balance in the public schools?	8.58	88.61	2.81	(c) After the fighting stops	4.36		
5. Do you think enough emphasis is now being placed on environmental protection by the Federal Government?	33.39	60.90	5.70	(d) Never	52.14		24.94
6. Do you approve of the President's efforts to end the war in Vietnam?	68.48	26.42	5.07	8. Do you support a national health insurance program?			
				(a) Operated by the Government, providing care for all U.S. residents and financed by payroll and income taxes	23.87		
				(b) That would require all employers to provide private health insurance financed by contributions of both the employer and employee	51.16		
				9. How do you feel about the way wage-price controls are working?			9.27
				(a) Satisfied	23.66		
				(b) Dissatisfied	67.06		

CONGRESSMAN RAILSBACK SUPPORTS COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS CENTERS

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, over the last few years, my State of Illinois has been engaged in a comprehensive program of corrections reform under the dynamic leadership of Gov. Richard Ogilvie and Department of Corrections Director Peter Bensinger, and with the bipartisan support of the General Assembly. Most recently the Department of Corrections has been taking testimony around the State on the proposed next phase of the program—the establishment of several small, community based correctional facilities.

One of the most eloquent and persuasive statements in support of this concept was submitted by my good friend and colleague, Congressman TOM RAILSBACK, who has been investigating correctional systems first hand in connection with his responsibilities on the House Judiciary Committee. To quote from his statement:

The consequence of large, often overcrowded facilities is that we practice custody, not corrections, and are preoccupied with security rather than treatment. What is needed is individualized treatment in smaller facilities which are structured with rehabilitation in mind.

At this point in the RECORD I include the full text of Congressman RAILSBACK's

testimony, and commend it to the reading of my colleagues:

STATEMENT OF HON. TOM RAILSBACK, 19TH DISTRICT, ILLINOIS, BEFORE THE COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS CENTERS PUBLIC HEARING BOARD, ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

Director Bensinger, Members of the Board, and residents of the Quad Cities area: I am pleased to submit the following statement, commenting on proposals by the Illinois State Department of Corrections to develop a system of smaller, regional prisons to be located in metropolitan communities. I sincerely regret that legislative matters pending in Washington prevent my personal appearance before this distinguished panel.

I would like to begin by commending the State Department of Corrections for holding its series of public hearings on community based correctional facilities. It reflects a significant understanding of the role the public must have if our prison system is to be an effective means for reducing crime. It is also another indication of the fine work being done in Illinois corrections under the dynamic leadership of Peter Bensinger—modern thinking and management coupled with decisive action in improving manpower, facilities, and programs.

I appear before this Board with views that are based on personal study. During the past year, my subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee has been investigating correctional systems and is presently considering a series of bills which could have a significant impact on the Federal prison system. In the course of our study, we have visited the prison systems of Illinois, California, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, and the District of Columbia, and have spoken to numerous correctional and police officials, inmates, lawyers, and other individuals with experience in the area of corrections. I would like to explain why I believe the proposal for community based correctional facilities deserves the support of the public.

Traditionally, the incarceration of offenders in correctional institutions has been

based on the presumptions that confinement as one form of punishment acts as a deterrent and that these institutions, by whatever methods—punishment, penitence, education, therapy—are thought to have a rehabilitative effect leading to social and occupational improvement. These presumptions are open to some serious questions. There is increasing evidence that lengthy imprisonment does not deter crime or recidivism. In fact, reducing incarceration time has been found to result in no significant increase in recidivism, and oftentimes has been associated with a decrease in future offending.

It is also becoming increasingly clear that overcrowded and isolated total confinement institutions are ill-suited to accomplish the objective of rehabilitation. Recidivism rates are the clearest proof of the failure of the present facilities. Corrections rarely correct. In fact, I am convinced that often times the impact of the institution upon the individual may be more destructive than rehabilitative. Life at many institutions is at best barren and futile and at worst incredibly brutal and degrading. The conditions in which offenders are incarcerated are often the poorest possible preparation for their successful re-entry into society. There is overwhelming agreement among lawyers, judges, correctional officials, and government authorities as to the failure of the system and its own contribution to the growing crime rate.

In part this failure stems from the inadequate, obsolete and decrepit physical structures in which many prisoners are housed. The design of such facilities is inconsistent with the stated purposes of corrections. It is impossible to mass produce law-abiding citizens out of criminal raw material, and nothing but mass production is possible in one thousand to two thousand inmate penitentiaries. The consequence of large, often overcrowded facilities is that we practice custody, not corrections, and are preoccupied with security rather than treatment. What is needed is individualized treatment in smaller facilities which are structured with rehabilitation in mind. Such facilities are less costly

to build and require fewer personnel in terms of custody supervision.

The failure is also due in part to the segregation of the institution from the community. In my opinion, the nation's penologists are correct in urging that correctional facilities be located in or near metropolitan areas.

It is naive to believe that once the offender is out of sight behind a high wall many miles away that we have solved any problems. Nineteen out of every twenty offenders incarcerated eventually are released to return to society. The very moment the offender returns he is as much a part of the community as any other person and if his experience in the prison system has not been of a nature that will contribute to his success in this community, the system has clearly failed, and society's interest has not been served after all.

If this line of reasoning is to be accepted, the goal of the correctional system should be the preparation for resumption of normal social and occupational activity. As the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration stated:

"The task of corrections therefore includes building or rebuilding solid ties between offender and community, integrating or reintegrating the offender into community life—restoring family ties, obtaining employment and education, securing in the larger sense a place for the offender in the routine functioning of society."

One of the most promising alternatives to the traditional expensive and overcrowded prisons is the type of community based facility under consideration by this board which stresses the goals of reintegration, resocialization and rehabilitation.

The arguments favoring this proposal are persuasive:

1. Since incarceration provides only short-term protection at best, ultimate community protection is conditioned upon change on the part of the offender, which in turn is contingent upon his complete and successful reintegration into that community. It is only in the community that the offender can build the ties to job, family, and neighborhood and acquire the skills, habits, education, and independence that will make him law-abiding on his own initiative.

2. The process of reintegration will not result in the detrimental effects of the overcrowded and isolated institution on the personality. It will in fact maximize the building of sound social ties between the offender, his family and his community and permit

the offender to demonstrate his ability and trustworthiness, to gain community acceptance and become a contributing member of society.

3. It is economically advantageous—both in capital expenditures and reducing the high cost of crime—to place facilities in metropolitan communities, because the resources of the community are available for utilization in the rehabilitative effort. A facility situated in a metropolitan area is able to draw upon the medical, social work, psychiatric, educational, and employment resources of that community and can involve community residents and family members in the corrections process.

Critical factors in the development of a public acceptance of community based correctional facilities will be citizen understanding and involvement. The public needs to know that present concepts of institutionalization are not working and in fact often times have the counter effect of contributing to increased crime. The community must be aware and have confidence that the community based facility offers a better way to serve the dual purpose of protecting society and rehabilitating the offender. I am convinced that it does and hope that these hearings will serve to communicate this message to the general public.

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE PUBLISHED IN NEWSLETTER

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, I recently mailed my first questionnaire to the 18th District of Pennsylvania which I represent. Over 35,000 of my constituents took the time to respond to this questionnaire.

The tabulation of these responses has now been completed and published in a newsletter to constituents. In the hopes that this information might be as beneficial to my colleagues as I am sure it will be to me, my June newsletter is herewith reprinted:

[In percent]

	Inflation	Jobs	Vietnam	Crime	Environment	Foreign policy	Spending	Drugs
Excellent.....	2	3	7	2	6	11	2	3
Good.....	6	7	12	12	10	21	16	16
Fair.....	52	59	49	42	60	62	42	42
Poor.....	40	31	32	34	24	6	34	39

In brief, the questionnaire responses show that most of my constituents are suspicious of any new tax, regardless of what's promised along with it. You show a real concern about improving the quality of life, through your approval of continuing aid to higher education, cleaning up our water, and your support of a national health insurance plan. You are also obviously concerned about your tax bill and inflation, as shown by your "vote" to cut defense spending and your reluctance to increase Social Security benefits. An overwhelming majority (79%) of you want to see our involvement in Vietnam ended, either contingent on the release of our POW's or without conditions. Again, many thanks for your responses.

SPECIAL REPORT ON HEARINGS IN OUR DISTRICT

Because I am concerned about the problems facing Allegheny County's more than

175,000 citizens over 65 years of age, and because I particularly wanted to listen to the ideas of the aging and those who work with them, I requested Congressional hearings in Allegheny County. For two days, April 14 and 15, the Special Studies Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee, on which I serve, took testimony from local citizens at high schools in Avalon and Natrona Heights.

