

by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, to authorize an increased contribution by the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 15508. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that renewal licenses for the operation of a broadcasting station may be issued for a term of 5 years and to establish certain standards for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcasting licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ESCH (for himself, Mr. HORTON, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. McKEVITT, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. McCURE, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. MALLARY, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, and Mr. FRENZEL):

H.R. 15509. A bill to provide greater assurance of Federal fiscal responsibility to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 15510. A bill to amend the Judiciary and Judicial Procedure Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS (for himself and Mr. ABBITT):

H.R. 15511. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to change the times for the filing of reports of receipts and expenditures by political committees and candidates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MILLS of Arkansas:

H.R. 15512. A bill to protect suppliers of property in trade and commerce with respect

to credit card promotions, to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 15513. A bill to amend section 8191 of title 5, United States Code, to extend benefits thereunder to officially recognized or designated members of a legally organized volunteer fire department, ambulance team or rescue squad not employed by the United States who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15514. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to correct certain inequities in the crediting of National Guard technician service in connection with civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHOUP:

H.R. 15515. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 in order to increase the authorization of appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, for public works and development facilities grants, and to require that a larger percentage of such appropriations be expended in certain redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STRATTON (for himself, Mr. ABOUREZK, and Mr. COLLINS of Illinois):

H.R. 15516. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to increase benefits and improve eligibility and computation methods under the OASDI program, to make improvements in the medicare, medicaid, and maternal and child health programs with emphasis on improvements in their operating effectiveness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 15517. 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. WHALEN:

H.J. Res. 1229. 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. DEVINE (for himself and Mr. WYLIE):

H. Res. 1017. Resolution praising Columbus, Ohio, and her residents on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of Columbus Day, U.S.A.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 15518. A bill for the relief of David B. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUILLLEN:

H.R. 15519. A bill for the relief of Carl W. Houston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHOUP:

H.R. 15520. A bill for the relief of Jung Sup Shin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE REVEREND ROBERT RIVES

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, the Reverend Robert Rives, of the Garden City, Mich., Presbyterian Church, has stepped down from the pulpit after 34 years of devoted service.

From my boyhood days in Garden City, I have had the privilege of knowing Rev. Dr. Rives. He was our family minister when I was growing up, and he has been a good friend through the years.

I ask unanimous consent that several newspaper articles concerning the retirement of Rev. Dr. Rives be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wayne (Mich.) Daily Eagle, Apr. 27, 1972]

REV. RIVES STEPS DOWN

(By Dann Barkume)

At approximately 12 noon on Sunday, the Rev. Robert Rives will step down from the pulpit at the Garden City Presbyterian Church for the last time.

Rev. Rives is retiring from the ministry after 35 years of service. He has been pastor of the Garden City church since May 14, 1939.

In that span, Rev. Rives has performed 702 marriages, 1,285 baptisms and has conducted 622 funerals. His career in Garden City spans not only ministerial duties, but also includes involvement in several fraternal groups and civic associations.

The Garden City Presbyterian Church has been in existence since Aug. 15, 1840 with the original congregation numbering 13. But most of the church's growth has been under Rev. Rives leadership.

Under Rev. Rives, the church has thrived and has a full program of activities, including four choirs—adult, youth, children's and cherub—Sunday School program, Women's Association, Men's Club and Boy Scout Troop 784.

Rev. Rives and his wife arrived in Garden City when it was a small community with a population of 3,000. The existing church, located on Middlebelt Road just south of Ford Road, was dedicated on Oct. 28, 1928.

The original half-acre site has expanded to its present 3.5 acres and three additions have been added.

Rev. Rives is the 46th minister to serve the congregation during its 132-year history.

He is also retiring from the board of directors of the People's Community Hospital Authority, a position that he has held longer than all but one member of the 46-man-board.

He also served as chaplain in various Army and Navy hospitals. During World War II he was chaplain of the Garden City branch of the Red Cross and also served on the Rationing Board.

Rev. Rives enlisted in the Navy as a chaplain on Veteran's Day in 1944 and served until June 18, 1947, attaining the rank of commander. He served as chaplain aboard the aircraft carriers Midway and Wake and remained in the service after the end of World War II to serve as chaplain of the Naval facility in Dearborn.

Last night he was named Pastor Emeritus by the Michigan Presbytery, just four days before his retirement from active ministerial work.

Mrs. Rives, who received a master's degree in education from the University of Michi-

gan, will retire in June after more than 30 years as a teacher. For the past 25 years, she has taught in the Wayne-Westland school system.

They have two children, Mary Luella Wade, who lives in Detroit with her husband, a director of student activities at Wayne State University, and Janet Ruth Rives, an elementary school teacher in Homewood, Ill.

A reception honoring the Rives is scheduled for 4 p.m. Sunday at Garden City West High School. Rev. Rives will be introduced by way of an Honor Guard from the U.S. Navy and many dignitaries will join an estimated 1,500 to 2,000 well-wishers to honor the retiring pastor.

Messages of commendation will be read from President Richard Nixon and Gov. William G. Milliken. A personal appearance is expected by U.S. Sen. Robert Griffin (R-Mich.), a longtime friend of the Rives.

The Rives plan to leave in June for an extended European vacation, hoping to travel around the continent for most of the year before returning to their home in Garden City.

A native of Texas, the 65-year-old pastor's only comment was "I just really can't imagine not being pastor of this church. So often people don't realize what a fine community we have to live in."

Three generations of Garden City residents will gather on Sunday to say goodbye to a man who helped build the community, but as one member of the congregation put it, "We won't be saying good-bye, we're giving him a new commission and new duties."

For Robert Rives, forced to retire at the age of 65, Sunday will culminate a 35 year relationship with a community, a relationship which he voluntarily took upon himself to build and nurture. For 35 years, Rev. Rives worked for the spiritual growth of his congregation. His congregation, almost to a person, agree that Rev. Rives will be sorely missed.

[From the Detroit News, May 1, 1972]
GARDEN CITY PRESBYTERIANS HONOR RETIRING
PASTOR

(By Gerald L. Nelson)

The Rev. Robert Rives, stepping down yesterday from the pulpit he occupied for 34 years, said his retirement festivities "were just like Easter all over again."

More than 500 turned out for Sunday services in the Garden City Presbyterian Church. Later, 1,200 showed up for the congregation's retirement reception and dinner for the burly, crewcut pastor.

Normally, a few hundred might attend services on a balmy, warm spring day, but this was Mr. Rives' last sermon.

"I was simply overwhelmed," beamed the Texas-born minister at a testimonial dinner attended by almost every important clergyman, businessman, civic leader and politician in Garden City.

"I never visualized anything like this for me. I've been to a lot of retirement dinners, but never thought of myself in that role."

Among the greetings read at the testimonial at Garden City West High School were those from President Nixon, Gov. Milliken and U.S. Senator Robert Griffin.

In a personally signed card, President Nixon commended Mr. Rives' "long and dedicated service to God and your fellow man."

In a gray suit, the carnation in the lapel drooping slightly, Mr. Rives, 65, accepted the handshaking and congratulations modestly and with a trace of his characteristic humor.

"When I saw the price of these tickets," he said, "I never thought more than 25 would show up."

His 34 years in the pulpit were interrupted by a three-year wartime stint as a U.S. Navy chaplain aboard a battleship in the Pacific.

His origins were in the cattle-and-brush country of Texas, but the road to Garden City was circuitous. He tried it as an engineer, window decorator, school teacher and photographic assistant.

Finally, his preacher father prevailed, and in 1938, fresh from the seminary, Mr. Rives took over the dissention-ridden Garden City church. There were 20 parishioners, mostly Southern-born, poor and angry.

The last minister had left amid a dispute, but says Mr. Rives, he arrived intending to stay.

"Some people said I wouldn't last a year," recalled Mr. Rives. "But there is a lot of bulldog in my nature, and I could get tough when anybody challenged."

The church, which has been expanded three times, now has 610 members.

The main speaker at last night's dinner, Dr. John Stone, pastor of an inner city church and seminary classmate of Mr. Rives, said:

"He was an ardent, devoted leader who, if things weren't right, would let you know it. But he was also like a good sailor. He could catch a wind and make it work for him."

After a one-year camping tour of Europe, the Rives will return to Garden City to live and "do some fishing." In April, the Detroit Presbytery named Mr. Rives pastor emeritus of the church.

Upon retiring, he said:

"I am saddened. I never saw myself as anything but a pastor, and I can't see myself not being pastor."

[From the Garden City Observer,
May 3, 1972]

NIXON LEADS TRIBUTES TO REV. RIVES

(By Leonard Poger)

After 1,288 baptisms, 702 weddings and 622 funerals, Rev. R. R. Rives Sunday declared

vacant the pastorate at Garden City Presbyterian Church.

In the reception line after his last service there were tears.

Rev. Robert R. Rives, who has touched thousands of lives in Garden City, was honored in a series of events Sunday on his retirement from Garden City Presbyterian Church—a pastorate that started 33 years ago.

The long list of civic tributes was highlighted by a congratulatory card from President Nixon and a best wishes letter from a White House aide.

Twin highlights were Rev. Rives' farewell sermon at 11 a.m. and the afternoon dinner and program—each attended by an estimated 475 persons.

The emotional departure of the popular clergyman was evident in the tears streaming down the cheeks of congregants following Rev. Rives' last service Sunday morning.

And one choir member put it afterwards: "It was the blubberiest choir I've ever sung in."

"There wasn't a dry eye in the house," added another member of the church following the service.

As Rev. Rives stood at the rear door of the church sanctuary shaking hands with churchgoers, many embraced him with tears in their eyes.

At Rev. Rives' side was his wife, Wilma, who has been in the Wayne-Westland Community Schools for 25 of her 30 years in the teaching profession.

The theme of the clergyman's farewell sermon was the historical milestones recalled during his 34 years in the community.

At the afternoon recognition dinner at West High School, a special Navy color guard placed an American flag and chaplain flag behind the head table. Rev. Rives was a Navy chaplain during World War II and later served in the Naval Reserves.

Beside the congratulatory messages from President Nixon, and a White House aide, there were best wishes in writing from Gov. Milliken and a promise of a state legislative resolution honoring him on his past service and retirement.

Representing the city government were City Councilman James Plakas and Assessor Douglas Waddell, a member of the Presbyterian church.

The congratulatory card from Mr. Nixon carried the presidential seal.

The letter on White House stationery misidentified the clergyman's church as the "Garden Groves Presbyterian Church."

The letter, from Henry Cashen II, deputy assistant to the President, said that Rev. Rives' "contributions reach far beyond the confines of the church you have served, beyond the city you live in and beyond your denomination."

"Courageous and compassionate ministries from men such as you gives strength to the fiber of our free society," said the White House letter.

Gov. Milliken expressed his congratulations "for a job well done."

"During the 34 years you have touched the lives of many people and I know that Garden City has benefited greatly as a result of your inspiration both in a spiritual and a civic way," Milliken said.

In his farewell sermon Sunday, Rev. Rives called the ministry "the queen of professions" and that "worship is the pause that refreshes and reforms our spirits."

He asked forgiveness from those he may have offended over the years and added:

"I am just too human to have had anywhere near a perfect pastorate but I have sincerely tried."

CONGRESS PUSSYFOOTS
ON BUSING

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, if ever there was an issue on which the voice of the American people has been heard loud and clear, it is the busing of school children for purposes of racial balance. Yet the court-ordered crosstown school buses roll on, carrying children from safe and pleasant neighborhoods to high-crime slums, in bitter mockery of Abraham Lincoln's hallowed description of a "government of the people, by the people, for the people." Excuses and evasions multiply endlessly, but the simple fact remains that Congress and the President could stop almost all busing now, immediately, by a simple law depriving the Federal courts of jurisdiction over cases involving the transportation of school children, because of their race.

This remedy by congressional statute is authorized by article III, section 2 of the Constitution, supported by no less than 77 legal precedents down through our history. It was actually approved by the Senate February 25 in a rare moment of statesmanship as part of S. 659, the Educational Amendments of 1972—only to be stricken out 3 days later.

Now this same bill, S. 659, after one of the most tangled legislative histories of the current session, is before the House of Representatives for final action. Along with setting up a colossal new multibillion dollar program for funneling taxpayers' money into our chaotic and often fiercely anti-American colleges and universities, and along with funding "educational parks"—huge consolidated schools in metropolitan areas bearing some disturbing resemblances to concentration camps—this bill pretends to meet the overriding concern of the American people about busing. It is aimed at convincing voters that Congress is really "doing something" to defend the neighborhood school. That pretense is quickly punctured by reading the actual language of the bill.

One long paragraph—section 802a—tells about how Federal funds are not to be used for busing to overcome racial imbalance. Buried in the middle is this saving clause for busing advocates:

Except on the express written voluntary request of appropriate local school officials.

In my experience, school officials are far from reluctant to ask for money for almost any purpose, even busing.

This paragraph goes on to say that no Federal funds will be used for busing children to a school "where the educational opportunities—will be substantially inferior to his neighborhood school." But who is to determine the relative value of those "educational opportunities"—whatever that splendidly vague phrase may mean? And what about the crime rate in the area where the school is located, one of the primary concerns of

parents? The bill makes no mention of that.