The hearings were the first held by a House Committee in our area in recent memory, and I am pleased to tell you that they produced important information which will guide me in working for passage of legislation in the areas where the aging want help. I, along with subcommittee chairman Rep. William J. Randall (D.-Mo.) and top staff aides heard testimony from representatives of the Allegheny County Labor Council, Visiting Nurses Association, Public Housing Author-

ity, Southwest Pennsylvania Regional Planning Commission, religious leaders, senior citizens themselves, and others.

Our findings revealed four major areas of exceptional concern among the aging:

Housing is expensive, the average rental unit in Allegheny County costs \$85 a month.

Since the average aged income is \$154, that doesn't leave much for senior citizens to lead lives of independence and dignity. The situation becomes even more burdensome when the retiree struggles to maintain his own home in the face of steadily-rising property taxes and other costs that eat into a fixed income.

Medical care is often not conveniently available to the aging, and in many cases, our elderly cannot afford the drugs they need or the cost of a nursing home. I have already introduced legislation to provide prescription drugs, at nominal cost, under Medicare.

Medicare coverage to include federal payment for most of the cost of prescription drugs? Yes 57; No 43.

The defense budget for the coming year is \$79 billion. Which of the following would you prefer:

Increase	8
Leave the same.....	18
Cut 2 percent.....	9
Cut 5 percent.....	14
Cut more than 5 percent.....	51

7. Do you feel aid to higher education (\$6 billion this year) should be:

Increased	28
Stay the same.....	38
Reduced	19
Eliminated	15

8. Which policy should we follow in Vietnam:

Escalate	2
Continue to withdraw.....	19
Get out on return of POW's.....	57
Pull out now.....	22

9. A 5% increase in Social Security benefits plus automatic cost of living increases is under consideration. Which do you prefer:

The above.....	47
Greater than above.....	29
No increase in benefits.....	24

10. Your rating of President Nixon's performance in the following areas:

Social Security benefit increases are needed immediately so that our aging can be self-sufficient and meet increased costs. Many of you, in responding to my questionnaire, indicated you opposed increasing such benefits, probably because you feared a tax rise. Our investigations show that because of a surplus in the Social Security fund, these benefits can be raised without raising taxes. A 5 percent increase has already passed the House but has been stalled too long by the Senate. I will support an even larger increase.

Senior citizen recreation and rehabilitation centers are badly needed. I tried to stimulate these through my bill, H.R. 13220, which provides financial aid for construction of such centers to give our older citizens a place for companionship, relaxation, and activities they enjoy.

TAX RELIEF AND REVENUE SHARING

As I write, we are about to consider the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972 which will provide Pennsylvania and individual communities within the Commonwealth with \$300.9 million during its first fiscal year of operation. Local government units in Allegheny County will get \$32.2 million, disbursed under a formula which will return between \$7 and \$10 for each man, woman and child. For example, Bellevue will get some \$177,152; Carnegie, \$173,329, and Tarentum, \$124,752.

Hopefully, this return of revenue to local governments will relieve them of some of the cost of providing such necessary services as police, sewers, water and transportation. I strongly favor federal revenue sharing because it can permit reduction of your local property taxes. To make this happen, you must insist that your local government economize effectively so that any savings realized actually result in a reduction of your millage. Also, we must work to insure Senate passage of the bill.

RECENT LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS IN YOUR INTEREST

I have taken the following actions in Congress to better serve you:

Supported the House-passed bill to increase the minimum wage over the next few years.

Voted to strengthen and pass the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1972.

Introduced a bill to provide for federal demonstration projects to help local communities answer the question of potholes and highway maintenance.

Introduced legislation to prevent the sale of personal mailing lists to commercial concerns for the purpose of solicitation and mailing of pornographic materials.

CRACKS IN HUD SECRET POLICIES

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, hearings on the operation of the Freedom of Information Act begun by the House Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee in early March, have produced a number of highly significant breakthroughs in broadening information policies by the executive branch to more nearly comply with the spirit of the act.

Among the changes are those forced on a reluctant bureaucracy within the Department of Housing and Urban Development by Federal courts in successful cases involving the Freedom of Information Act filed by the Nashville Tennessean and the Philadelphia Inquirer.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to an excellent article by the distinguished journalist, Mr. Clark Mollenhoff, bureau chief of the Des Moines Register of June 4 in which he describes the court rulings and their effect in helping to force Federal agencies such as HUD to comply with the information law.

The article follows:

[From the Des Moines Register, June 4, 1972]
CRACKS IN HUD SECRET POLICIES

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—George Romney's broad secrecy policies at the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) have been largely nullified by three federal court decisions.

Romney, the former Michigan governor who is now the HUD secretary, had given his personal endorsement of secrecy policies.

Romney didn't initiate the policies, which blocked disclosure of audit reports paid for with tax money and the names of "fee appraisers" employed by the Federal Housing Administration (FHA). Romney did, however, sign a letter on Nov. 11, 1971, in which he said he would take personal blame for any questionable appraisals and wouldn't allow disclosure of names of fee appraisers who made valuations of individual pieces of property.

THREE RULINGS

In all, three recent court rulings have forced HUD to revise drastically its secrecy policies. The general counsel for HUD has gone before a House government operations subcommittee and laid out in some details the changes in regulations that are being put into effect to end what is now ruled as illegal secrecy.

The court rulings will not be appealed, Romney said. Those rulings involved housing projects in Tennessee and eastern Pennsylvania.

New housing scandals seem to be emerging across the country with public disclosures in Detroit, New York City, Brooklyn, Camden, N.J., St. Louis, Chicago, and Washington, D.C.

The secrecy decisions of the federal courts and the record of the House subcommittee hearing on the same subject stand as lessons for all heads of governmental departments and agencies on the problems of excessive secrecy.

It was not as if Romney wasn't warned about the dangers of unwarranted secrecy. In July, 1971, a Tennessee newspaper filed court action under the Freedom of Information Act seeking the name of the FHA "fee appraiser" who had appraised a home that was sold to a blind couple for \$10,850. Two separate independent appraisers had set the value of the home at \$4,000 and \$4,500.

THE TACTICS

The federal court trial demonstrated the extent of obstructionist tactics of FHA and HUD in barring the Nashville Tennessean newspaper investigators and the homeowners from the name of the appraisers.

U.S. District Judge L. Clure Morton ruled that the appraisal report was a "public record" under the Freedom of Information Act, but that "no possible purpose would be served by releasing the identity of the appraiser and, based upon equitable consideration, the court decrees that the identity of the appraiser be withheld."

On May 5, 1972, the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals said:

"The appraisal in this case is an analysis of facts involving a professional opinion. The name of the author is a relevant and necessary part of that opinion. One of the reasons for the First Amendment (freedom of the press), as well as the Freedom of Information Act, is to promote honesty of government by seeing to it that public business functions under the hard light of full public scrutiny. The very name of an appraiser could

be sufficient to establish a motivation sufficient to trigger an investigation."

Romney, in his Nov. 11, 1971, letter, had said he was willing to take the blame for everything found wrong in the appraisals of HUD on theory that "appraisals . . . prepared in the first instance by individuals, were adopted by HUD and became action of HUD."

"Therefore, if any appraisals are wrong, it is appropriate to criticize HUD and HUD's executives, including me. But, it is neither relevant nor appropriate to criticize the individuals who made them," Romney wrote . . . "The press does not need to know those names in order to criticize HUD's actions."

"POISONOUS PRECEDENT"

Representative John Moss (Dem., Calif.), one of the authors of The Freedom of Information Act, charged Romney with adopting and spreading "a poisonous secrecy precedent."

Major federal housing scandals were uncovered in the Philadelphia area despite the obstructions of the HUD policies. Two U.S. district courts in that area slapped down HUD by quoting from a Supreme Court decision written by Chief Justice Charles E. Hughes that is probably more applicable to the operations of a \$200 billion-a-year government today than when it was written in 1931:

"The administration of government has become more complex, the opportunities for malfeasance and corruption have multiplied. Crime has grown to most serious proportions, and the danger of its protection by unfaithful officials and of the impairment of the fundamental security of life and property by criminal alliances and officials' neglect, emphasizes the primary need of a vigilant and courageous press, especially in great cities."

What should be clear to Romney and other high government officials at this stage of that housing programs and other federal and local programs designed to aid the poor can be subject to parasitic money grabs by speculators.