The next paragraph, section 802b, grandly prohibits all Federal agencies from acting to "urge, persuade, induce or require" local school boards to order busing, with just a little three-word exception—"unless constitutionally required." Everyone who reads his newspaper about busing knows that all busing for racial balance is alleged by its supporters to be constitutionally required. Those three words negate all the rest of this paragraph.

The only provision in this bill which would have any real effect on busing is the Broomfield amendment postponing the effective date of all court busing orders until all appeals have been heard or the time for appeals has expired, until the end of next year—when the election and the heightened political consciousness of the people which elections arouse, is safely past. Anyone who really thinks this issue is going to go away in a year and a half is living in a dream world.

The people want busing stopped now. Congress and the President could do exactly that by taking away court jurisdiction over transportation of school children, because of their race, or by passing a constitutional amendment overriding the busing decisions. No other measure can stop busing for good and to pretend otherwise is to deceive the electorate.

LOD AIRPORT ATTACK A COWARDLY ACT

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, although several days have passed since the terrorist attack at Tel Aviv's Lod Airport slaughtered 26 innocent victims, the echoes of that atrocity still sound.

The sounds are those of anguish and anger. The nations of the world ought to have reacted with stricter security at all airports by this time. They have not.

World opinion ought to have moved the airlines serving Israel to unite in taking drastic steps to discourage any recurrence of the Lod attack. Apparently, Mr. Speaker, they have not.

The United Nations should have, by now, moved into emergency session to take steps toward eliminating air piracy and the killing of innocents from international politics. Sadly, the United Nations is doing precious little in this area.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Government must take a leadership role in correcting the obvious deficiencies that have resulted in skyjacking and airport killing taking place almost daily.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, the United States and the United Nations should make every effort to discourage the Government of Lebanon from giving a safe haven to the terrorists who are committed to insane political acts of murder, oftentimes using the cowardly device of pirating aircraft that are tempting targets because of lax security.

It should be worth noting that the tightly guarded airplanes of El Al, the Israeli airlines, are not subject to terrorist attacks any longer.

Mr. Speaker, the challenge to the world community, the United States and the United Nations to bring about necessary reforms to protect aircraft crews and passengers is a vital and urgent challenge.

I join with my many colleagues in both the House and the Senate who have condemned the attack at Lod Airport and who have called for quick action to prevent such an outrage from happening again.

NATIVE TAIWANESE GET TOP GOVERNMENT POSTS

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, from time to time there have been questions regarding the amount of participation in the government of the Republic of China by native Taiwanese. Those who are well informed have realized there has been a constant increase in the number of Taiwanese in high positions in government and in the military. An article published in the Christian Science Monitor, Thursday, June 8, 1972, gives very real information on the progress being made in bringing native Taiwanese into the government in high positions. I submit it for reprinting in the RECORD:

NATIVE TAIWANESE GET TOP GOVERNMENT POSTS

(By April Klimley)

TAIPEI, TAIWAN.—Nationalist China's recent government reshuffle put so many Taiwanese in top posts that it could eventually radically alter the map of the island's domestic political terrain.

Premier Chiang Ching-kuo's new Cabinet is about one-third Taiwanese.

It includes well-known former Taipei Mayor Henry Kao, who was promoted to Minister of Communications; Lin Ching-shen, former secretary-general of the Taipei branch of the ruling Kuomintang Party, who became Minister of the Interior; Hsu Ching-chung, who moved up from Interior Minister to Vice-Premier; and three ministers without portfolio.

Everyone was surprised at the number of Taiwanese chosen.

"He could have gotten away with much less," commented one Nationalist Chinese observer.

OTHER SURPRISES

Chiang Ching-kuo did not stop with the Cabinet.

He also appointed Taiwanese Hsieh Tung-min as Taiwan's first native Governor. Formerly this post has always been held by mainlanders, those who followed Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek to Taiwan in the late 1940's.

An even bigger surprise was the appointment of Chang Fung-hsu, the magistrate of the down-island county of Pingtung, as Taipei city Mayor. Mr. Chang has never been connected with national politics, although his record as an administrator in Pingtung is excellent.

The new Cabinet has been welcomed and

praised by newspapers, intellectuals, and students.

But for the near future the appointments are unlikely to change the real power balance in the national government.

One reason for this is that, except for Henry Kao, all the new men are Kuomintang Party members and are thus expected to stick to the party line, which is usually conservative on most subjects.

IDENTITY LOST?

"Taiwanese who are party members lose their identity," explained one young intellectual recently. "They will never speak out for Taiwanese."

This seems borne out by the histories of men like Vice-Premier Hsu, Interior Minister Lin, and Taiwan Governor Hsieh.

Mr. Hsieh is looked down on by many Taiwanese since he left Taiwan in the 1920's and did not return until the mid-1940's with the Nationalist Chinese Government. He is sometimes called a "ban shan," a "half mountain," which means half a Taiwanese.

Mr. Hsieh's new post as Governor is not particularly powerful because the responsibilities of the provincial government are shrinking year by year.

The two ministries—Communications and Interior—which are being given to Taiwanese are not very important either.

POWER BASE HELD

Even the post of Vice-Premier is of debatable value. It only seems key when it is held by someone like Chiang Ching-kuo who held it up until his present appointment as Premier and who already had established a separate power base of his own.

The sole job likely to have any real impact is that of Taipei Mayor. Former Mayor Henry Kao made a worldwide reputation for himself running for the office twice. He then was appointed to the job when Taipei became a special municipality.

However, despite this political success, Mr. Kao was never very successful in overhauling the outdated city bureaucracy. The new Mayor, while not well known, is reputed to be an honest and able administrator.

'SIGNIFICANT' APPOINTMENTS

But even if Chiang Ching-kuo's appointments do not have a major impact right away, everyone on the island agrees they are "significant."

For one thing, they are an obvious attempt to rectify a situation in which native Taiwanese have been excluded from power for over 20 years.

There has been pressure on the Nationalists to share power since they retreated to the island. But only now, in the wake of expulsion from the United Nations and President Nixon's visit to Peking, has the government started to move in that direction.

The appointments also indicate that the Premier is not afraid to break precedent.

TWO NOT PROMOTED

Usually a man who does a good job in a Chinese government gets promoted, regardless of qualifications or specialty. The Premier, however, left two very good men right in their places: K. T. Li retained his job as Finance Minister, and S.Y. Sun stayed on as Economics Minister.

The reshuffle also showed that the 62-year-old heir apparent is determined to continue the attempts he has made throughout his career to woo Taiwanese.

Chiang Ching-kuo has had strong prejudices to fight against since many people resent his Soviet education and Russian wife.

"He's a hard man to respect," said one Taiwanese politician about the Premier. "He's certainly not the ideal leader."

But this man added: "If some day he leads us and fights for us, we will follow him because there's no one in the Kuomintang stronger than him."

FLAG DAY—JUNE 14, 1972

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, although the United States is one of the world's youngest nations, our flag is one of the oldest national emblems and even predates the present Union Jack of Great Britain and the French Tri-color.

The Continental Congress on June 14, 1777, while sitting in Philadelphia, resolved:

That the flag of the thirteen United States be thirteen stripes, alternate red and white, that the union be thirteen stars, white in a field of blue, representing a new constellation.

The design for the new national emblem had been developed by a distinguished committee of the Continental Congress, named in 1775, and composed of Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Lynch, and Benjamin Harrison.

Thus, we created the emblem of the United States of America which is known most widely around the world today. Most people have attributed special significance to the colors of the flag: blue, to represent justice or a covenant against oppression; red, to represent defiance or daring; and white, to represent purity or liberty. However, this is not what we honor today. We honor our Nation, and, in the words of Henry Ward Beecher:

A thoughtful mind when it sees a nation's flag, sees not the flag, but the nation itself. And whatever may be its symbols, its insignia, he reads chiefly in the flag, the government, the principles, the truths, the history that belong to the nation that sets it forth. The American flag has been a symbol of Liberty and men rejoiced in it.

Flag Day has been celebrated for many years now in the United States. I believe that it is appropriate for us to pause each year to commemorate the anniversary of our national flag. To take the opportunity on this day to reflect upon the timeless ideals of the Founding Fathers which have given this Nation its heritage of freedom and justice for all.

Therefore, we honor not merely the flag today, but also what it represents. We must commit ourselves again to the achievement of its ideals and the continuation of its traditions. In honoring our flag, we should reaffirm our allegiance to the highest values and ideas which it embodies, and pledge our determination to respect and defend it against all who would remove or defile it. On Flag Day, 1972, I feel that it is appropriate to quote the words which President Wilson spoke on Flag Day, 1917:

This flag, which we honor and under which we serve, is the emblem of our unity, our power, our thought and purpose as a nation. It has no other character than that which we give it from generation to generation. The choices are ours.

These words, Mr. Speaker, are still relevant today, and it is certainly up to us to continue the heritage which has made this Nation and its flag great. Therefore, on this Flag Day, let us re-

dedicate ourselves to the ideals which Old Glory has continuously embodied for nearly two centuries.

MR. AND MRS. HERBERT SAGENDORF**HON. ELLA T. GRASSO**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, those who donate blood perform an invaluable service which is often a gift of life to people in need.

Special tribute should be paid to Mr. and Mrs. Herbert Sagendorf of Thomaston, Conn., the reigning U.S. championship donor team. Mr. Sagendorf recently gave his 96th pint of blood and is now one pint ahead of his wife. The Sagendorfs, who have been donating blood since World War II, are just shy of the celebrated 24 gallon mark. Last year in New York, they were deservedly honored as the Nation's top donor couple.

Generosity of people like the Sagendorfs is a splendid example of how each of us—in our own way—can serve our fellowman. For the interest of my colleagues, articles which recently appeared in the Thomaston Express and the Waterbury Republican regarding the Sagendorfs' feat follow:

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) American, April 26, 1972]

MAN DONATES 96TH PINT

THOMASTON.—Pulses pounded and corpuscles raced at the Red Cross Bloodmobile here Tuesday as onlookers awaited for one-half of the U.S. Championship donor team to come and shed his 96th pint.

Everything was set at Congregational Church Hall as the time approached for Thomaston's own 60-year-old Herbert Sagendorf to pump out the liquid that would make him a Blood Bank immortal.

A cake had been baked just for him and a banner citing his expected accomplishment was furled and ready. Mrs. Sagendorf, whose total donations dating back to World War II also come to 95 pints, was standing by as Bloodmobile Captain-of-the-Day.

One question was uppermost in every mind: Would Sagendorf pass the physical all donors must undergo?

Finally, he arrived, in the van of several young donor-recruits led by Sagendorf's nephew, Harry Waterhouse, 18.

The medics did their thing. Temperature? O.K. Pulse? Check. Blood pressure? Good!

They unfurled the banner. And for the 96th time, Harry Sagendorf entered the lonely world where man meets needle—eye to eye.

The Sagendorfs, now just a pint shy of a connubial 24 gallons, were honored by the American Association of Blood Banks in New York last year as the nation's top donor couple. Mrs. Sagendorf, now a pint behind her spouse, says she plans to catch up next time around.

Mrs. Winfield Wight, Thomaston blood chairman, said Sagendorf and his recruits helped the unit exceed its 200-pint quota for the visit by 11 pints.

A number of aspirants to duplicate the Sagendorf saga got special recognition after Tuesday's donations. They were led by Robert Henderson, who gave his fifth gallon; Ralph

Humphrey, William Gill Jr. and Harold Morton, who reached the four-gallon level.

[From the Thomaston (Conn.) Express, May 4, 1972]

BLOOD DONORS GIVE OVER 200 PINTS

THOMASTON.—Over 200 pints of blood were collected at a very successful Bloodmobile visit in Thomaston April 25. Some 218 people were registered, but 7 were rejected for health reasons, and 24 non-scheduled donors, many in the teen age group, showed the spirit of the community.

The excitement of the afternoon came when Herbert Sagendorf was awarded his 12 gallon pin for the 96 pints he had donated from Sept. 1950 to the present. After he passed the medical history requirements, a banner created by Mrs. Daniel Samson, was unfurled showing the 12 gallon. In the canteen, he was presented a specially decorated cake by Nancy Scott, Harry Waterhouse of Northfield, an 18 year old, accompanied his Uncle, Herbert Sagendorf, and brought four additional friends with him as first time donors.

A Five Gallon Award was given to Robert Henderson, four gallon Awards went to William Gill, Jr. and Ralph Humphrey, three gallon Awards to Harold Morton, Joseph B. Kelley and Donald Yurtin, two gallon Awards to Raymond Baldwin, Stacia Cocca, Rickard Darm, Horst Getschmann, John Reardon and Muriel Rowland.

The Future Nurses of Thomaston High School wore Red Cross arm bands made by Girl Scouts of Cadets Troop 4050, under the supervision of Mrs. John Cianciolo. General Time led the industries with 37 employees recruited by Lucille DeCastro, R.N.

Sincere appreciation is extended by Mrs. Winfield E. Wight, Thomaston Red Cross Blood Donor Chairman, to the management of local industries for the 94 persons who were scheduled on factory time, to the donors and the dedicated workers who served during the afternoon, for their cooperation and assistance. Appreciation, for a successful visit is also extended to the Senior Citizens for directing traffic, and to Chester Dusak for the use of his parking facilities which adjoin the Auditorium.

THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS OBSERVES 29TH ANNIVERSARY**HON. JOE L. EVINS**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, one of the most effective representatives and champions of small business is the National Federation of Independent Business, which this year is observing its 29th anniversary.