Illegal schemes are one of the constant hazards to social programs. The corruption not only robs the poor and the blind, as well as the federal taxpayers, but causes the public to have an attitude that can jeopardize entire programs.

THE REAL LESSON

As HUD's recent experience shows, the department heads can't keep the programs clean from Washington, although they may be run by experienced men with the best intentions.

That is the real lesson of Secretary Romney's experience with secrecy at HUD and the corruption it has hidden in cities from coast to coast.

TWO TALES FROM THE SAME CITY

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, what follows are two tales from the same city.

Indianapolis Star editorial, October 15, 1955:

J. Bracken Lee has announced that he will not pay his income taxes. . . . Perhaps he merely wants to stir up protests among Americans against being the milch cows for people in scores of nations most of us have never heard of. If that is his purpose, we're all for him.

Indianapolis Star editorial, May 28, 1972:

The decision of Jane Hart, wife of Senator PHILIP A. HART (D-Mich.), to quit paying

her income tax as a protest against the war in Vietnam is an excellent example of what has been described as the "liberal death-wish."

The editorials follow:

CHALLENGING FEDERAL COLOSSUS

The only way an American citizen can find out whether a law he opposes is constitutional is to break it. Then he can try to have it tested in the courts—if the government does not stall him off so long that he goes broke before he gets the job done. Vivian Kellums broke the withholding tax law deliberately in order to try to force a test of that law. She did not get a clear determination on the constitutional issues involved, but neither did she lose her case. So that question involving "involuntary servitude" prohibited in the Bill of Rights is still largely unsettled.

Mrs. Manuel Miller of Bethel, Vt., also broke a law—the draft law—in order to get a test of its constitutionality. The government first sent her off to an insane asylum in order to sidetrack the case, but that did not work. She has since been indicted and tried in the lower court and convicted. She is appealing to higher courts hoping to get a ruling also on the applicability of the prohibition of "involuntary servitude" to conscription.

A group of women in Texas refused to collect their social security taxes from their domestic help on the grounds that they were not tax collectors and that the social security system was unconstitutional. They lost when the court decided that social security taxes were just like income taxes and therefore legal. They did make a point, however, which was that social security is not insurance as has been claimed, but a simple tax-supported dole.

Now the governor of Utah has decided to break another law to test its legality. J. Bracken Lee has announced that he will not pay his income taxes. He claims that the Federal government has no constitutional right to use his tax money to support people living in foreign countries, or their governments. If Mr. Lee loses, he will have to pay his taxes with 6 per cent interest. If he wins, the American taxpayer can expect lower taxes, fewer deficits and less government spending.

Perhaps Governor Lee's objective is simply to dramatize the huge amounts of taxpayers' money being sent abroad for economic or military support.

Perhaps his main purpose is to mobilize public opinion against foreign aid. Perhaps he merely wants to stir up protests among Americans against being the milch cows for people in scores of nations most of us have never heard of. If that is his purpose, we're all for him. If he succeeds in getting a clear court ruling that foreign economic aid is unconstitutional, we're all for him, too.

We hope that in this case the government will not stall around, indulge in technicalities and try to wear Mr. Lee out by diversionary tactics, as the government so often does in such cases. It is difficult enough to find ways to protest the power, the arbitrariness, the unconstitutional actions of the huge government that now bestrides the land. The law is our only recourse most of the time. Let's hope the law gets a chance to work this time.

LIBERAL DEATH-WISH

The decision of Jane Hart, wife of Senator Phillip A. Hart (D-Mich.), to quit paying her income tax as a protest against the war in Vietnam is an excellent example of what has been described as the "liberal death-wish."

The first reaction of anyone who does not not share Mrs. Hart's dovish outlook on the war is likely to be:

"Very well. That is a game that more than one can play. I'll quit paying my taxes to

protest welfare chiseling, bureaucrats, grants to revolutionary and crackpot intellectuals, abuse of antipoverty programs, half-baked decisions by left-leaning members of the Federal judiciary, funds for phony commissions that reach foregone conclusions, supporting the double-crossers in the United Nations and inflated salaries for ultra-liberal lawmakers who kowtow every time a Communist commissar sneezes."

In other words, as a senator's wife, Mrs. Hart has not set the best of examples for the citizenry. She has put herself above the law, which is getting to be the rage, too much so, in an era of bombings, assassinations, mob violence and the like.

She has refused to abide by the decision of the government elected by the majority and in so refusing has tossed a monkey-wrench into the machinery of what old-fashioned liberals used to reverse as "the democratic process."

But that is not the most far-reaching import of her decision. She has acted according to a line of logic which, if it were followed by all taxpayers and carried to its ultimate, would bring about her destruction.

The loss of Mrs. Hart's approximately \$25,000 a year in Federal income tax would have little effect on the war only because it is an isolated protest, a drop in the bucket. But suppose it were otherwise.

Suppose most American taxpayers quit paying taxes to support a war of resistance against Communist aggression. Suppose, as a result, the American military-industrial complex, that Hades in the liberal cosmos, did collapse.

And suppose it would follow, as it inevitably would, that Communist power moved into the vacuum and occupied the defenseless United States.

What would become of Mrs. Hart? She is a member of the bourgeoisie. Communists liquidate the bourgeoisie. Does she think they would make an exception in her case? She seems to think so. Many liberals seem to think so. They are willing to stake lives—usually other people's—on this delusion whose falsity is written in the blood of millions.

But most Americans are not like Mrs. Hart. Most are willing to go on paying the cost of defending the perimeter of freedom, including, luckily for the senator's wife, hers.

SECRETARY LAIRD ADDRESSES U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY CLASS OF 1972

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the privilege of attending the very impressive graduation ceremonies at the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis.

It was a memorable occasion, made doubly so for me by the fact that the honor man, Brian Christian Haagenen of Fairview Park, Ohio, was one of my appointees, and by the fact that the principal address was given by my very good friend and former colleague, the distinguished Secretary of Defense, Melvin R. Laird. I am very proud of these two exemplary Americans and of the two other young men I appointed who also received their commissions yesterday, Ens. Ralph R. Michalske, Rocky River, Ohio, and Ens. Thomas C. Goudy,

formerly of Chagrin Falls, Ohio, and now of Oconomowoc, Wis.

I would like to share with all my colleagues in Congress Secretary Laird's thought-filled and inspiring address, as well as an article from the Plain Dealer telling of Ensign Haagenen's achievements at this point:

ADDRESS BY HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

It is an honor for me both as a former Lieutenant, junior grade, and as Secretary of Defense to speak to you graduates of the U.S. Naval Academy Class of 1972.

You receive your commissions today in an international security environment that none of you could have foreseen when you entered Annapolis as plebes in 1968.

What has occurred in the intervening years is that President Nixon, our Commander-in-Chief, acting from a position of strength, has brought us to a point where it is possible for us to do more than merely chart a new course. We are also in the process of drafting some new and exciting charts in foreign and national security affairs.

Implementation of the Nixon Doctrine began and the President's trips to Peking and Moscow concluded the first steps in laying a solid foundation for profound changes in the conduct of our foreign and national security policies.

Your graduation is marked by change. Your Superintendent, Vice Admiral James Calvert, leaves Annapolis for an important command at sea. Vice Admiral William P. Mack, is here from brilliant service as Commander of the Seventh Fleet in the Pacific to succeed him.

And today, some of you are going to make another profound change—from bachelors into bridegrooms, and I want all of you to make it to the church on time. That is why I am going to change things by not just promising, as most graduation speakers do, that I will be brief. I intend to deliver on that promise.

You become commissioned officers at a time of profound change and a time of rising hope for a better future for mankind. The winds of peace are stirring. They hold out the hope that better ways than fighting will be found to resolve—or to live with—differences among nations.

This year, for the first time in history, an American President has journeyed to Peking and to Moscow. He has returned from potentially hostile countries with understandings and agreements that reduce tension in the world and heighten the prospects that our future relations with these countries will be peaceful. He has gone behind the Iron Curtain and entered the countries of Eastern Europe to be welcomed as a friend and recognized as a pilgrim for peace.

At Moscow, President Nixon concluded a number of historic agreements with the leaders of the Soviet Union, some providing for cooperative action by the two nations in fields in which mankind's common interest is very strong. Expansion of the frontiers of knowledge and the conquest of dread diseases are examples.

Other agreements reached in Moscow deal directly with some of the causes and symptoms of tension among nations, such as the reduction of incidents at sea. The man chiefly responsible for this accomplishment is Secretary of the Navy, John Warner, who demonstrated the highest order of skill, persistence, and diplomacy in the extended negotiations which resulted in the signing of the accord last week in the Kremlin.