The national federation was founded on May 20, 1943, by the late Mr. C. Wilson Harder, the organization's first president and chairman of the board of directors.

The purpose and program of the federation was articulated by Mr. Harder as follows:

To promote and protect our system of private business, with equal rights to all. To give small business a greater voice in laws governing business and our Nation.

The federation is continuing this tradition of dedication and assistance to

the Nation's more than 5 million small businessmen. The federation now has more than 310,000 members located in all 50 States. These 310,000 members employ some 2.6 million persons and generate more than \$48 billion in business volume annually.

Representatives of the National Federation of Independent Business work closely with Members of Congress and as chairman of the House Small Business Committee, I want to commend and congratulate Mr. Wilson Johnson, president of the national federation, Mr. James Gavin, legislative director, and other officials and leaders in this important small business organization for their great work in representing in the public interest the best interests of small business on Capitol Hill.

I also want to congratulate officials and members of the federation on their 29th anniversary, and certainly I wish for this fine organization much continued good luck and success for the future.

MOSCOW TRIP DID NOT STOP OUR NEED FOR ARMED POWER

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has transmitted to the Congress the SALT agreement reached with the Soviet Union, along with the interim arms limitation agreement. The Senate, under the Constitution, has responsibility for ratifying the ABM treaty and both Houses of Congress will be involved in approving the interim agreement. These agreements have been received, generally, with hope and enthusiasm. However, we must guard against euphoria and we must be realistic. There have been many agreements in the past which have not been honored by the Communists. We have come as far as we have because we have negotiated from strength. It is essential that America remain strong if further progress is to be made on the road to peace.

The McPherson, Kans., Sentinel has published the following editorial which is an excellent and realistic appraisal of the agreements reached with the Soviet Union. It is deserving of the attention of all Members of Congress and the people of our Nation as we evaluate the results of the President's mission to Moscow. The editorial follows:

MOSCOW TRIP DIDN'T STOP OUR NEED FOR ARMED POWER

Since President Nixon's trip to Moscow, many of us have been living in a dream world of peace from now on forever with Russia.

Defense Secretary Laird has punched a most timely needle in that bubble of a dream. Very convincingly he stated that we must keep up our armed strength to maintain our bargaining strength with Russia in future arms talks.

He is right. All that was agreed in Moscow was restriction of nuclear bombs. Guns, planes and ships were not mentioned.

This is not an argument for a wild in-

flation in arms buildings. Rather it is a reminder that the cold war is still here. That Russia will grab any chance she gets to seize more countries.

The only restraint Russia still will honor is the restraint of brute force.

We'd better keep a little of it just in case.

LIBERALISM VERSUS LIBERAL EDUCATION

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was most disturbed to read in the Washington Post this past Sunday an account of the bitter controversy and intimations of academic repression that have greeted the publication of a study on the effects of busing by Prof. David Armor of Harvard University. According to the Post article as well as independent reports which I have received, Professor Armor has become the subject of severe denunciation, harassment and even vandalism because he had the honesty and courage to publish a report measuring the effects of busing which contradicts the conventional wisdom of the academic community of which he is a part. Perhaps indicative of the state of academic freedom at that great university is the statement reported in the Post by an anonymous faculty member that:

Only a damn fool would talk . . . I don't want to pay the price.

Certainly one may take issue with the substance of Professor Armor's findings and the methodologies he employed in obtaining the results revealed in his study. As one who has taken the position that measures to relieve racial isolation and concentration in our ghetto schools are essential if we are to fulfill our national commitment to truly equal educational opportunity, I find Professor Armor's study disheartening and hope that it will be subjected to the closest critical scrutiny and evaluation.

But disagreement with methodologies and the scholarly merit of the study does not seem to be the real source of some of the more strident criticisms being directed at Professor Armor. Instead he is being denounced for the mere act of publishing the study in the first place. Even the Boston Globe, which did nothing more than reprint excerpts from his article, has been condemned for engaging in an "act of pure racism."

Obviously, the assumption behind this kind of criticism and denunciation is that scholarly work which questions the validity of the prevailing academic wisdom on certain matters should be suppressed and kept locked in the study. Yet what could be more abhorrent to the concept of academic freedom than that regrettable notion? What could do more to chill the climate for open and dispassionate inquiry than the threat that unexpected results of scholarly investigation will elicit a barrage of denunciation and intimidation if made public?

Mr. Speaker, one of America's fore-

most social scientists, Prof. James Q. Wilson, recently published an article in Commentary magazine that is addressed to this very question. In an article entitled, "Liberalism versus Liberal Education," he warns of the growing threat to academic freedom and open inquiry within our great universities themselves—the very institutions which have historically nurtured those values and which have the most to gain from their preservation. In light of this most recent outbreak of repression and illiberality, I believe his article is particularly timely and would urge that all of my colleagues read it.

The article follows:

LIBERALISM VERSUS LIBERAL EDUCATION

(By James Q. Wilson)

My title will strike many readers as paradoxical, even absurd. Liberalism, far from being the enemy of a liberal education, is widely regarded as being the product of it. For better or worse, the liberal creed has been nurtured and propagated on the college campuses, and though not all students become its disciples, almost all are affected by it, and some dramatically so.

At one level that is all true enough. We know that those who are college-educated are the most tolerant of unpopular opinions, are most prepared to endorse measures to advance civil liberties and civil rights, and are least willing to support anti-democratic regimes. Indeed, one of the watershed discoveries of political sociologists writing in the 1950's was that democratic values were least secure among the working class and most secure among the college-educated upper-middle class. That finding was sharply challenged, though never successfully disproved, by those few scholars who retained during the 1950's and early 1960's the conviction that the upper-middle class was characterized not by civic virtue but by the ambition for power and animated not by democratic values but by economic ones. Yet even those who offered a radical critique of society found their allies and followers, not among the workers, but among fellow college students and college graduates. Dissent, in this country as in all countries, in this era as in almost all eras, has been chiefly the province of the intelligentsia.

Among the intelligentsia, it has been those who have studied the liberal arts—especially the social sciences and the humanities—who have displayed the most "liberal" attitudes. Students of engineering, of applied sciences, and of agriculture are all much more conservative. And as Seymour Martin Lipset has shown, not only do the liberal arts stimulate liberal views, but the most able, distinguished, productive, and (presumably) highest-paid professors of the liberal arts are the most "liberal" in their orientation. In short, higher education stimulates the liberal impulse, a liberal-arts higher education stimulates it even more, and the "best" (or at least the most expensive and prestigious) liberal-arts higher education stimulates it most of all.

How, then, can I suggest that a liberal education is at all inconsistent with liberalism? I suggest it, quite simply, by pointing to the fact that it is within higher education that one finds today many but not all of the most serious threats to certain liberal values—the harassment of unpopular views, the use of force to prevent certain persons from speaking, the adoption of quota systems either to reduce the admission of certain kinds of students or enhance the admissions of other kinds, and the politicization of the university to make it an arena for the exchange of manifestoes rather than a forum for the discussion of ideas.

The liberal values that have become pre-

carious in the very institution that once defended them are those of civility, free speech, equality of opportunity, and the maintenance of a realm of privacy and intimacy safe from the constant assaults of the political and the societal. These are not, as I shall point out, the only elements of the liberal faith, but they are important ones and they are very much in jeopardy. I realize that the vast majority of faculty and students do not approve of acts which they even say, quietly, that they deplore them; yet the vast majority also have created a communal setting and institutional culture that permits such acts to continue. The imperiled values have not been repudiated so much as they have been subjected to benign neglect.

The evidence that such a state of affairs exists is not as readily available as my confident generalizations might lead one to suppose. There is, for some reason, no organization that monitors the state of freedom on the campus, or none having the resources and persistence with which, for example, the American Civil Liberties Union monitors attacks on civil liberties off the campus. But if one works at or visits a major university, one will find the history of that sorry procession of episodes which has produced not mounting horror but wordless acquiescence and weary resignation.

During my adult life I have been part of five institutions—the Catholic Church, the University of Redlands, the United States Navy, the University of Chicago, and Harvard University. If I were required to rank them by the extent to which free and uninhibited discussion was possible within them, I am very much afraid that the Harvard of 1972 would not rank near the top. In the last two or three years, the list of subjects that cannot be publicly discussed there in a free and open forum has grown steadily, and now includes the war in Vietnam, public policy toward urban ghettos, the relationship between intelligence and heredity, and the role of American corporations in certain overseas regimes. To be sure, certain points of view about each of these matters can be, and are, discussed, but a serious discussion of all sides of these issues is risky, if not impossible. To be specific: a spokesman for South Vietnam, a critic of liberal policies toward the ghettos, a scientist who claimed that intelligence is largely inherited, and a corporate executive who denied that his firm was morally responsible for the regime in South Africa have all been harassed and in some cases forcibly denied an opportunity to speak.

Some of those who have not been able to speak at all, or to speak only under mental and social duress, have views I disagree with; others have views I agree with; still others have views that I have not made up my mind about. Regarding the last, it is not clear that I am going to have a chance to make up my mind for it is not clear whether the speakers involved are going to feel that the personal costs of public statements are worth the gains in educating me and others.

These problems have not been unique to my university and their emergence has been frequently deplored. I am not here interested in adding any rhetorical flourishes to this discussion: the matter is too important for either declamation or recrimination. I do wish to dispute, however, the view that because the organized New Left has lost stature and influence of late, the problem has ceased to exist. The tumult has subsided a bit (though, as I write, the President's office at Harvard is occupied by demonstrators and the Center for International Affairs has recently been sacked) and a mood of "business as usual" is now displayed by most faculty and students. But a decline in tumult and a return to self-interest are hardly equivalent to a reaffirmation of liberal values, or

of any other values for that matter. The legacy of the campus flirtation with authoritarian politics is still very much with us, not in the continuance of militant action but in the absence of democratic convictions. The New Left may have repudiated itself by its extremism but it also weakened the institution that gave birth to it by casting doubt on the legitimacy of the university and of the principles of free discussion that support it.

My thesis is that the atmosphere that nurtures certain kinds of illiberality is in part a product of liberal education itself. This is not to say that a liberal education teaches disdain for civil liberties or tolerance for violence; quite the contrary. Nor is it to say that only a liberal education contributes to this attitude; certain persons by family origin and the political socialization it provides are more likely to display both liberality and illiberality than others. It is to say that among the consequences of a liberal education is a set of sympathies which lead many, though not all, persons in a university to acquiesce in the uncivil acts of a small minority.

It is time I offered some definitions. By "liberalism" I mean a loose set of values that emphasizes the protection of civil liberties, the support of equal political and economic opportunity, the amelioration of the lot of the disadvantaged, and the enhancement of the area of personal self-expression. Liberalism, thus defined, is a tendency that both liberalizes and liberates; that is, it calls both for generosity and open handedness in the treatment of others and for a minimum of restraint or bondage on the actions of one's self. The modern father of liberalism remains John Stuart Mill: as he explained it, the policy should be organized both to insure the liberty of the citizens and the liberality of the government; the social principle should be the greatest good of the greatest number and the legal principle should be the greatest freedom of an individual consistent with the freedom of others.

A "liberal education" is thought to mean schooling in subjects that broaden one's cultural and historical sensibilities and strengthen one's critical faculties. The purpose of a liberal education is to induct a student, however partially and briefly, into the world of the intellectual. That world, in turn, is one which places a high value on the exercise of criticism, the display of originality, and the understanding of what is unfamiliar, ancient, distant, and problematic. The application of critical faculties to political and social practices means displaying suspicion toward what is formally and conventionally thought to be true in favor of what the initiated believe is actually and informally true, challenging beliefs about the purposes and legitimacy of institutions, and comparing existing practices with real or imagined alternatives. The critical thrust of liberal-arts education is invariably directed against the "conventional wisdom," and as new conventions succeed old ones, the process of criticism is repeated *ad infinitum*. The object is to acquire new and esoteric knowledge to replace popular or conventional opinion. The criteria for what constitutes "knowledge" are often not clear, being sometimes the outcome of the "scientific method" and sometimes merely the ability to be original, daring, or shocking. For example, the critical faculties when applied to American government would emphasize not constitutions but "power structures," not public opinion but the social determinants of opinion, not official statements and legal enactments but bureaucratic empire-building and legislative special interests.

The other part of the world of the intellectual is that which enlarges the perceived range of conduct, thought, and opinion by the sympathetic portrayal of what is remote,

forgotten, unusual, deprived, obscure, or precarious. This aspect of the intellectual world stresses the development, not of criticism, but of cosmopolitanism. The variety of aesthetic, political, and cultural experiences is portrayed and, by being portrayed in neutral or even sympathetic tones, that variety is made to seem, if not desirable, then at least legitimate. This aspect of liberal education is directed not so much against conventional opinion as against conventional morality, which is to say, against bourgeois morality. We learn from this experience to know and appreciate the secret worlds and despised habits of those persons who, before we began our liberal education, were beyond our ken or unpalatable to our taste. For example, we are led to read sympathetically the works of authors and poets who have stood outside the main cultural stream; we are informed of the life and plight of those who have been disadvantaged in the prevailing distribution of political or economic resources; and we encounter the different life styles of other tribes, cultures, and epochs.

Now there is obviously a close relationship between liberalism and liberal education. The exercise of the critical spirit requires the maintenance of political and intellectual freedom. An interest in deprived or despised groups leads to a concern for them, and this in turn tends to imply public and political generosity toward them. It is no surprise that liberal-arts students and professors should become liberals.

How, then, can a liberal education ever be the adversary of liberalism? The answer, I think, is that while the critical faculty requires the existence of civil liberties, it also erodes the bases of authority and legitimacy of those institutions that define and defend those liberties. Criticism is relentless and accepts no bounds; it may prosper when discourse is free and unconstrained but the price paid for that intellectual prosperity is the unceasing assault on those political and legal practices that have produced such freedom. And in the case of Herbert Marcuse, the critical faculty even comes to doubt the value of the freedom itself. Freedom exists because there first existed a certain kind of social order maintained and defined by laws, governments, and authority. Freedom cannot exist outside some system of order, yet no system of order is immune from intellectual assault.

Intellectual criticism would have bounds if there were a widely-accepted principle of authority or theory of human nature on which certain political institutions could rest immune from eroding questions. At various times there have been. Jefferson believed, or wrote as if he believed, that political and civil liberty were among the natural rights of men. But the concept of "natural rights," I need hardly add, has been among the first principles to be criticized, for it implies by its use of the term "natural" that something exists beyond man's invention and thus beyond man's revision. Reinhold Niebuhr offered a different defense of democracy: man's nature is good enough to make it possible but bad enough to make it necessary. Stated differently, we grant civil liberty because we cannot trust anyone to decide the truth. But that notion is no better suited to resist the critical impulse; it also is based on a theory of human nature and thus implies that there are aspects to our lives that are beyond the capacity of society to understand or to alter. Finally, there is the theory of consent: we have freedoms because we have agreed to have them. But if we have agreed to have freedom, we might also agree not to have freedom. Consent is a weak theory of legitimacy, and intellectuals sense it: their own privileges, if granted simply by democratic vote, could be revoked by democratic vote, and from time to time the society has been inclined to do just that.

When one presses an intellectual to supply a defense of liberty, he tends to give some variant of a single argument: utility. Liberty is good because it is useful: it enables society to discover the truth or to find, by discussion, the best policies or the wisest leaders. Under ordinary circumstances, that defense is probably good enough: liberty is useful, or at least more useful than the alternatives. But in extraordinary times, such as the present, the argument is not decisive. Persons who feel strongly that an injustice should be corrected or a condition alleviated are likely to be impatient with, and even actively hostile toward, those who wish to say that the injustice does not exist or the social problem is the fault, not of society, but of those who display the symptoms. Efforts will be made to silence such persons. The majority will not participate in such efforts, but if they believe the doctrine being silenced is sufficiently odious, they will take no active steps to oppose the censorship. They will be all the more reluctant to oppose it if it is being imposed by members of the community they value and on whose esteem they substantially depend.

It is here that the cosmopolitan aspect of liberal education becomes important. When one has cultivated an especially keen regard for the plight of some group, one is especially reluctant to continue a critical discussion of the merits of the case. The commitment to the object of concern ought to be expressed. The ways in which that priority is stated are familiar enough: "Following rules ought not to interfere with doing what is right," or "It is wrong to prefer form over substance."

Let me state in more grandiose terms what I am suggesting. Liberalism, at least as it is conveyed by higher education, is less a theory of justice than a theory of benevolence. By "justice" I mean, roughly, treating equals equally and by rules known in advance and applicable to all. By "benevolence" I mean a disposition to treat someone in a generous way, to serve his or her perceived interests and desires. Liberalism imparts a commitment to certain rules and practices that are very much a part of a theory of justice—the rule of law, equality of opportunity, democratic voting—but these rules and practices, being abstract and justified on grounds of utility, cannot easily or for long withstand an aroused sense of benevolence. Benevolence, after all, is motivated by sentiments of compassion and a belief in the worthiness of some person or group. A natural, or at least easily-stimulated, sentiment will usually be more powerful than a belief in a rule or practice.

It is sometimes suggested that students are "idealists" and that it is this that explains much of their political behavior. If the view I have developed here is correct, the word "idealist" is not the proper one, for it implies a conception of an ideal world, or the existence of an ideology, or an attachment to the importance of ideas. None of these connotations has been, in my experience, descriptive of the behavior being explained. A more accurate account would stress the fact that students, and young persons generally, have a larger and more active sense of compassion and a more easily aroused instinct of benevolence. The emotions of the young lie close to the surface; they are quickly stimulated and highly volatile. The current style that favors "coolness" should not blind us to this fact. The best evidence for it is found in the personal relationships that characterize the young: sudden attachments, romantic love, a concern for "sincerity" and openness. The communal tendencies of students have been far more visible and will probably be far more enduring than their ideological ones.

What a liberal education does is to provide a new or enlarged range of objects for those sentiments: the poor, the black, the

ancient, the aesthetic, the distant, the natural. And a liberal education supplies a set of reasons for the neglect or disadvantage which these favored objects must bear. That reason is, in its most general version, the callousness of spirit, selfishness of interest, and the smallness of mind of society, its governing institutions, and, above all, its dominant class. At least in the modern period, a liberal education has tended, with varying degrees of success, to challenge the values of prevailing society and to set students apart from it. What Lionel Trilling has found to be true of modern literature is true of modern education generally:

Any historian of the literature of the modern age will take virtually for granted the adversary intention, the actual subversive intention, that characterizes modern writing—he will perceive its clear purpose of detaching the reader from the habits of thought and feeling that the larger culture imposes, of giving him a ground and a vantage point from which to judge and condemn, and perhaps revise, the culture that has produced him.

In its extreme form, the concern with authenticity as opposed to conventionality leads to a preoccupation with pure emotion, the unconscious, and even the occult and supernatural. "Authenticity," to quote Trilling again, is an object of almost obsessive concern both "as a quality of the personal life and as a criterion of art." In its extreme form, this concern may be new, but at root it is as old as man. It once was called "sincerity" or "passion," and it has always characterized the social world of the young. Today, the young are no longer simply a biological category, they are virtually a social class, at least insofar as they are college students, and thus their concerns have become ours.

The personal concern for sincerity, feeling, and authenticity becomes, when displaced onto society, a concern for benevolence and compassion. That this displacement should occur in the way it does is a consequence of modernity; that is, it is a consequence of the fact that we now live in a secular society. Religion and God once served as objects for passion; to a limited degree, they may be returning; but in general only society can today supply the extra-personal object for passion and benevolence. The decline of religion as a focus for emotion has been underway for decades, but it became dramatically evident in the early years of the last decade. During the 1950's, theology emphasized the depravity, corruption, and imperfection of human nature and the consequent need for social restraint and legal authority as a way of preventing political and social fanaticism. But by the 1960's, as Daniel Bell has noted, an astonishing reversal had occurred: God was dead, society rather than man was the problem, social restraint was insufferable, and activism was the only form of purity. Barth, Tillich, and Niebuhr were replaced by Altizer, Vahnanian, and Cox. A secular theology became a fervent ally of political liberalism.

Thus, almost the only source of ultimate value that could maintain a sense of justice against the rush of benevolence gave way. The delicate balance that must be maintained between form and substance, between rule and action, was seriously disturbed. Liberating oneself, and adding in the liberation of deserving others, became the single end. How this was done was less important than the fact that it was done.

But benevolence can never be the sole principle of human action. At a superficial level, benevolence often tends to be perceived by its objects as busybodyism, even paternalism. At a more profound level, benevolence risks rejection or failure: what if those aided do not improve, or if for some reason personal efforts are not followed by institutional commitments? Benevolence,

when frustrated, often turns to rage and those who once celebrated the virtues of compassion may come to indulge sentiments of hatred.

In 1962, an organization of students produced a document that read in part as follows:

We regard men as infinitely precious and possessed of unfulfilled capacities for reason, freedom, and love. . . . Men have unrealized potential for self-cultivation, self-direction, self-understanding, and creativity. . . . The goals of men and society should be human independence: a concern with . . . finding a meaning of life that is personally authentic, . . . one which has full, spontaneous access to present and past experiences. *Human relationships* should involve fraternity and honesty.

Within a few years, this organization, including many of those who signed this statement at Port Huron, were attacking universities, harassing those who disagreed with them, demanding political obedience, and engaging in deliberate terrorism. Nothing could have been more liberal than the 1962 statement of the SDS; nothing could have been less liberal than its subsequent history.

For most of us, choices are never this stark. There is a sense of balance that almost always asserts itself so that neither the stern and unyielding principles of justice nor the heedless sense of compassion dominates our actions. A liberal education is at its best when it strikes this balance: when it makes one aware that principles must ultimately be justified by something more than mere utility, that liberty is as worth preserving when it is attacked by a group one admires as it is when assaulted by a group one detests, and that the bonds of civility upon which the maintenance of society depends are more fragile than we often admit.

When properly conducted, there is an inevitable and desirable tension in a liberal education: developing only the critical faculties produces universal skepticism, even about those new worlds of the mind that are discovered in a college, while heightening one's sensibilities and enlarging one's powers of compassion tend to suppress the exercise of criticism. Among the best students and teachers, that tension is evident: they are educated up to that delicate point where they can be neither true believers nor utter skeptics.

And so it should be with liberalism, or indeed with any other political faith. The commitment to fair rules and procedures often inhibits the solution of certain problems, just as the commitment to social action can subvert the maintenance of those rules. Living with such partially incompatible goals requires, ultimately, the preservation within oneself of a realm of inner privacy into which neither politics nor society can reach and where quietude and imagination do gentle battle for the loyalty of our spirit.

MEMORIAL DAY AND THE SHARPSBURG ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor of participating this year and last in the annual Memorial Day parade in Sharpsburg, Md., in the center of historic Antietam National Battlefield. One of the most impressive sights in the parade was the contingent of schoolchildren from the Sharpsburg Elementary School. The school has written a short summary of

its participation in this annual event, and I would like to share it with my colleagues:

MAY 29, 1972.

SHARPSBURG SCHOOL

The day dawned clear and bright. A gentle breeze stirred. The weather was perfect for every outdoor activity, especially a parade. The entire town of Sharpsburg had been cleaned, swept and polished for the Memorial Day Parade. At an early hour visitors arrived in the town.

The Sharpsburg Elementary School, which forms a unit in that parade, had chosen for its theme "Our Keys to Freedom." The girls were dressed in white, while the boys wore navy trousers and white shirts. A red shoulder sash added a colorful touch. Two large golden keys carried by girls flanked either side of the main banner theme. The kindergarten children portrayed "Hand in Hand." The primary children were grouped with the girls portraying "Peace"; and the boys "Let's Build A Home"; and the intermediate girls and boys "Let's Teach the World to Sing." As the line of march neared the reviewing stand in the center of the town, the children stopped and sang "I'd Like To Teach the World to Sing."

The school children have participated in this parade, annually, as early as 1920. For many years the boys and girls wore white and carried a small flag over their shoulder. Since 1951 the school's part has been more meaningful and colorful. Such themes as these have been used in the past; "Lest We Forget," "Let Freedom Ring," "The Flag—What Does It Mean?," "God Bless America" and "I Hear America Singing."

Patriotic colors of red, white and blue have generally been used. All school children who wish to participate may do so.

On several occasions miniature floats mounted on children's express wagons have been used. Large floats built by teachers, parents and children have also been used.

Yes, Memorial Day has meant planning and work. But it has added a meaningful touch to a community celebration. Many people come each year just to see the school children in the parade.

WILLIAM TYLER PAGE AND THE AMERICAN CREED

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, today marks the beginning of the Honor America Day celebrations throughout the country. On Flag Day I cannot think of a more fitting subject to mark the occasion than William Tyler Page, one of Frederick, Md.'s, most distinguished citizens and the author of the American Creed. At the time of his death in 1942, William Tyler Page had served his country and the House of Representatives perhaps longer than anyone in the history of the Republic beginning as a House page and working his way through many positions to Clerk of the House.

I would like to share with my colleagues in the House a short biography of William Tyler Page and the American Creed, an important American document and the summation of William Tyler Page's life.

The items follow:

WILLIAM TYLER PAGE

William Tyler Page, descendant of President Tyler and Carter Braxton (a "signer" of the Declaration of Independence), was born on October 19, 1868 in Frederick, Maryland. He was educated in the public schools of Baltimore and at the Frederick Academy.

Page began his service in the Capitol on December 19, 1881 at the age of thirteen. He received an appointment as a page in the Clerk's office of the House of Representatives. When he became too old to continue work as a page, he received a position in the House Post Office. He held a variety of other jobs as a House employee, i.e., assistant keeper of the archives, various clerkships, clerk to the Committee on Accounts (14 years), and secretary to four Members from Rhode Island.

In 1902 he ran as the Republican candidate from the second district of Maryland and was defeated. In 1917 Page wrote his famous *American Creed*, which is familiar to millions of Americans.

On May 19, 1919 he was elected Clerk of the House and held this position for six terms. In December 1931 when the Democratic party organized the House, Mr. Page lost the Clerkship but was awarded the post of minority clerk for life; a position which was created for him.

Besides the American Creed, Page authored *The Story of the Nation's Capital* (1932), *The Romance of the Constitution* (1937), and Page's Congressional Handbook. He was the senior warden of St. Columbia's Episcopal Church and was awarded a degree of Doctor of Laws by George Washington University.