The agreements which deservedly have received most attention are those dealing with limitations on anti-ballistic missiles and on offensive land and sea-based missile systems. These accords, fixing quantitative limits on the missile systems to which they

apply, are the result of three years of difficult negotiations. Another man with strong Navy ties played an important role in these negotiations—former Secretary of the Navy, Paul H. Nitze.

It is highly important that the American people have a clear understanding of how these agreements came about. These encouraging first steps to restrain the growth of strategic weapons systems have been agreed on because our country maintained its military strength and because our President was firm and resolute in three years of negotiations.

The way to achieve lasting peace is through hard, tough, meaningful negotiations. The way to negotiate successfully is to maintain adequate strength as the foundation for negotiations.

As a consequence of maintaining our strength and of hard bargaining, we have succeeded in reaching an agreement that applies the brakes to the momentum of the ongoing Soviet missile buildup.

The President, the Joint Chiefs, and I fully recognize that these agreements cannot protect us against grave risk if we fail to maintain the quality and the realism of our deterrent strength in the years ahead.

If we are to continue to make progress in negotiation to reduce threats to peace, we must remain strong. Only a strong nation can negotiate with confidence and with a minimum of risk.

When you graduate today and receive your commissions you become an active part of that strength—and, I might add, a part of the single most important factor, the military men and women who serve our country in uniform.

More than any other nations, the United States and the Soviet Union have the power to turn the world away from war and toward peace. We have reason to hope that both nations are conscious of the great responsibility they bear and of their common interest in promoting peace in the world.

This is not to say that all of our interests converge. It is not to say that we will cease to be adversaries. I believe great nations can be peaceful adversaries and competitors. They need not be belligerent antagonists.

There are profound differences and disagreements between us and the Soviet Union which cannot simply be ascribed to historical accidents or misunderstandings. They are rooted in different conceptions of the rights and responsibilities of men and of governments. They are rooted in different approaches in dealing with other nations. They manifest themselves in conflicting interests in different regions of the world.

We cannot eliminate overnight these profound differences. It we continue to recognize these strategic and political realities as the starting point for our efforts toward peace, we enhance the chances to achieve peace and decrease the risks to our own basic interests.

When you leave you will become important members of our total force devoted to bringing about and keeping peace. It's not an easy path you have chosen but I think you will find that it's exciting and stimulating. And, of course, the opportunity is there for you to make your mark in the changing international security area.

You of the 1972 graduating class at Annapolis will have the opportunity to take a responsible part in the exciting work of keeping peace in a world which will never be free from tension, threat, and turmoil. Your profession as part of the Nixon Doctrine peacetime deterrent forces is one in which you will find strong challenge and deep satisfaction. You will be working toward the fulfillment of the greatest need and the highest aspiration of people everywhere—a generation of peace.

As you leave Annapolis today, may God go with you, your proud families and friends.

FAIRVIEW PARK MAN RANKS NO. 1 IN NAVAL ACADEMY'S CLASS OF '72

(By Roy W. Adams)

The top academic student in this year's graduating class of the U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., is Brian Christian Haagensen of Fairview Park.

Midshipman Haagensen, 21, son of Mr. and Mrs. Ronald S. Haagensen, 4570 W. 212th Street, next Wednesday will be "Honor Man" for the class of 1972. He will be first in his class of 925.

On June 10 he will wed his high school sweetheart, Valerie Jean Swank, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Wilbur F. Swank, 4109 W. 219th Street, Fairview Park.

When told he had achieved top academic honors, Haagensen, now at home, said, "I can't believe it."

He plans a career in nuclear submarines. Haagensen was born in Lakewood, Aug. 4, 1950. His father, an engineering officer aboard aircraft carriers and other warships of the Royal Navy in World War II, came here from England after the war.

Today the elder Haagensen is the principal surveyor on the Great Lakes for London-based Lloyd's Register of Shipping.

Brian is the oldest of four Haagensen children. He was graduated from Fairview Park High School in 1968. He became an Eagle Scout, was a member of the National Honor Society and student council and lettered in varsity tennis for three years.

U.S. Rep. William E. Minshall, R-23, appointed him to Annapolis for entry in June 1968.

In physics Haagensen achieved a perfect grade, 4.0, every semester except his first. That was a 3.8.

After his marriage and a short leave Haagensen will report to the Navy's postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif., where he will work for a master's degree in nuclear physics.

That will be followed by a six-month course at the Navy's Nuclear Power School at Mare Island Navy Base, Calif., six months at a Navy nuclear submarine prototype school and then the start of his duties at sea.

SCHOOLBUS SAFETY

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the Kenosha News, one of the fine daily newspapers in my district, reported on June 5 a near-fatal schoolbus accident that occurred in Glenview, Ill., a city not far from my congressional district.

This incredible accident, in which the wheel of the schoolbus simply fell off, is the latest compelling example of why new schoolbus safety legislation is so desperately needed.

As you know, 79 Members of the House have joined me in cosponsoring the Schoolbus Safety Act of 1972 (H.R. 13999). I hope that it will not take many more of these terrifying schoolbus accidents before Congress passes this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to carefully read this important article in the Kenosha News, which follows:

SCHOOLBUS CRASHES

Thirty-five school children escaped injury Friday afternoon when a Glenview, Ill., schoolbus lost a wheel as it approached the west frontage road at I-94 while eastbound on Hy. 20.

Racine deputies reported that the wheel rolled onto the rear of a car driven by James M. Aleshire, Janesville, who had stopped for a stop sign at the frontage road.

The bus driver reported that the front wheels wobbled as he approached I-94, and when he applied the brakes, the wheel assembly came off. The bus narrowly missed a tanker truck before going into a ditch.

A cotter pin missing from the wheel assembly apparently caused the accident as the bus returned from a school trip, according to deputies.

PENDING WELFARE LEGISLATION COMPLETELY INADEQUATE

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, on June 6, 1972 an important article appeared in the Washington Post. It concerned the pending welfare legislation, was entitled "A Crucial Stage for Welfare Legislation," and was written by Mr. Nick Kotz.

To refresh some memories, Mr. Kotz was the gentleman who stirred America's conscience, temporarily, over the problem of hunger in this country. His Let Them Eat Promises was a searing examination of the Federal Government's successful attempts to ignore those who cannot even afford to eat.

Nick Kotz has done it again. His article focused upon the so-called liberals who are about the betray millions of poor Americans in the name of welfare reform.

Mr. Kotz approached the betrayal via an 8-step drama which ended with ratification of welfare reform legislation. The curtain comes down on this scene:

About 15 million, mostly powerless poor people will suddenly discover that they have less money and no food stamps with which to feed their children.

I call special attention to Mr. Kotz' delineation of three simple truths about welfare recipients, truths which "do not register on the minds of people who want to believe something else":

1. There are no more welfare chiselers than there are income tax chiselers.
2. No one is getting rich on welfare. The average family on welfare today is receiving far less than what the government calls a poverty-level income.
3. The welfare deadbeats are few unless one counts in their number 8 million dependent children, 4 million disabled and elderly, and more than two million mothers of dependent children. There are fewer than 200,000 able-bodied men among more than 14 million welfare recipients.

I urge my colleagues to read Mr. Kotz' excellent article, and to reject any welfare reform legislation which ignores the needs of the 25 million poor and 15 million hungry American citizens.

Mr. Kotz' article follows:

A CRUCIAL STAGE FOR WELFARE LEGISLATION (By Nick Kotz)

As the political rhetoric heats up in a presidential election year, candidates once again are promising they will stamp out welfare loafers who are living it up at taxpayers' expense, Governor Wallace would put an end to the welfare bonanza created by liberal

"pointy heads." Senator Humphrey, even though he has co-sponsored a generous welfare bill, has adopted a campaign tone hostile to welfare recipients. President Nixon has been asserting that emptying bedpans at \$1.20 an hour is just as rewarding a job as being President.

It is in this atmosphere that Congress reaches a crucial stage in its three-year consideration of so-called "welfare reform" legislation. At this time, it is awfully hard to find anyone who is speaking for and to the human needs of those 12 million children, old people, and disabled who comprise more than 85 per cent of the welfare "deadbeats." Their case deserves to be stated in a country that still prides itself with concern over the helpless, the powerless, and the child.