At the time of his death, October 20, 1942, William Tyler Page had served the House of Representatives for 30 Congresses, close to 61 years. He had witnessed the convening of 73 sessions and had served under 14 Speakers.

THE AMERICAN CREED

(By William Tyler Page)

I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a Republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I therefore believe it is my duty to my Country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies.

NAVAHO COAL MINER HARASSED BY GOVERNMENT

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the governmental bureaucracy has done it again. A constituent of mine, Mr. Tom Williams of Elberta, Ala., has relayed to me press reports of an Arizona Indian who was trying to operate a one-man mine before he was buried under a mountain of Federal forms and procedural regulations.

Perhaps one of the greatest challenges we in the Congress face is to snap our bureaucracies out of the unfeeling, unseeing trance into which they always

seem to lapse. Every day we see examples of agencies which seem to have a rhinoceros hide when it comes to providing a compassionate response to the needs of the people they are supposed to serve.

We cannot expect confidence in government until the people are treated as something more than just another ripple on the bureaucratic sea. My constituent points out astutely that we in Congress pass the laws which create these bureaucracies and we provide them with the funds to operate. It follows then that we should be able to end the coma of indifference by insisting on greater responsiveness. In this regard, I call on every Member of the House to pass the word forcefully to our bureaucracies that service to the people must take precedence over all other considerations.

Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Members, I am attaching to my remarks a copy of the article which appeared in the June 10, 1972, issue of the *Mobile Press Register*:

NAVAJO COAL MINER SAID HARASSED BY GOVERNMENT

WATERFLOW, N. MEX.—A Navajo coal miner is in trouble with the federal government because he doesn't use an electric lamp on his cap and doesn't have a telephone line between his tiny mine and the shack where he stores his wheelbarrow.

Clifford George, 65, is being threatened with fines up to \$60,000 and says he can't pay the \$950 fine the government says he already owes.

One of his problems is that he can't read the 6-inch high stack of documents and letters that federal authorities in Washington have been sending him since November 1970.

He's been stopped from working the small seam of low grade coal near his home. He had dug a hole about 50 feet into the side of the hill and had been hauling the coal away in a wheelbarrow to sell to his neighbors.

The mine is tiny, but there are government documents marked: "Re: Hogback No. 1 mine, case Number 3505."

Now his 39-year-old wife has had to go to work to earn a living for the couple and their six children.

George's plight was revealed Friday by Navajo Tribal Councilman Harry Tome of Red Rock, Ariz., who said, "The government has been harassing this man to death. They're treating him like they'd be treating some big company."

"George has built himself a little shack about 5 by 7 feet to shelter his tools in," Tome said. "I don't know what they expect since he's the only guy working in the mine. Is he supposed to call the shack from the mine and then run back there and answer the phone?"

Another violation, said Tome, "was that George didn't have a name tag on his belt. We got him a name tag."

Still another violation was that George didn't have a mask called "self rescuers," which miners can use to get oxygen in case of emergency.

"A coal company in Kentucky donated us one, which we gave him," Tome said.

"He was accused of a violation because he hasn't filled out the forms which are required every few days on the quality of the air and dust control in the mine."

Tome said George couldn't fill out the forms because he can't speak, read or write English.

The inspectors also cited George for not having a brake on his small handcar.

"We investigated that and found we couldn't buy a one-man handcar that had a brake, or even get a brake put on it," Tome said.

Shortly after the documents started arriving, Tome took George's problems to the Navajo Tribal legal aid society at Window Rock, Ariz., 100 miles from this northwest New Mexico village.

"They've been battling back and forth ever since," Tome said.

SOWING AND REAPING

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, on June 3, 1972, I had the opportunity of attending the speech contest of Region VII, Toastmasters International, which was conducted in York, Pa., my Congressional District.

I also had the high honor of receiving from Dr. Russell Herron, the organization's president, a medallion in appreciation of my attendance at this event. The medallion cites as follows:

Toastmasters International is a non-profit, educational organization of toastmasters clubs which provide their communities a program for men to improve their abilities in communication and leadership. More than a million "men on the move" have benefited from the toastmasters program since it was introduced in 1924.

I would like to say that all seven contestants made superb presentations, the majority of which dealt with the state of our Nation.

The winner, Mr. John L. Fulbright, Jr., represented District 36, the National Capital District. In his speech he portrayed past difficulties associated with the rearing of our young and identified the steps he believes necessary to get our new generation off to a good start. Mr. Fulbright stressed the urgent need for a return to discipline and guidance.

For the past year, Mr. Fulbright has been an active member of two Toastmaster Clubs—a 15-member interracial discussion forum and the 35-member Austerior Club at the Department of the Interior, where he has been employed for 5 years. He is married, has one daughter, and resides in Sterling, Va.

Mr. Fulbright's message was both meaningful and timely, having vital application to America's social posture. I, therefore, introduce it to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues. Mr. Fulbright's address follows:

SOWING AND REAPING

(By John L. Fulbright, Jr.)

Nations are like men, whatsoever they soweth, that they shall also reap. And during the time between sowing and reaping individuals and nations must do all the work necessary to insure that their crop gives them the most yield. As we look around our Nation today and view the bombing of the Pentagon and the Capitol Building, as we see the drug problem in every major city, and as we witness multiple assassinations or attempted assassinations, one has to wonder, did we work our crop? We know we planted good seeds, we know we had fertile ground, but it appears that we, like the foolish ostrich, stuck our heads in the sand when we saw the weeds that could hinder our plants' growth. We, in

moments of overconfidence, practically let our plants grow on their own.

We went to the garden and told the plants about the weeds of dishonesty and the plants saw us go into the house and cheat on our income tax. The plants saw us take unfair business advantage of the poor and ignorant. We went to our garden and we started to pull the weeds of injustice. We pulled away a few weeds, tired, and the plants saw a generation that incarcerated innocent Japanese-Americans in World War II and take all of their property without any firm grounds.

We went to the garden and we took a hoe to chop away the weeds that destroy brotherhood but again we tired and the plants heard us spread the seeds of derogatory remarks like nigger, poor white trash, and pepper belly. The plants heard us spread the seeds of ignorance to our children by telling them they were better because of their race, color, or religion.

We went to the garden and took a very weak herbicide to destroy the weeds of disrespect for teachers and community leaders and the plants saw us degrade those leaders with conversation and overt disgraceful acts.

Now the plants have almost reached maturity and what do we have—a crop of stunted plants that we call a bunch of hippies, yuppies, dirty-smelly kids or a bunch of rioters, looters, and killers.

And so we take all types of measures to suppress them and maybe we should. However, should not our over-riding attention be given to removing the weeds that we can so that the remainder of their growth be somewhat in a normal fashion? We must consider remedies and treat causes.

One of the best tasks that we can perform is to let those plants see how we're going to work and cultivate our new crop and the first step is getting that garden off to a good start is to make the irrigation ditches of capitalism responsive to our newly planted seeds. Now don't misunderstand that statement. Don't take that statement wrong. Capitalism is the best and most productive system under which our plants can live. But when a system has been modified to a point whereby its citizens who make \$5,000 a year pay more taxes than some of its citizens who made in excess of \$225,000 a year, then that system needs careful review and reworking. When a system reaches the point whereby a ten-year-old boy can purchase dope on the corners of New York and all of our law enforcement officials cannot stop the drug traffic into this country because of organized crime, then that system needs a tremendous overhaul. Malcolm X said that capitalism cannot survive because it needs to suck the blood of the poor and undeveloped. I disagree. Capitalism can survive, but its survival must be in an environment of justice and fair play. And those malignant weeds that places men's greed before the Nation's welfare must be removed.

Next we must fertilize our plants with brotherhood. Not with the spoken word but with the living being, because it will be difficult for the plants to understand brotherhood when the most segregated time in America is every Sunday morning at eleven o'clock.

We must water our plants with the justice of Joseph Addison who stated that, "Justice discards party, friendship, and kindred, and is therefore represented as blind." The plants must see justice administered in terms of the offense irrespective of the man's race or financial status.

And then we must take those steps necessary to insure that the plant grows in discipline and guidance. Discipline and guidance must be returned to home and school and those who misuse it must and should be punished. Too long, too long have we removed the rule instead of the offender.

We have good plants. We have the will and resources needed to make the risk of failure

extremely low. We must join hands and work our newly planted seeds. With the help of God and the dedication of man to sound principles and justice, we'll reap plants that will truly turn swords into plow shares and the harvest will be beneficial to all mankind. Will you help us raise this crop?

PITTSBURGH AREA STUDENTS PARTICIPATE IN "YOU ARE THE FLAG" ESSAY CONTEST

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, there are those among older Americans who are quick to criticize the young for what the elders term a "lack of patriotism."

I do not believe that this is the case. I think that today's youth holds the interest and well-being of their country just as high as many of us do and did when we were their age.

Today's youth happens to question more than some of us did and they may be a bit more skeptical of patriotic slogans, the meaning of which seem to get trampled or distorted in everyday application. But these qualities are strengths not weaknesses. A healthy skepticism leads to intelligent decisions.

Annually the Flag Plaza Foundation of Pittsburgh, an adjunct of the Boy Scouts of America, and the Duquesne Light Co. join to sponsor a "You Are the Flag" essay contest among Pittsburgh area students. There were 30,000 entries in the contest this year.

As in past years, the winners have presented their youthful patriotism in a number of unique written forms.

I would like to share them with my colleagues at this time:

YOU ARE THE FLAG

(By Marty O'Malley)

Who is the flag? Is it you, or me, or an idea? Please allow me, a piece of cloth with red and white stripes and fifty stars on a field of blue, to speak. Let me talk about how the flag was launched from a sewing room in Philadelphia all the way to the moon. Allow me to say some of the things I have seen along the way.

My colors were a symbol against tyranny and gave heart to those early Americans who wanted freedom and the right to pursue happiness. When I came on the scene I stirred those hearts to endure whatever was necessary to achieve our final goal. It took many years but I finally flew as the symbol of a new nation.

So many times I have flown with pride and glory. There were also times when my color seemed to fade. Not from the sun and rain but from my own tears. These tears were shed during our own Civil War when this nation was threatened to be torn apart from within. Tears were shed again when the red, white and blue was flown at half-mast due to the sudden and tragic loss of such men as Abraham . . . Martin . . . and John.

These colors blossomed again, as I think they always will, because of the desire of the people they represent. They shine bright with joy when they are aboard a ship loaded with food for the people of an underdeveloped nation. They glisten brightly on the side of an airplane carrying doctors, nurses, and

medical supplies to victims of an earthquake or some other disaster.

Who is the flag? Is it I or is it you? I think it's both of us. I am the symbol, but you are the people and the purpose!

YOU ARE THE FLAG, JULY 4, 1972

(By Mark E. Rodenberg)

What a wonderful day for flying! Those winds are hitting just right . . . Wow, look at all those people down there! All that flag saluting, and celebrating. For me? Why? Could it be my beautiful colors of red, white, and blue? Would they do the same thing if my colors were pink, purple, and green? I know it's not that. I have flown in many other colors. Back in 1776 when I was called "Don't Tread on Me", I was brown and yellow.

Then what is it that makes people salute me? Is it what stands behind me, my history and fame compacted into a cloth of red, white, and blue? Or is it people like George Washington and Thomas Jefferson who founded our democratic government? Might it be Thomas Edison and Alexander Graham Bell who gave America a voice and ears? Is it the same thing that made the Wright brothers and John Glenn give wings to America? Could it be Andrew Carnegie and Henry Ford who built American industrial and technological power? Or Martin Luther King, Jr. and Susan B. Anthony who brought about better social life in America? Is it athletes like Jim Thorpe, Jackie Robinson, or Babe Ruth trying to become some of America's best? What is it? Is it the courage and faith they found in America? Where is it? Could it be in themselves? Is it the ability to fight and overcome a problem or discouragement. Who is it? Is it their God, their coach, or their ideals; or is it themselves and their faith in the American way? Maybe I'm just the way Americans represent themselves, their accomplishments, and reveal their pride in America. Whatever it is, it makes me proud that, "I am the Flag."

YOU ARE THE FLAG

(By Mary Spindler)

In recent years there has been public desecration of the flag of the United States of America by burning, displaying it improperly, or by using it as a mere piece of clothing. To me, this desecration of the flag was not justifiable, but to those involved, it was a way of expressing their disagreement of many American policies, especially the war in Vietnam. The very fact that these people could do this to the flag shows how great a country America is. If people in some countries were to attack their government in any way they would be punished.

What these dissenters should realize is that their criticism should be constructive and not merely destructive. Merely tearing down will not solve any situation. Citizens must work, either individually or collectively, toward correcting any wrongs which they feel exist.

A nation's greatest resource is its people. It is the pride which people take in their work that betters a nation. Each individual must work hard at their job, whatever it may be. Men such as George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, Alexander Graham Bell, Henry Ford, Thomas Edison, Martin Luther King, and many other Americans used their talents for the benefit of the United States and the world. But it is not merely the famous personages which make a country strong, but people like you and me.

Each individual has God-given talents for which he is responsible. He must take pride in himself and develop these talents for the honor and glory of his creator and his country which gave him the freedom to develop these talents.

So as I look upon the "Stars and Stripes" I

realize that I am very fortunate indeed to have been born in this country. I have been blessed with the chance to go to school and learn to think for myself. I have received many abilities from God and have a chance to develop them. But I also have the duty to use these gifts for the betterment of myself and my country.