Ironically some of the welfare poor are just as worried today about protection from their "friends" (liberals in Congress and newspapers like The Washington Post and the New York Times) as they are sickened by their enemies. They thoroughly understand the intentions and motivations of Senator Russell Long (D-La.), the Finance Committee chairman, who is openly preoccupied with the present shortage of women willing to wash his shirts for poverty wages. Long and a majority of his committee and the House Ways and Means Committee traditionally have approached welfare with a keen interest in maintaining a cheap, helpless labor supply in the South and elsewhere.

But members of the National Welfare Rights Organization composed of poor people who must exist on welfare, and their allies in the National Council of Churches, are far more perplexed, but no less worried about the liberal legislative strategists who keep pushing this year's welfare reform bill toward the White House.

Advocates for the welfare poor, such as NWRO and the Council of Churches are convinced that Congress is now virtually locked into a legislative course that almost certainly will leave present welfare recipients worse off than they are today. Yet this legislative drive is being kept alive by liberals flying under the banner of welfare reform and an interest in helping the poor, but unmindful of the likely outcome.

This is the legislative scenario that is envisioned by these spokesmen for the welfare poor:

1. The House has already passed a Nixon administration welfare bill, which could result in a loss of legal rights and benefits for 90 per cent of the recipients now on welfare. The poor in only four or five states might end up better off. Food stamp aid, now amounting to \$2½ billion annually to 12 million poor, would be eliminated. Numerous hard-won legal rights are stripped from the poor. A family of four would be guaranteed only \$2,400 a year, which is about one-third of what the Labor Department says it takes to live on a low-level budget in a typical American city. The reform in the bills is that the working poor will get benefits for the first time.

2. The Senate Finance Committee will report out a bill, that will make even the most regressive features of the administration's House-passed bill look generous by comparison. If that bill contains subtle measures to control the poor, the Long bill openly punishes welfare children and their mothers.

3. The White House will then negotiate a compromise bill with a single senator, Abraham Ribicoff (D-Conn.). The White House needs Ribicoff and liberal Democrats because the administration can't find a half dozen Republicans to support its own House-passed bill. Ribicoff needs help from the White House because his own proposal, which helps rather than punishes the poor, also probably cannot pass the Senate.

So the President and Ribicoff strike a compromise restoring a few of the local rights which other proposals snatch from the poor, and offering at least a better guarantee that millions of poor people won't have their already inadequate benefits cut still further. (To Ribicoff's credit, he is the one liberal senator to have designed and worked hard on a practical, generous welfare plan.)

4. The Senate, depending on how many liberals have deserted the floor for presidential and other campaigning, will probably approve some form of Nixon-Ribicoff compromise. The quality of the compromise will depend on the mood of the White House, which has swung to a punitive attitude on welfare, and of Senator Ribicoff, whose volatile views about the poor have varied from punitive to humane understanding.

At best, the Senate will pass a bill that improves somewhat on the House version and guarantees that current welfare and food stamp recipients aren't left worse off than before. Such a guarantee would require ironclad provisions that state benefits above the minimum are maintained, that food stamps are retained or replaced dollar-for-dollar with cash, and that welfare recipients are not denied their civil liberties and legal rights.

5. A Senate-House conference committee will then convene to consider the different House and Senate versions of welfare reform. The committee will probably consist of the senior members of Long's Finance Committee and Rep. Wilbur Mills' Ways and Means Committee. Based on past voting records, there is not among these senior men a single one who will support decent living standards for the welfare poor.

The conference committee will reach a compromise. If the Senate conferees make any pretense of supporting the Senate-passed bill (which they violently opposed), then the compromise probably will be no worse than opening the way for 80 percent of the poor to suffer reduced benefits.

6. The conference bill will be reported back to the House and Senate floors, just as Congress is about to adjourn and political demagoging of welfare has reached election year fever pitch.

The House will approve the conference report overwhelmingly, over the protest of the Black Caucus and a few dozen others.

The Senate also will pass the bill by a wide margin after first hearing the belated protests of a few liberal senators that the bill should be defeated because it takes bread out of the mouths of already undernourished children.

It will be a good vote for most members of Congress. It will be considered a good political vote not only against welfare loafers but for social security increases. (Social security and welfare are considered in a single package.) Few congressmen would consider endangering a social security hike in an election year.

7. President Nixon will sign the bill, announcing his greatest legislative achievement—which will put an end to the welfare mess.

8. About 15 million, mostly powerless poor people will suddenly discover that they have less money and no food stamps with which to feed their children. Senator George McGovern and others who fought for the last six years to end hunger in America will sadly discover that the hungry are right back where they started, without the principal food program that was starting to help them.

The legislative scenario described here doesn't have to be acted out. It can be short-circuited in several ways.

A Senate majority of liberals and moderates could conceivably exercise a collective profile in courage. But this would require action now. These senators would have to

pledge, starting this week, that they will kill any legislation that hurts poor people. Ribicoff hasn't made that pledge. They will have to decide that the fate of millions of poor Americans should not be decided in private negotiations between a single Democratic senator and the White House, nor by two ultra-conservative finance committees whose members have hard hearts when it comes to poor people. These senators will have to forswear the political luxury of casting one vote for poor people, and then resignedly voting for a final bill that punishes the poor.

These senators will have to decide, as have NWRO and the National Council of Churches, that there is a price that is too high to pay for a few elements of structural reform.

The price is too high when it includes increased suffering for innocent children. The price is too high when it strips poor Americans of the rights they have won the last 10 years in the U.S. Supreme Court. The price for establishing the principle of aid to the working poor is too high when it includes increased misery for 15 million already miserable people.

The welfare bill also could be killed by a coalition of senators who refuse to hurt the present welfare poor, and conservatives who disapprove of aid to the working poor. Noticeably absent from the entire debate are a few facts about welfare.

1. There are no more welfare cheaters than there are income tax chiselers.

2. No one is getting rich on welfare. The average family on welfare today is receiving far less than what the government calls a poverty-level income.

3. The welfare deadbeats are few unless one counts in their number 8 million dependent children, 4 million disabled and elderly, and more than two million mothers of dependent children. There are fewer than 200,000 able-bodied men among more than 14 million welfare recipients.

Many of the women are needed at home to care for small children. Many do work—at poverty wages. Many more want to work but can't find jobs that would pay them enough to support their families. Many can't find jobs at all. Many are not qualified for jobs.

But these kinds of facts do not register on the minds of people who want to believe something else. The welfare recipient becomes a convenient scapegoat for a troubled society.

So the genuine representatives of poor people watch with dismay while their self-appointed liberal champions keep the welfare legislation rolling, without attention to legislative realities that could end disastrously for the poor. The poor still look for the champions who will say "no" to legislation that could mean less food for 8 million children and millions of elderly who already can't afford an adequate diet.

MOORHEAD ANNOUNCES HEARINGS ON LEGISLATION TO CURB SALE OF MAILING LISTS BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee will hold hearings next week on a number of bills that would amend the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) to limit the sale of mailing lists by Federal agencies for

commercial purposes. There are several dozen cosponsors of such legislation, including H.R. 327, H.R. 7564, H.R. 8903, H.R. 9738, and H.R. 10020.

Members and others interested in testifying on this legislation or submitting statements for the hearing record should contact the subcommittee office—225-3741. We have set aside Tuesday, June 13, for Members' testimony. Executive department witnesses and others will be heard on June 16. Written statements for inclusion in the record should be sent to room B-371B, Rayburn House Office Building.

ELDERLY CITIZENS' DAY

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, June 9 is Elderly Citizens' Day—a time to pay tribute to those people whose industry and energy have built our Nation.

Every American should have the opportunity to face his later years in tranquility and peace. Unfortunately, for many of our older Americans, later years are filled with anguish and suffering.

Many of our elderly citizens are faced with a problem which, essentially, stems from a rising cost of living and a fixed income. Inflation and inadequate benefits savagely rob older people of their buying power and turn hard earned dollars into shrunken dimes. The costs of food, medicine, and other vital necessities remain relative to other goods. These items become luxuries for citizens who receive small pension or benefit checks.

I believe that many of these problems can be overcome through modifications of our present social security system. Since entering the Congress I have consistently supported legislation which would provide for additional social security benefits and facilitate the payment of existing benefits. I worked hard for the passage of legislation establishing a nutritional program for the elderly which in March of this year was enacted into law. Legislation providing for a 20-percent across-the-board increase in social security benefits has my complete support. Nevertheless, gaps remain in the present system of providing social security benefits. Today I am introducing three bills to correct some present inadequacies in the social security and medicare programs.