The flag symbolizes all these things to me. As a united people, working effectively and courageously together, we can make every effort to right the wrongs, to dispel all prejudices and bring our nation to a proud existence under "Old Glory."

THE FLAG'S REPLY

(By Wanda Veltre)

I saw two boys who I have known, For eighteen years, but now they'd grown, Both were healthy and happy till then. Yes, the day came to show they were men. I called these boys to come and defend, My country, their country No need to pretend. But, both boys came forward with love and such pride.

Was I to know that one had lied? Both full of life, so happy, so proud, When on that day, came before me, heads bowed.

But, one I knew was weak inside. His true feelings he was trying hard to hide. When it came to fighting for what both enjoyed

One was a man, but one still a boy. Yes, another man then died for me, To keep me waving proud and free. And, another fraud had gone and run, Nothing accomplished, his duty undone. Was it fair? It's up to you. You'll have your chance to fight for what you believe true.

And, on that day when your number is drawn, Stand up with courage and know that we've won.

For, a country like ours, United, strong, With the true band of freedom, Can not be proved wrong.

WITHOUT MY FLAG

(By Wendy Weinstein)

They came in the middle of the night with bombs that lit the sky as they destroyed my family and friends. My flag, the symbol of free men such as I, was captured. I am no longer privileged with the joy of life, for I am dead. Yes, my eyes still see and my hands still work, but they are of no use to me. They work for the government with no profit for myself. From dawn to dusk my ears grope for the sound of children's laughter. I am foolish to even hope for the sound because the young ones work in the fields and have no time for play. My home is a pile of rubble that shows no sign of the happy lives that were destroyed by the attack. Memories of my family constantly shadow my mind. My legs serve no purpose for the forests have been burned down, and I no longer desire to take a walk. Books are banned because knowledge of better lands and happier lives is not permitted. Food raised by hardworking women and children is taken away to be eaten by the invaders. Many people are soon to die from starvation. All that was once ours has been taken from us.

I opened my eyes and realized that I'd been dreaming. From my window I could see that nothing had changed. My flag wasn't going to be taken for quite a while at least. The nation is too strong for that. I still have a wonderful country full of freedom and love to live in. Houses, buildings, forests and mountains still stand. Children joyfully play in the streets without fear of being attacked. My flag still flies and will guide me through life, for without it I have nothing!

I AM THE FLAG

(By Pamela Nusz)

Here I am in Independence Hall, locked in a glass case with no way to tell the world how proud I am to represent this, my great nation. I was made in 1776 by Betsy Ross. That was almost two hundred years ago, and the purpose behind me still has not changed. I stand for the actions, the thoughts, the hope, and the unity of the people here in my country. I remind them of the freedom they fought for and may have to fight to keep.

There may have been a few changes in my design over the years, but only because as my country grows and changes, I must, too. Many people come to see me here. Some who see me remember how bravely they fought to keep me. Some think of their friends and loved ones who died for this country's freedom.

I could go on and on to describe the feelings they have for me, but I think everyone would rather hear how I feel about the people of my country. I have no other word that expresses my feelings so well as the word "proud." In years of distress and depression, very few people deserted me; they have always flown my colors high to proudly show others they will stand behind me, united. Those who have not experienced it do not know what it feels like to be a mere piece of cloth that unite millions of people.

I am a symbol of our freedom. At the olympic games I did not bow to king or ruler as other flags did. I bow to no one; for in my American eyes every man is equal.

I am just part of what makes our "Star-Spangled Banner." The people, all of the people, working together, living united and free, are what I, our Flag really represents. We are the Flag.

NATION'S FIREMEN TO BE HONORED

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to the initiation of a program to honor the heroism of the firefighters of this land in the performance of their duty. As is the case with so many of our public servants, the men who respond to fires go about their duties unheralded and unsung. We realize their importance to our daily lives only in times of disaster or when we ourselves experience some devastating occurrence.

I was therefore pleased to learn that a program of annual awards to mark the heroism of firemen on or off duty, and applicable to all ranks, has been announced by a large manufacturer of firefighter equipment. The awards, consisting of four cash prizes and symbolic plaques, will be presented to the four chosen at a national presentation dinner.

Some 25,000 announcements have been sent to both paid and volunteer fire departments throughout the country. They advise that official applications must be filed and set out rules for the awards. All applications are to be filed prior to June 30 of this year.

The distinguished panel of judges which has been selected to determine the winners includes: Arthur Fiedler, the

widely known conductor of the Boston Pops Orchestra; I. Irving Pinkel, Director of NASA Aerospace Safety and Research Data; Dr. Irmagene N. Holloway, of Kansas, a former assistant in HEW's Bureau of Product Safety; John H. Washburn, president of Home Insurance Co.; Curtis Volkamer, president of the International Association of Fire Chiefs; and W. H. McClennan, president of the International Association of Firefighters.

DERWINSKI STILL IN DOUBT ON U.N.

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, for the past 3 months our colleague, Representative EDWARD DERWINSKI of Illinois, has provided notable service as a presidentially appointed delegate to the United Nations General Assembly in New York City.

He brought to that task the same ability to see through to the heart of problems and the same wit and good humor for which he is known in this House. He was especially effective in his debates and discussions with Soviet representatives.

At one point, when a Russian delegate voiced a tirade against the threatened rebirth of Nazism in Europe, Mr. DERWINSKI interrupted:

I have seen no signs of a revival of German militarism except in 1968 when East German forces goose-stepped into Czechoslovakia. And in Russia today, we see the Jewish people, who were Nazi victims a generation ago, made to suffer persecution again. It is easy to see where the threatened evils of Nazism really exist—behind the Iron Curtain.

Has Mr. DERWINSKI changed his critical view of the United Nations? Discussing this question, the Chicago Tribune's distinguished columnist, Willard Edwards, reports that—

DERWINSKI remains in serious doubt about the effectiveness of the U.N. and was appalled by its refusal to practice austerity even in the face of impending bankruptcy. A financial crisis has been swept under the rug but will soon recur.

Despite the contempt with which the Department of State tends to treat congressional delegates, there were rewarding moments. Mr. EDWARDS notes that—

What DERWINSKI enjoyed most, obviously, was tilting with representatives of the Soviet Union. They must have been happy when he left because, day after day, he prodded them about the hypocrisy of their anti-American attacks.

EDWARD DERWINSKI has brought honor to the House by his service at the United Nations. I wish to share with my colleagues the article by Willard Edwards which appeared in the Chicago Tribune on June 8, 1972. This article follows:

DERWINSKI STILL IN DOUBT ON U.N.

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, June 7.—Rep. Edward J. Derwinski [R., Ill.] has had to endure some ribbing in the House about his recent three-month term as a Presidentially appointed

delegate to the United Nations General Assembly in New York City.

Since only two out of 435 members are thus singled out each year, both envy and sarcasm presumably tinged his salute as "ambassador" in floor debate. Rep. H. R. Gross [R., Ia.] suggested that "Living high on the hog at the U.N. and rubbing elbows with the foreign gentry" had altered Derwinski's foreign policy views.

Any intimation that Derwinski has been affected by his U.N. service was dispelled when he issued a 70-page report to the House Foreign Affairs Committee on his experiences in the international body. It was deemed valuable enough to be printed as a House document.

It is thoughtful, informative, and often entertaining. Derwinski remains in serious doubt about the effectiveness of the U.N. and was appalled by its refusal to practice austerity even in the face of impending bankruptcy. A financial crisis has been swept under the rug but will soon recur.

The American contribution to the U.N. must be reduced to 25 per cent [from the current 31 per cent] without delay, Derwinski recommended, and the Soviet Union and France pressed for substantial cash payments which they have withheld.

He did oppose, however, an immediate \$25 million cut in U.N. funding voted by the House May 18 and it was this stand that aroused Gross' ire. Derwinski's explanation was that this was a default in violation of U.N. charter rules comparable to the reneging of Russia and France, making the United States equally culpable. The House, by a 202-to-156 vote, refused to agree.

In one respect, Derwinski found his U.N. service frustrating. The State Department treats congressional delegates with poorly concealed contempt, he discovered, giving them only cursory briefings, demanding to censor their speeches, and sending them instructions on voting at the last minute. He protested this bureaucratic control but got nowhere.

But, on the whole, he reported, he found the experience rewarding. It was a rare opportunity to participate directly in the conduct of foreign affairs, to study the methods and the motives of delegates from other countries, and to test wits in debates with them.

What Derwinski enjoyed most, obviously, was tilting with representatives of the Soviet Union. They must have been happy when he left because, day after day, he prodded them about the hypocrisy of their anti-American attacks.

A Russian delegate rebuked him, recalling that President Nixon had announced "an era of negotiation, not confrontation."

"What troubles me about this era of negotiations," Derwinski replied, "is that the negotiators on the Russian side may later disappear from sight and from the history books. That was the fate of Stalin and Khrushchev. President Nixon won't know how long the individuals he dealt with in Moscow will be around. They, too, may vanish from the history books and where does that leave the agreements they signed?"

Again, when a Russian delegate voiced a tirade against the threatened rebirth of Nazism in Europe, Derwinski interrupted:

"I have seen no signs of a revival of German militarism except in 1968 when East German forces goose-stepped into Czechoslovakia. And in Russia today, we see the Jewish people, who were Nazi victims a generation ago, made to suffer persecution again. It is easy to see where the threatened evils of Nazism really exist—behind the Iron Curtain."

Derwinski was a U.S. delegate during the period when Communist China was admitted to the Security Council and its predecessor, Taiwan, was expelled.

The U.S. delegation fought to prevent the

expulsion of Taiwan, he said, but its efforts were made futile by the visit to Peking of Henry Kissinger, special adviser to President Nixon, at the very time the U.N. was debating the issue.

That trip "could not have come at a more inopportune political or psychological moment" and it convinced many nations that the U.S. was not sincere in its proposal of dual representation.

FORREST CATE'S COMEBACK

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, there are many little-known stories of triumph over adversity where resolute individuals succeed despite the severest of handicaps. I know about one because it happened in the Chattanooga area and received due recognition in the press. I have reference to the story of Forrest Cate, who, though totally blind, still managed to ride a show horse and win a ribbon in the competition at the Rossville, Ga., Kiwanis Charity Horse Show last Saturday.

The story of this accomplishment has been told with understanding by Jay Searcy, sports editor of the Chattanooga Times, in his column, "Searching with Searcy."

In calling attention to Forrest Cate's "comeback," I hold it out as an example to all of us. There is a great deal which can be accomplished whenever there is a will to do it. The lesson will be obvious as you read Jay Searcy's column.

SEARCHING WITH SEARCY

(By Jay Searcy)

SUSPENSE AND MR. IMPERIAL

"You should have been here last night," everybody kept saying at the horse show Saturday night. The man on the gate said it, grooms hanging on the rail, people under the tent in center ring.

Everywhere you went they were talking about Forrest Cate's suspenseful ride on Mr. Imperial Friday night.

"Not many people knew what was happening," said a lady under the tent. "I don't think many of the riders even knew."

What was happening was that Forrest Cate, winner of a number of ribbons and trophies in the pleasure walking horse classes over the years, was making a comeback.

It was a horse show setting familiar to Forrest, a 38-year-old automobile dealer. Except this one was at Rossville's new city park, one of the biggest show rings in the Southeast.

There was color everywhere, like a scene from an Indiana state fair. Handsome people with brown faces. Western jeans, well faded. Cowboy hats. Riding boots. Double-breasted blazers, sulky silks. Horse trailers, motor homes, concession stands, box seats, bleachers. Organ music. Dancing horses.

LIKE MANNEQUINS

The riders looked like department store mannequins—neat, trim, pretty, handsome, clean. And they were so practiced most of them could have shown their horses blindfolded. But only one rider rode blindfolded, and that's what made Forrest Cate's comeback so suspenseful at the Rossville Kiwanis Charity Horse Show.

The blindfold Forrest wore is called diabetic retinopathy. It blinds permanently. It had been four years since Forrest had

been in a show ring, but he had never been there competing on a track he couldn't see, against competition he could only hear, for judges and spectators he could only sense. When they called for the pleasure walking horse class, Forrest rode Mr. Imperial out in a flatwalk toward the biggest challenge of his life.

His one big concern was keeping the horse on the rail. Mr. Imperial, pretty as he is, sometimes is temperamental and isn't always an easy horse to show.

Those who were watching were a lot more tense than Forrest. This was the horse that threw him not long ago, shortly after he made his first blind ride. And there was no guarantee it wouldn't happen again—show ring or no show ring.

FROM THE RAIL

Forrest wore tiny earphones that looked like hearing aids and he was being fed information by his trainer, Slim Easterly, who was standing outside the rail talking into a transistor radio speaker:

"Pull on the right rein. Good. Looking good. Tighten up now. Left rein Straighten up now. Good."

Everything went fine until the announcer called for the center. The horse wasn't going quite fast enough when Forrest bumped him and Mr. Imperial balked, momentarily. Forrest's hat flew off and Slim broke into a run down the rail to help. But before he could get there, Forrest had the horse cantering beautifully down the track in time with the organ music. It was the only bit of trouble.