One bill provides a minimum monthly social security benefit at age 72 to all uninsured individuals. This is an important piece of legislation. Most important, it would provide minimum benefits to the many people who have contributed to the economy in some way, but do not qualify for social security benefits under the present system.

The second bill would permit the computation of benefits payable to a married couple—or the survivor—on the basis of their combined earnings. Under the pres-

ent law, it is possible for the wife to contribute part of her salary in social security taxes and yet receive no additional benefits upon retirement. This legislation would rectify this discriminatory situation.

The third bill doubles the number of lifetime reserve days for inpatient hospital benefits under medicare from 60 to 120. Because of their age, elderly Americans are faced with increasing medical costs. Serious illnesses may drain their medicare benefits and still leave them with a continued need for hospitalization.

The three bills I have introduced today will not eliminate the poverty facing so many of our 20.5 million elderly citizens. However, if enacted, they represent an important step—along with social security benefit increases and the new elderly nutrition program I helped draft—toward providing a better life for older Americans.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM BLACKIE

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago today one of the most remarkable careers in the history of the American industrial community came to an end with the retirement of Mr. William Blackie, chairman of the board of Caterpillar Tractor Co. which has its world headquarters in my hometown of Peoria, Ill.

While I would not want to embarrass my friend by referring to him as a "giant of industry," I must say that the policies which he conceived and administered so skillfully during his 10 years as president and then chairman of the board and chief executive officer have had a gigantic impact, not only in the Peoria area where employment rose by 7,000 from 1962 to 1971 but also in other parts of the world where an additional 21,500 jobs were created by the construction and acquisition of 11 new Caterpillar factories.

As Mr. Bill Franklin, the new Caterpillar board chairman says:

Mr. Blackie's genius is in organization.

But I also have no doubt that his frugal Scottish background has stood him in good stead during his career. I can say without fear of contradiction that we could use those qualities here in the Congress especially when we consider the funding of all these Government programs which are running into billions of dollars.

BLACKIE'S LEGACY: 28,500 NEW JOBS
AROUND WORLD
(By Tom Pugh)

This Wednesday Caterpillar Chairman William Blackie will take a last, quick inventory of his undecorated office in the company's seventh-floor executive suite and retire to a director's office on the sixth floor.

The walls of the 66-year-old Scots-Ameri-

can's office have always been bare—even though it is now five years since Caterpillar's new headquarters opened in downtown Peoria.

Why did Blackie, who has personally transformed the public corridors of the seventh floor into a striking gallery of world art, put not a thing on his own walls?

"We just haven't got around to it," is his answer.

Blackie did, however, "get around to" a number of other things in the decade he has spent as president and now chairman of the board and chief executive officer of Caterpillar.

While he denies personal credit—when he says "we" he really seems to mean Caterpillar people and not himself—for anything much beyond buying most of those paintings on the seventh floor, it is easy to see the important thing he has done.

That monumental building in downtown Peoria with all those foreign flags fluttering in front represents Blackie's legacy—28,500 new Caterpillar jobs around the world.

It was his organizational "genius"—that word keeps recurring when people talk about him—which transformed Caterpillar from a huge factory strangling East Peoria with traffic into a unique successful multi-national manufacturer.

That Blackie did it—putting into operation 11 foreign factories which now employ 12,000 people—while Peoria area employment was boosted by 7,000 people and employment in other parts of Illinois and America rose by another 13,000 people is amazing.

Almost nobody thought that would have been possible ten years ago when Blackie and his boss, now retired Chairman Harmon S. Eberhard, insisted that Caterpillar had to "undertake production in foreign markets" in order to compete.

That they succeeded cannot be questioned. Sales grew from \$743 million to \$2.175 billion. Profit went from \$55.8 million to \$128.3 million—and last year was not even as good as the two previous years.

The more important measure here in Central Illinois, however, is shown in this list of year-end Caterpillar employment figures in the Peoria area:

1962	19,240
1963	21,191
1964	23,893
1965	24,993
1966	26,401
1967	26,369
1968	26,422
1969	27,597
1970	26,829
1971	26,713

The vital thing in those figures is the employment stability Blackie produced here. Steady jobs.

While this month's Fortune magazine warns of competitive trouble ahead for Caterpillar and concludes "life may be a lot less serene in Peoria," Peorians who recall the three massive layoffs in the 50s—6,000 in 1952, 7,000 in 1956, and 5,000 in 1959—have had reason to be serene in Blackie's decade.

Over those ten years, Caterpillar also lifted much of the crush of its concentration in East Peoria by building new facilities in Mossville, Morton, Mapleton and Peoria. In so doing, the company became a bigger taxpayer in Peoria county (\$2.4 million last year) than it was in Tazewell county (\$2.3 million).

How did Blackie do it? For one thing he does "get around." He personally helped choose the sites for Caterpillar's plants in his native Glasgow; in Newcastle and Leicester, England; in Sao Paulo, Brazil; in Grenoble, France; in Gosselies, Belgium; in Melbourne, Australia; and in Tokyo.

But the people who know him say it is not so much where he travels but how he does it.

They say Blackie never stops moving and never thinks much about himself.

"Watch him play tennis," former Caterpillar chairman Louis Neumiller said. "He's never down. He wants to win right up to the last ball that's in play."

"I've never seen him walk except at double quick time—and he's always going somewhere. There's nothing aimless about Bill."

I asked Mrs. Helen Williams, Blackie's secretary for 24 years, to dig out of a storeroom all of the plaques and certificates which Blackie had received over the years and did not hang on his office walls. She came across a sterling silver one from Tiffany's which was engraved:

"DUN'S to William Blackie, Chairman, Caterpillar Tractor Company: 'One of America's Ten Best Managed Companies.'"

"Mr. Blackie waited for this one to come," she said. "He wanted to hang it up downstairs where everybody could be proud of it. But when it came in, it had his name on it—not just Caterpillar's—so he just had me file it in the morgue."

William Franklin, who will succeed Blackie as chairman Thursday and who like Blackie is a certified public accountant, says Blackie's genius is in organization. (Blackie, incidentally, says Franklin's genius is in finance.)

"Bill was the architect of the company. He evolved its organization over the years and it took final form a number of years ago," Franklin said. "Its biggest characteristic is the fact that we have staff vice-presidents in charge of functions who have responsibility worldwide. We don't have an international and a domestic division as most other firms do."

Blackie says that "organization is only a tool for a purpose. It's a good tool if it works. If it doesn't work, it should be changed."

One Caterpillar executive perhaps made it plain what Blackie meant when he said the company has a chart of organization but everybody put it away in a drawer and forgot it. We don't much hold to "going through channels."

Blackie says the company structure is "purposely loose" but that it aims "as far as possible to have decisions made at the lowest possible level—with ideas and recommendations flowing both ways."

Perhaps most important is Blackie's idea of how a boss ought to function. "Authority is a tool not a title" to him and he will have some words to say on the subject when he speaks at the Monmouth College commencement next Saturday.

Generally, Blackie stresses that top leadership and decision-development must be carried out by more than one person, although final responsibility still has to be pinned on somebody.

The four men who share the executive wing with Blackie—Franklin and Executive Vice Presidents L. L. Morgan, W. L. Naumann and V. V. Grant—seem to perform with complete independence but somehow (in a way that probably only they understand) they function as extensions of Blackie himself.

It is interesting that Neumiller, who retired ten years ago, looks back upon Blackie, who was his executive vice president, as the man who "decided" to put the new company headquarters in Peoria rather than in Mossville.

Both Neumiller and Franklin say Blackie is the man who got Caterpillar to make its manufacturing investments abroad in the face of a lot of arguments to the contrary.

Why did Blackie think his overseas manufacturing scheme would work? Part of the reason has to lie in his near-religious faith in the new "multi-national corporations" which are adding worldwide manufacturing plants to their earlier-established international sales systems.

In a speech Blackie once called the multi-national corporation "the most constructive agency for the propagation of material good ever known." He can make a convincing argument that he was not exaggerating a bit.

Beginning with the premise that incorporated firms everywhere are chartered "not to make profits but to produce goods and services," Blackie contends that successful corporations serve more people more efficiently than any other agency he knows about and that a corporation which goes beyond national boundaries in all of its endeavors is bound to end up serving more people.

This thesis inevitably conflicts with Communist or socialist thinking on the same subject, and Blackie makes this conclusive accounting:

"By comparison with the success of our system, theirs is a poor second."

Does he think the Communist nations are beginning to realize this?

"Yes, I think so. I know that for nearly ten years now, Russia and the socialist nations of eastern Europe have been modifying their economic systems to incorporate more of the principles of free capitalist enterprise."

"They are introducing interest as a factor in determining where capital should be employed. They are determining profit as a measure of comparative performance. They are paying incentives to those who are more productive than others."

"The one basic tenet which they adhere to is state ownership of the means of production, transportation, and finance."

And on that basic tenet, Blackie reminds us that most of the nations which Americans consider to be free agree to some extent with the socialist thinking. "I think we are perhaps the only country in the world today that doesn't already own its major railroads and utilities," Blackie said. "Virtually everywhere else they are generally owned by either national or local governments."

While Blackie will talk at length about the value of multi-national corporations generally—keep in mind that all of them are not American firms—he prefers to talk specifically about his own corporation.

"Caterpillar is not a conglomerate (a bunch of unrelated companies stuck together under one management) because we don't want to be a conglomerate," he said.

"We don't wish to be one because we don't want undue dilution of our main objective—and that's to be tops in our own field."

Caterpillar is already there and everybody knows it. The vice president of a competing manufacturer put it this way recently:

"Caterpillar has always been No. 1, but today there isn't even any No. 2 or No. 3 or No. 4."

Blackie smiled upon hearing that and tried to respond to my question as to who really was No. 2.

"In crawler tractors, it would be Komatsu in Japan," Blackie said. "In rubber-tired tractors and equipment it would now probably be TEREX. In front-end loaders—on tracks and wheels—I'm not sure. Maybe International Harvester."

At that point Blackie gave up and said that somebody else once said that "Caterpillar doesn't fit in an industry—it is one."

Then he leaned back and said, "You know, things can work in this company that won't work in other companies because of the kind of people we have."

Asked if he really believed that, he shot back, "Absolutely!" Then he said he based his belief on what other corporate executives have told him about the people who worked for them and what they told him about the people who work for him.

Blackie has worked hard over the years

seeing to it that the kind of people Caterpillar has are taught how to do the jobs they do. About a generation ago when he was a vice president he wrote a booklet (without a byline) entitled "Building an Effective Work Force." Among other things he wrote:

"The major test of industrial worth must, of course, always be individual performance... It can never be a supervisor's 'alibi' that his failure to accomplish his task is attributable to subordinates who fail..."

By his own measurement or anybody else's, William Blackie's "industrial worth" has met the test.

Last month Caterpillar's profits, in total amount and per share of stock reached an all-time record for any month in the company's history; and this month the price of its stock hit an all-time high on the New York Stock Exchange.

As Blackie said: "For a time to bow out, it's not all bad."

A COUPLE OF GRIPES

Employees in Caterpillar's downtown headquarters, although they are the best-paid people in town, have two gripes.

They don't like a rule which puts the automatic coffee machines throughout the building off-limits for a couple hours a day, and they kid about the odds of being killed on the escalators, which move almost as fast as Bill Blackie does.

The coffee rule, which says stay away from the machines before 9 a.m. and between 1 and 2 p.m., was put out in a memo from company President William Franklin shortly after the new building opened, but some wags say it was really Blackie who was bugged by the sight of a non-productive gang-up around the machines every morning and afternoon.

The escalator speed, however, is completely blamed on Blackie. Everybody believes that speeding them up is just the thing he would do.

Actually, according to Franklin, the escalators run faster than Carson's or Bergner's because the stores slow theirs down so customers can look at the merchandise.

As to whether the coffee rule is really his or Blackie's, Franklin will only say, "It's a company rule."

On Thursday Franklin will be running the company.

GOING HOME

William Blackie and his wife, Florence, will go back to their native Scotland, which he left in 1930, after he retires—but just for a vacation.

After business meetings in the United Kingdom, they plan to get together in Scotland with their son, the Rev. Bruce L. Blackie of First Presbyterian Church in Akron, his wife and the three grandchildren, Heather, 9, Holly, 7, and Heidi, 3.

Blackie has for a long time played tennis at the Country Club of Peoria virtually every summer weekend and in recent years during the winter a couple times a week at the Central Illinois Racquet Club. In the past, he usually golfed with his wife. Now he'll have more time to play with the men. Last week he started looking over his fishing tackle. And he probably will work more in his yard on High Point Drive.

He is thinking a little about doing some writing—something he has done a lot of during his years at Caterpillar. He plans to help the American Red Cross raise some money and to work with the Smithsonian Institution in an effort to bring its treasures to more of the people, perhaps by having a traveling exhibition come to Peoria.

But mostly he will probably keep going downtown to his sixth floor director's office, trying to help Caterpillar without getting in the way of Chairman Bill Franklin.

THE SACB AND THE NEW INTERNAL SECURITY PROGRAM

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, next week, I understand, an attempt will be made in the Senate to eliminate the appropriation for the coming fiscal year of the Subversive Activities Control Board, SACB, which, under legislation overwhelmingly passed by the House on May 30, would serve as the heart of a new internal security program, painstakingly devised through the joint efforts of the executive branch and the House over a period of several years. The new program, which would combine and continue as one program, two long successful existing programs, permit actions against the Communist Party U.S.A.; Maoist, Trotskyite and domestic brands of communism, groups attempting to deprive others of their constitutional rights by unlawful means; and organizations which violate laws pertaining to treason, rebellion, insurrection, riots or civil disorders, sedition, conspiracy, among others. By means of the program the American public would be alerted to the nature of such organizations and the Federal Government would be assisted in its hiring or retention of people unsuitable for Federal employment.

The older of the two existing programs dates back to 1943 when President Roosevelt issued an Executive order under which Attorney General Francis Biddle cited almost 50 groups as subversive. The Executive order was based on the President's recognition that totalitarians of various kinds—Communist, Nazi, and Fascist—whose aim was the destruction of our constitutional form of government were seeking or had obtained Government employment to assist in achieving their aims.

It also was based on the President's determination that such persons were unfit for employment and, if and when uncovered, should be eliminated from the Federal service. This was the beginning of the Attorney General's list as it is known today and was advisory to Government officials who had to resolve problems relating to loyalty of Federal employees. President Truman in 1947 issued Executive Order 9835 which expanded the program and in 1953 President Eisenhower revised the program with Executive Order 10450 which, among other things, retained President Truman's requirement for an advisory listing of totalitarian, Fascist, Communist, subversive, et cetera, groups and directed that sympathetic associations with them be one of the factors considered in determining an employee's or applicant's fitness for Federal service. Executive Order 10450 was continued under Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, and under President Nixon until he issued Executive Order 11605 on July 2, 1971, amending the previous order.

The second existing program in the area of internal security came into being with the Subversive Activities Control

Act of 1950 which established the SACB. This act was enacted after years of hearings and much deliberation, to expose the Communist Party USA with its members, as a Communist-action organization controlled by the Soviet Union or the world Communist movement and dedicated to the subversion and overthrow of the United States. The act also provided for the exposure of the "fronts" of the party; that is, organizations not ostensibly connected with the party but controlled or dominated by the party.

Both programs developed shortcomings which have been corrected by President Nixon's Executive Order 11605 and H.R. 9669 which passed the House on May 30.

In the case of the Attorney General's list, the designation of organizations by the Attorney General was a non-adversary closed administrative procedure. In the early 1950's a series of judicial decisions indicated the need for open adversary proceedings with the trappings of due process. As the executive branch lacks the authority to confer such powers as that of subpoena and a right to judicial appeal, there have been no designations since 1955 and the list is sorely in need of updating. Nevertheless, in extensive hearings before the House Internal Security Committee, all of the Government witnesses who testified before the committee stated, in effect, that the program had been and is effective and that only the list of organizations needs modernizing. Therefore, groups such as the Black Panthers, Students for a Democratic Society, or the Progressive Labor Party, all organizations of an extremist and radical nature, have never been added to the Attorney General's list because of their recent vintage. To further complicate matters, the SACB, because it handles only organizations which are Soviet oriented, cannot review the three above-cited organizations, all of which are outside the SACB's jurisdiction.

To improve the situation, President Nixon promulgated Executive Order 11605 which transferred to the SACB the function of designating organizations which had previously been that of the Attorney General. The Attorney General's much broader jurisdiction would enable the SACB to handle the three cases cited above. In addition, as the SACB is a quasi-judicial body, with the right of cross-examination and examination of evidence afforded those involved, the objection to the Attorney General's list concerning open adversary hearings is eliminated. Executive Order 11605 requires, for the first time, that only "knowing" association with any of the six classifications of groups on the list be considered in weighing a person's security status. It thus provides greater protection for the individual. Also, the order defines precisely what is meant by the six types of organizations that may be placed on the list. President Roosevelt's order had merely referred to "subversive" activities without definition whereas the Truman order used the classifications of "Communist," "Fascist," "totalitarian," and "subversive" without defining these terms precisely.