When they lined the horses up to be tied, Forrest knew he had won the challenge. Even if he didn't win a ribbon, he had completed the ride, and save one small incident, it was nearly perfect. Then came the announcement:

"The blue ribbon in the pleasure walking horse class goes to Mack's Golder. Go Boy!" the announcer spoke and C. B. McMullan of Shelbyville pulled out of line to the awards tent and accepted the prize.

"And second place goes to Mr. Imperial, owned and ridden by Forrest Cate Jr.!"

By now everyone at the show knew about Forrest's challenge and there were goose pimples and cloudy eyes hidden among the applause when Slim pulled Mr. Imperial out and led him to the awards stand.

"I'm so proud of you," his wife Marcia told him when he left the ring.

"Are you really?" Forrest seemed surprised.

"Really," she said hugging him.

"You should have been here," everybody kept saying.

SECRETARY VOLPE'S RELEASE OF HIGHWAY FUNDS

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from Secretary Volpe announcing that the entire \$4.4 billion in obligatory authority for the Federal-aid highway program for fiscal year 1973 will be released as of June 15, 1972, on an annual basis rather than in quarterly amounts as has been the practice in recent years. Such funds will become available on July 1.

This is good news for the highway program. Release of funds in this manner will assure a maximum of flexibility to each State in planning and scheduling

Federal-aid highway projects. The result will be a more orderly implementation of each State's highway program and the avoidance of sudden changes in the pace of the program due to shifts in the obligatory amounts provided as has occurred in recent years.

In his letter to me, Secretary Volpe declared that his action in releasing these funds was, "Responsive to the needs of our Nation's highway program". I could not agree with him more.

I commend the Secretary on his understanding and comprehension of the problems of future development of our highways. I congratulate him for removing yet another obstacle to continuing highway development. Unquestionably, efficient development of our highways—when done with a safety awareness—will yield dividends to all Americans who will travel these roads in future years.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF A PERMISSIVE SOCIETY

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, in light of the lack of trust and confidence sometimes accorded to the youth of our Nation, it is indeed worthy to note the fine achievements continually being accomplished by our young adults. In a recent oratorical contest sponsored by the Knights of Columbus, western New York district, Mr. Brian Bryzinski of North Tonawanda, N.Y., was named runnerup, based upon his brilliant speech and his powerful delivery. Mr. Bryzinski, 17, a senior at North Tonawanda Senior High School, will soon be attending Bucknell University. He has received numerous community awards for his many accomplishments, amongst which are: New York State Regents Scholarship Award, selected as "Youth of the Month" by the Exchange Club of the Tonawanda's, Quality Student of Tonawanda and a member of the National Honor Society.

"The Consequences of a Permissive Society," a speech by Mr. Brian Bryzinski, follows:

THE CONSEQUENCES OF A PERMISSIVE SOCIETY

A society is most robust in its youth. On aging, as most societies in the past, these societies succumb to permissiveness, encumbered with unresolved problems and internal turmoil, as exemplified by the Babylonians, the Greeks, the Egyptians, and the Romans. This renders the society easy prey for the younger, emulous nations, eager to assume a paramount position of importance. However, it is my contention that a society does not lapse into debility and permissiveness unless its citizens are, also, debilitated and permissive. It is not the society which defines the individual, but the individual who defines the society.

Lack of self-discipline is the intrinsic feature of a permissive individual. It is this lack of discipline which causes him to lose faith—faith in his religion—faith in his fellow man—faith in himself. It is this lack of discipline which makes him self-centered; and it is this lack of discipline which destroys his aspirations. As a result, his morals may be

debased, his ambition curbed, and his stability threatened. We are all cognizant of the fact that instability is the element which has the most profound influence upon society. While searching for rationality, the unstable individual becomes dissatisfied with society. Why?—because he has lost his faith. If many such individuals command an influential incumbency, a permissive legislative trend may be noted, for these individuals, eager to possess self-assurance, will exhaust any means possible to achieve their ends. Thus, a liberal attitude is established; for in order to experiment, permissiveness must prevail.

Many of the same qualities existing in a permissive person are characteristic of a permissive society. Whenever permissiveness is extant, crime and corruption rise, for there is neither the means nor the desire to suppress them. As previously stated, these circumstances arise from loss of faith, loss of hope, frustration, and the new-found liberties. The public, perplexed by these privileges, exploits them, and thus they acquire an adverse connotation. In addition to this laissez-faire attitude, it is feasible, in a permissive society, for a concerned, vociferous minority to dominate the wishes of an unconcerned, silent majority. It matters not who is just or righteous, but who prevails. A movement originates and advocates the overthrow of established order, but presents no design by which to formulate a new code; it attacks the "law used to oppress those who threaten the ruling class," but manipulates and contorts the law to achieve its desires, and it despises the society, but makes no endeavor to ameliorate that society. Goals remain obscure and enigmatic; however, the movement steadily gains proselytes, for the populace is too perplexed to reason lucidly. It is not only the government which may be beset with these incursions, but the church may, also, experience tumult, as the questioning attitude encroaches upon church orthodoxy, doctrine, and rites. Tenets, branded as outdated, are abandoned, and a new orthodoxy is promulgated to complement the permissive vogue. Finally, the populace experiences a total loss of faith in the governmental system, and a wave of fear shudders through the society, for their trust has long since expired, their wisdom has been taxed, and that last spark of hope has been extinguished. A revolution sweeps through the nation, and an era of repression is instituted.

Thus, the inception of permissiveness seeds itself in the individual, manifesting itself in the society. The government, citizens, and even the church are tainted, and the law derided. However, "to love the rule of the law is not to minimize its imperfections and to hate the law is to hate the freedom it secures." Let us enjoy the fruits of progressive change, rather than the spoils of permissiveness and repression. Most important, let us not be battered upon the rocks of permissiveness, for as the incessant waves of the sea, the malevolent effects of permissiveness are both recurrent and uncontrollable.

HONOR THE AMERICAN FLAG

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, in observance of Flag Day I would like to share with my colleagues the following article which has been highly recommended to me by one of my constituents,

¹ William Kunstler.

² James J. Kilpatrick.

Cmdr. Robert W. Collins of Yazoo City who is retired from the U.S. Navy Reserve. The article which follows, was originally written by Clayton Rand in 1969:

OUR AMERICAN FLAG
(By Clayton Rand)

Annette, the six-year-old, with amazing skill, reproduced in a small, neat, folded miniature pamphlet, copies of the flags of many countries, all in color, with special emphasis on the Stars and Stripes.

At the same time your scribe received from retired Commander Robert W. Collins, U.S. Naval Reserve, "A Chronology of Our Flag Laws."

Our first Flag Law was enacted by the Continental Congress June 14, 1777; the first U.S. Flag Law was enacted Jan. 8, 1794, and the final and permanent Flag Law was adopted April 4, 1818. It specified a flag of thirteen horizontal stripes, alternating red and white, with 20 white stars on a blue field representing the states, with an additional star to be added on each succeeding 4th of July for every added state.

Flag day is designated as June 14, the date on which the Continental Congress adopted the first Flag Law.

The Stars and Stripes should have been unfurled and flown everywhere on June 14 and should fly July 4, 1969. Not in the memory of the living has the Red, White and Blue been so desecrated at home and defiled abroad. Flag waving has become a foppish gesture to a new breed of anti-Americans infected by a perverted form of patriotism. These desecrators of Old Glory should be forced to wear the stripes to designate their degradation.

**SENATOR HUGH SCOTT HONORED
BY THE PENNSYLVANIA ASSOCIATION
OF BROADCASTERS**

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, the Pennsylvania Association of Broadcasters paid tribute to Senator HUGH SCOTT for his accomplishments as an outstanding Pennsylvanian by awarding him its 1972 Gold Medal, last night at the Washington Hilton Hotel.

The senior Senator from Pennsylvania joins a select group of "native sons" so honored by this group for both initiative and service to their fellow man.

I would like to add my voice to those paying tribute to Senator SCOTT for the wisdom and foresight displayed over the years of his distinguished public service.

His tireless concern for the welfare of this Nation's citizens is well chronicled in legislation he has introduced, his voting record, and his support and outstanding management of so many important pieces of legislation.

In recent years, he has undertaken the additional challenge and responsibility of being the Senate Republican leader, a job that he has tackled with his usual zest and great skill.

I know from a firsthand experience of having worked closely with HUGH SCOTT for many years, how characteristic it is for the Senator to apply himself day and night to a problem at hand and its prac-

tical solution. His own hard-driving intensity, plus the demands he places on himself as minority leader of the Senate makes him a truly remarkable man, and I am sure that my colleagues will join me in hailing his most recent honor by the Pennsylvania Association of Broadcasters.

**SWIFT, SHIFTY FLIGHT OF THE
DOVE**

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the following editorial by James J. Kilpatrick.

The editorial follows:

SWIFT, SHIFTY FLIGHT OF THE DOVE

WASHINGTON.—Clark Clifford, the eminent dove, last week flew a classic course through the House Foreign Affairs Committee. It was a dazzling performance, much applauded by the evening TV news and by the Sunday papers, but it invites a few dissenting observations nonetheless.

I happen to live quite literally in dove country, up in the Blue Ridge Mountains, and would tell you something of this marvelously talented bird. Unlike the quail, which is constantly heard but not so often seen, the dove is highly visible. Unlike the bashful woodcock, which hides in shady places, the audacious dove delights in public attention.

Yet the dove is notoriously the most difficult prize of the upland hunter. The dove owes his survival not so much to sheer speed, though he is deceptively swift; the genius of the dove lies in his skill in shifting direction—left, right, backwards; now skimming, now soaring. The dove always lights, as if by magic, just ten yards out of range. He can vanish in a second.

Observe the flight of Clark Clifford: "The national security of the United States is not threatened in Vietnam, regardless of the outcome of the fighting." Here he is skimming the truth. He maintains his speed: "The small, underdeveloped non-industrial nation of North Vietnam constitutes no threat to us . . ." True enough; true enough. Now he soars: "And it is equally clear that Russia and China are not on the march in Southeast Asia." But how did that get to be equally clear? It is communism that is on the march, communism in whatever mask it wears.

During his days as Secretary of Defense, Clifford set no records for infallibility. It is thus unclear why he should be regarded as a fount of perfect truth and wisdom when he insists that Nixon's measures "will have no immediate effect on the outcome of the fighting in the South, and probably no effect for many months."

On the contrary, when account is given to the totally different kind of war now being waged, there is reason to believe that Nixon's relatively bloodless measures of "denial" may seriously inhibit a flow of fuel and heavy weapons to the enemy. To some observers, whose record at least matches Clifford's, it seems worth a try.

Clifford's own solution, as he testified, is "short and simple." He flies circles around its essence, but essentially his plan is for the United States to admit defeat and to surrender the whole of Southeast Asia to the Communists. This he describes as an "overall settlement" not incompatible with the interests of Hanoi. It is a solution, one is

bound to concede, perfectly in keeping with the swerving flight of the fleeing dove. Now you see him; now you don't.

**UNEASY PEACE IN THE MIDDLE
EAST**

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the uneasy ceasefire in the Middle East and the seeming intractable positions of the various parties to the Arab-Israeli conflict are the topics of two good New York Times editorials by John Oakes, the editor of the editorial page, who recently visited Egypt and Israel.

In the June 12 editorial, Mr. Oakes argued:

The Egyptians want Russian influence in Egypt no more than they want Israel's occupation of the Sinai. But the one is likely to last as long as the other.

And in his June 13 editorial, he concludes:

Perhaps it is just because the conflict between secure borders for Israel and the demands of Palestinian nationalism seems so insoluble that the Israelis are content to ride along for a while with the present situation, which is clearly more tolerable for them than an immediate foreseeable alternative.

The two editorials follow:

[From the New York Times, June 12, 1972]

VIEW FROM THE CANAL

(By John B. Oakes)

The small plane takes off from Tel Aviv's local airport, nonchalantly dodges the towering stack of the municipal power plant and skims down the Mediterranean coast past ancient ports and modern pipelines, then along the northern edge of some of the most desolate country on earth, the Sinai Peninsula. Within an easy hour the plane puts down at a desert airstrip marked by a couple of huts, a handful of soldiers and the Israeli flag fluttering over the "administered territories" of Sinai.

The civilian visitor hops into a truck manned by a middle-aged reservist doing his fortnight's active service. The car bumps westward past grotesque relics of the 1967 war, wreckage of vehicles sprawling in the desert sand like the skeletons of dinosaurs.

Through the silent rubble of the city of Qantara, a once flourishing town utterly destroyed by Egyptian artillery in the "war of attrition" and now deserted except for a few birds, dogs and flies, there at last comes into view at the very edge of the Canal the familiar paraphernalia of war: sandbags, dugouts, barbed wire, halftracks, jeeps and even a few tanks and guns.

On the far bank less than 200 feet away, a couple of Egyptian soldiers are idly fishing. An Arab guard, armed with a rifle and a pair of binoculars, intently peers from his flimsy lookout tower on the Egyptian side of the Canal at the visitors in civilian dress atop the opposite embankment. Suddenly a harsh shout is heard from the tower (no language is easier on the eye or harder on the ear than Arabic); one wonders if it's an end to the cease-fire that has been rigidly observed by both sides on this front for almost two years.

After a moment of tension, the Israeli soldiers burst into laughter; they shout back

with enthusiasm. A vigorous verbal exchange continues for several minutes. What's it all about? the Israeli commander is asked. "When the Egyptian lookout across the canal saw you he began cursing all of us, all of our ancestors, and all of our children. There's nothing for us to do," he added with a twinkle, "but curse back."