Finally, rounding out the program is the administration's bill, H.R. 9669, which passed the House on May 30 by a lopsided vote of 226 to 105. This proposal would first change the name of the SACB to the Federal Internal Security Board. Next, in response to the contention of some that the President lacks authority to assign additional duties to the Board, this bill would expressly authorize the President to delegate such duties to the Board. Lastly, the bill makes applicable to such designation hearings, the due process procedures that have been provided for proceedings under the Subversive Activities Control Act.

As mentioned above, much time and effort has been expended in formulating this new internal security program. I understand the need for an additional Executive order was first considered in the Johnson administration, was revised and refined under the present administration and finally promulgated on July 2, 1971. The House Internal Security Committee began its extensive hearings on the administration of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 and the Federal civilian employee loyalty-security program on September 30, 1970. Later additional hearings were held by the committee on various legislative proposals with H.R. 9669 receiving committee approval, resulting in House passage on May 30.

In view of the great effort expended in formulating this new internal security program and the key role delegated to the SACB, it would seem that the move to eliminate the SACB appropriation would be imprudent, if not dangerous. The above information conveys briefly the vast effort and experience which have gone into the internal security program dating back to the President Roosevelt order of 1943. The ingredients of the present program have been devised and tested over a long period of time and with the involvement of all three branches, the Executive, Congress and the courts.

To illustrate who would gain from the elimination of the SACB, two recent items from the Daily World, the Communist Party organ, should be perused. The first from the May 31 issue reports on the passage of H.R. 9669 and conveys the concern with which the Communist Party views this legislation. The second item, from the Daily World of June 6, tells about the upcoming Senate attempt to eliminate the SACB. Incidentally, in another article in the Daily World's May 31 issue there appears this excerpt which is cited as a goal of the CPUSA:

Abolish the FBI and end political frame-ups, eavesdropping and wiretapping. Abolish the Subversive Control Board, the House and Senate Internal Security Committees and repeal all repressive laws. End police brutality. Disarm all police. Forbid use of police, National Guard or the Army to suppress labor and peoples' struggles.

I insert at this point the two items mentioned above:

CONGRESS MEMBERS FIGHT WITCHHUNT BILL
(By Tim Wheeler)

WASHINGTON, May 30.—A group of Congressmen, including Rep. Bella Abzug (D-

N.Y.) and Ronald Dellums (D-Calif.), fought today to block passage of a bill which would vastly expand the witchhunt powers of the Subversive Activities Control Board. They urged, instead, the abolition of the board which has had "nothing to do" since the Supreme Court struck down key sections of the McCarran Act.

During two hours of debate, anti-SACB Congressmen urged defeat of HR 9669 which would give the SACB a new name—the Federal Internal Security Board—and would amend the Walter-McCarran "Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950."

The expansion of the SACB powers was approved late today by 226 to 105.

The amendments would authorize the President to delegate to the board authority to conduct witchhunt hearings for the purpose of barring "subversives" from Civil Service jobs on "loyalty and security grounds."

The amendment also gives the SACB authority to "conduct hearings and make findings as to the character of organizations" for the purpose of updating the notorious Attorney General's list of "subversive" organizations.

NIXON PRODUCT

Rep. Richard Ichord (D-Missouri), chairman of the House Internal Security Committee, told the House members that the bill is a Nixon Administration product, written by the Justice Department and introduced for President Nixon by ultra-rightist John Ashbrook (R-Ohio).

Ichord said the bill is designed to eliminate Constitutional objections to the Walter McCarran Act raised by the U.S. Supreme Court in the cases of Eugent Robel and Herbert Aptheker.

Robel, a Seattle shipyard worker won his Supreme Court Appeal against attempts by

the Federal government to have him fired for his militant trade-union activities.

Aptheker, the renowned Marxist historian, similarly defeated efforts by the Federal government to deprive him of his passport.

The court ruled that the McCarran Act was too "sweeping" and was "excessively vague."

FORCE TESTIMONY

The legislation would reaffirm the SACB's powers of subpoena and would assure "the assistance of Federal courts to enforce that power."

It would thwart fifth Amendment rights by empowering the SACB to force a citizen to bear witness against himself while offering so-called "immunity for testimony compelled over self-incrimination claims."

The bill also provides for "penal sanctions for acts of misbehavior in the presence of the board."

BIG PAYROLL FOR IDLENESS

Ichord said the measure is necessary in order to give the SACB something to do.

Since the Supreme Court struck down sections of the McCarran Act, the nine members of the SACB have been drawing their \$36,000 per year salaries while doing little more than occupy their plush office a few blocks from the White House.

Mrs. Donna Allen, Washington representative of the National Committee Against Repressive Legislation, was in the public galleries during the debate today. She told the Daily World that the HISC rushed HR 9669 to the floor in an attempt to catch the opposition off guard.

Many Representatives are still absent following the Memorial Day holiday, including Rep. Robert Drinan (D-Mass), a member of the House committee, who voted against the measure in the committee.

Drinan is on a visit to Israel.

FIGHT ON WITCHHUNT AGENCY DUE THIS WEEK

WASHINGTON, June 5.—Mrs. Donna Allen, Washington representative of the National Committee Against Repressive Legislation, told the Daily News today that a measure will be introduced in the Senate this week to cut off all funds for the witchhunting Subversive Activities Control Board.

A "Dear Colleague" letter, she said, has been sent to all U.S. Senators by Senators Sam Ervin (D-NC), William Proxmire (D-Wis) and Allen Ellender (D-La) urging them to vote for an amendment they will introduce eliminating all funds for the SACB.

Tuesday, the House approved a measure, HR 9669, expanding the powers of the SACB. The measure has been sent to the Senate Judiciary Committee. She said this makes all the more urgent support for the efforts of the senators to cut off funds for the committee.

Additionally, Sen. Ervin has attached to the appropriation bill which contains the funds for the SACB a rider which stipulates that none of the funds appropriated to SACB may be used for implementing Pres. Nixon's executive order of last year expanding the SACB's powers.

Mrs. Allen described this measure as a "fall-back" position for the senators if they are defeated in their efforts to eliminate funds for the SACB altogether.

If the Senate passes measures to abolish or curb SACB, then a House-Senate Conference Committee will be convened to resolve the differences between the two bodies on the fate of SACB.

This makes it important, Mrs. Allen said, for the Senate conferees to be "instructed" to abide by the vote in the Senate against SACB and not yield to pressures to compromise on the measure.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, June 12, 1972

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God is spirit: and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.—John 4: 24.

O God and Father of us all, we wait upon Thee for the uplift of Thy spirit which clarifies our minds, strengthens our hearts, and leads us in the ways of truth and love. Quicken within us every noble impulse that we may walk uprightly with hearts free from malice and filled with good will.

Bless our country with Thy favor and guide our people in the paths of peace. Be with all who serve under the banner of our Government, particularly our Armed Forces, and prisoners of war. Strengthen them in times of temptation and give comfort to those who mourn the victims of violence.

Give us faith to see beyond the troubles of this day the working of Thy providence in the affairs of men and may we ever strive to walk in Thy way.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

CXVIII—1284—Part 16

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on June 6, 1972, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1915. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States;

H.R. 13150. An act to provide that the Federal Government shall assume the risks of its fidelity losses, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 13361. An act to amend section 316 (c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 9096. An act to amend chapter 19 of title 38 of the United States Code, to extend coverage under servicemen's group life insurance to cadets and midshipmen at the service academies of the Armed Forces.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11417) entitled "An act to amend the

Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 to provide financial assistance to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation for the purpose of purchasing railroad equipment, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 722. An act to declare that certain federally owned lands shall be held by the United States in trust for the Stockbridge Munsee Indian Community, Wisconsin.

S. 2987. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to make grants to Eisenhower College, Seneca Falls, N.Y., out of the proceeds of the sale of minted proof dollar coins bearing the likeness of the late President of the United States Dwight D. Eisenhower.

AMERICA'S SHAME IN VIETNAM

(Mr. DOW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I am severely disturbed by an article in the New York Times of June 10, 1972 which is headed, "Military Waging War as They Want." This shows very clearly that the generals and the admirals in charge of the air war in Indochina have the fullest freedom to range up and down Vietnam and elsewhere, pounding the Vietnamese "into the Stone Age," as one general once put it.