Cursing across the canal is better than shooting across the canal, as everyone agrees; but the real question is how long the present quiet state of affairs will last on this, the most dangerous (if least active) of all of Israel's embattled borders. Moshe Dayan, Israel's Minister of Defense, freely predicts that the Egyptians will continue to hold their peace until after the winter (during which the Syrian airfields are unusable) but are likely to launch an attack next spring. This may be mere psychological warfare on Dayan's part; yet if no progress is made in the next few months toward a peace treaty, the bitter frustrations so evident in Cairo, steadily fed by Russian arms, could well explode into the ultimate folly, a renewal of the suspended war.

For the Egyptians, recognizing that they were disastrously defeated in 1967, do not recognize any justification in this defeat for the loss of even "one inch of Egyptian territory" which, as they insist, has been Egypt's for 5,000 years. Nor do they admit that the cession of any Egyptian land—in the northern Sinai, on the Straits of Tiran or anywhere else—can be reasonably considered essential to Israel's security in this missile age. Having in fact accepted the reality of Israel's existence, they mistrust Israel's future intentions as much as the Israelis mistrust theirs—and it is this, rather than any ideological or territorial imperative, that constitutes the fundamental barrier, even to demilitarization, that neither United States nor United Nations nor other would be peacemakers have yet been able to surmount.

Having fought four wars for their very existence during the past quarter century, most Israelis—from their indomitable Prime Minister down—refuse to believe that the ultimate Arab goal is not still to drive them into the sea; and the unremitting barrage of Arab propaganda, rejecting in some cases even the very name of Israel as well as its existence, only confirms that belief. Hence the Israelis are loath to give up their present advantageous military position, which they are convinced insures their security on the ground, for what they fear would be but another "scrap of paper."

While few, even of the extreme right wing, argue for retention of all of the Sinai, fewer still seem to believe that they can safely give up once again—as in 1956—all of the occupied areas—through demilitarization instead of military control may yet be a feasible alternative. Speaking of the outpost of Sharm el-Sheik at the tip of the peninsula, which guards the narrow entrance of the Gulf of Elat, one of Israel's most distinguished and moderate leaders observed that "we must retain control there because we must never again be placed in the position where Egypt by simply closing the straits can force us to declare war." So far from giving it up, the Israelis have in fact already built a hotel and are turning this isolated, sun-baked military post into a small tourist resort. "Moses walked, you can fly," runs the slogan.

Yet, in the incredibly complex arena of Israel's relationship with the Arab world, it is Egypt that counts more than any other Arab state; and it is with Egypt that Israel must first make peace. Egypt's population of 35 million (more than ten times that of Israel) is expected to double by the end of the century. Egyptian technology, light-years behind Israel's, is nevertheless improving. Egypt is the only Arab state whose ultimate military power, built up by Soviet assistance, is a potential menace to Israel. The

Egyptians want Russian influence in Egypt no more than they want Israel's occupation of the Sinai. But the one is likely to last as long as the other; and neither Israel, relatively satisfied with things as they now exist, nor Egypt, bursting with hatred and frustration, seems ready to modify even the uncompromising tone—much less the substance—of their apparently irreconcilable positions. Yet no two nations are more conscious of history than the Israelis and the Egyptians—and if history proves anything, it proves that no national rivalry or territorial dispute is truly irreconcilable given the desire and the will to end it.

[From the New York Times, June 13, 1972]

VIEW OVER THE JORDAN

(By John B. Oakes)

The paradox of Israel today is that while Israelis are surely more self-satisfied and relaxed than probably at any other time in their 25-year history, there is neither peace nor the prospect of peace as the dangerous frustrations of the surrounding Arab world grow steadily deeper.

From the Golan heights to Sharm el Sheikh, from the Jordan to the Suez Israelis show a proud confidence that their extraordinary achievements of the past quarter-century fully justify; but the visitor is left with an uneasy feeling that the future of their embattled country cannot be secure so long as its two most pressing and most proximate international problems remain unsettled: Egypt, discussed in this space yesterday, and the Palestinians.

It must be recognized from the outset that many of the several hundred thousand Arabs living in the green and fertile valleys of the West Bank under Israeli military occupation since 1967, are economically better off than they have ever been before. With virtually free access to Israel across the old Jordanian frontier, thousands of Palestinian Arabs are now working in Israeli fields and factories at the Israeli wage rate, three or four times as much as they could conceivably earn in their own homeland—to the distress mainly of large Arab landowners who complain bitterly that they have lost their cheap (and highly exploited) labor supply.

While some Israelis worry about this influx of Arab labor and its potential effect in upsetting the demographic balance of the state, many others see it as a golden opportunity to bring the Palestinian Arabs into direct contact with Israelis, leading ultimately, as they hope, to closer economic, social and—who knows—political bonds. This process—augmented by the "open bridges" policy whereby commercial traffic is now permitted between Israel and Jordan proper, and still further by the "summer visitor" program under which perhaps 150,000 Arabs from all over the world will be allowed to cross the borders on temporary permits—will necessarily be a lengthy one before it can bear fruit.

But in the meanwhile such a policy of leisurely amalgam—if it can be called a policy—fails to take adequate account of the fact that no people, including the Palestinian Arabs, can willingly accept a military occupation. This is true no matter how gentle (and the Israeli administration is not onerous) and no matter how economically and socially advantageous it may be for even large segments of the population.

The burning demands of a new-found nationalism can only grow, not diminish; and while the insanely savage terrorist activities of extremist Palestinian groups operating from outside the "administered territories" can only be counter-productive, the fact remains that the increasing political consciousness of the relatively advanced West Bank Arabs cannot be ignored. They are as unlikely to be permanently absorbed by Israel as they are to be satisfied by indefinite continuation of their present equivocal status.

And yet there is a dangerous tendency in Israel to ignore Palestinian aspirations by maintaining that the only authority with whom Israel can negotiate in reference to this area is King Hussein of Jordan, whom the Israelis know is as deeply despised by many West Bank Palestinians as they themselves are feared.

In any case, the longer the West Bank remains an "administered area," the safer most Israelis feel and the less inclined they seem to be to alter its present secure status. However, they are busy making it more secure by establishing new military settlements along the Jordan. In this way, as Deputy Premier Allon has suggested, the most strategic border areas on the river can be retained under Israeli control if and when the bulk of the territory is returned to Jordanian sovereignty. Minuscule as it is, the Jordan River is a pretty good tank trap; and that is why the Israelis show no present intention of relinquishing their military position on its western bank. Even if an arrangement can be reached with King Hussein over the West Bank and the separate but related problem of Jerusalem, the West Bank Palestinians will inevitably remain as an undigested, unregenerate and unreconciled force plaguing Israel's relationships with the rest of the Arab world.

The West Bank Arabs—born as they are in several directions by their dislike of the occupation, their contempt for Hussein, their new and eye-opening contacts with Israelis, their rising standard of living and falling self-esteem, their revolutionary inclinations and their conservative instincts—are themselves uncertain whether they want a state of their own, some kind of federative link with Jordan, with Israel or with both.

Perhaps it is just because the conflict between secure borders for Israel and the demands of Palestinian nationalism seem so insoluble that the Israelis are content to ride along for a while with the present situation, which is clearly more tolerable for them than any immediate foreseeable alternative.

BALTIC STATES FREEDOM COMMEMORATION, JUNE 14-16

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the period of June 14-16 is a time for special significance to Americans of Lithuanian, Estonian, and Latvian descent, as well as to all of us who are inspired by the courage and determination of the people of these three nations.

It was during this time, 32 years ago in June 1940, that the three Baltic States were brutally occupied by the Red Army and subsequently incorporated into the Soviet Union. These actions were in direct violation of treaties signed by Russia in 1920 which recognized the independence and sovereignty of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

The Soviets cynically disregarded the promises made a mere 20 years earlier in which they "voluntarily and forever" renounced all sovereign rights over the people and territory of the Baltic States.

The outrages suffered by these brave peoples were not, however, to end with military occupation. During the same period in June of the next year, 1941, mass deportations were executed by the Soviet Government. Thousands of Latvians, Lithuanians, and Estonians were arrested in massive sweeps by night and crowded into boxcars to be shipped to

Siberia and other remote parts of the Soviet Union far from their relatives, their friends, and their homelands. Still further criminal deportations took place in the years 1944, 1948, and 1949.

Mr. Speaker, during this period of solemn remembrance, let us pause to express our admiration for the courageous people of these three nations. Despite the tragedies they have endured, the Baltic peoples throughout the world remain dedicated to the restoration of the independence of their respective fatherlands.

We in the U.S. Congress can do no less than reassure them of our moral support. May the ideals of freedom and democracy be vindicated by the gallant determination of the people of the Baltic States. Their sacrifices should remind us all that we must continue to strive for a world in which all people can have the opportunity to live their lives as they themselves choose.

The Lithuanian-American Community of the United States of America, Inc., has requested that attention be called once again to House Concurrent Resolution 416 which was adopted by both the House and Senate during the 89th Congress. I was one of the sponsors of this legislation, the text of which follows:

H. CON. RES. 416

Whereas the subjugation of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation; and

Whereas all peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, cultural, and religious development; and

Whereas the Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights by the Government of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union, through a program of deportations and resettlement of peoples, continues in its effort to change the ethnic character of the populations of the Baltic States; and

Whereas it has been the firm and consistent policy of the Government of the United States to support the aspirations of Baltic peoples for self-determination and national independence; and

Whereas there exist many historical, cultural, and family ties between the peoples of the Baltic States and the American people: Be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the House of Representatives of the United States urge the President of the United States—

(a) to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and

(b) to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 18 I was unable to be present to vote on an

amendment to the State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary appropriation bill that sought to delete \$450,000 for the Subversive Activities Control Board, rollcall No. 162. Had I been present I would have voted "no" on this amendment. Ironically I was not present for this vote because I was attending a hearing in the House Administration Special Subcommittee on Police regarding stronger security measures for Capitol offices. This hearing was necessitated by an attack on Congressman DU PONT's office by a group of demonstrators.

On June 5 I was in California attending hearings as a member of a Special Ad Hoc Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor and missed five rollcall votes. On rollcall No. 185, the conference report on S. 1736, the Public Buildings Amendments of 1972, I would have voted "yea." On rollcall No. 186 on H.R. 12674, to establish a National Cemetery System within the Veterans' Administration, I would have voted "yea." On rollcall No. 187 or H.R. 10310, to establish the Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge, I would have voted "yea." On rollcall No. 188 on H.R. 14731, to provide for the effective enforcement of the provisions of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 prohibiting the shooting at birds, fish, and other animals from aircraft, I would have voted "yea." On rollcall No. 189 on H.R. 14106, to amend the Water Resources Planning Act to authorize increased appropriations, I would have voted "yea."

MOVE TO KILL SHORT POLITICAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, apparently Mr. John W. Gardner, head of "Common Cause," has made a determination that the American public does not possess the intellect which is necessary to properly interpret a 60-second political announcement on radio or television. Accordingly, he has suggested that no political announcements be allowed which are shorter than 5 minutes. Lest readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD forget I remind them that Mr. Gardner is the man who sat two seats to the left of President Lyndon Johnson on the National Security Council, which formulated the policy of escalating the war in Southeast Asia.

Radio station KLIV, in my congressional district, has been most energetic in attempting to give free time to all political candidates of all persuasions so that the public could benefit from their 60-second statements. I consider this to be outstanding public service and very much in line with the public service obligation that all broadcasting licensees assume. However, this public service would be impossible if Mr. Gardner would have his way.

On two occasions Mr. Robert S. Kieve recently editorialized on station KLIV regarding Mr. Gardner's proposal.

I believe a restatement of these edi-

torials, which follow, is worthy of being printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

REGARDING SHORT POLITICAL TALKS

There's a new cause among many people dedicated to the objective of making free government work. It's a mini-movement to ban from television and radio all political announcements that are shorter than five minutes.

The well-meaning people espousing this cause have apparently failed to note the irony: in the cause of free government, they are urging the prohibition of one form of free speech.

They say that short political ads today are dishonest and do not adequately discuss issues. That is indeed true of many short political ads. But long political ads or talks are not necessarily any better. A campaigner who can write a slick 60-second talk finds it even easier to talk a slick 60-minute talk. So length is not the factor that controls either honesty or significant communication.

What length does control is whether a message is listened to. A short talk gets listened to; a long talk often gets tuned out. If this editorial were to go on for five minutes, would you stay tuned? And if you would not, would the cause of free government benefit from this particular five-minute talk? And if you would not, would the cause of free government benefit from this particular five-minute talk? We doubt it. That's why our editorials are short. And that's why we think prohibiting short political talks would be an outrage to logic, as well as to free speech."

KILL SHORT TALKS

There's a movement to prohibit radio and television stations from broadcasting 30- and 60-second announcements by political candidates. We consider that a most unfortunate suggestion.

We say that the prohibition would result only in keeping voters more ignorant about the people whose names appear on our ballots. We suggest also that those who are trying to keep short political talks off the air should know the following two facts about most of their fellow citizens: first, most people do not read detailed news about the majority of political candidates; second, they will not sit still for a five-minute political talk.

And we might add a third point: many of those same people will sit still for the right kind of sixty-second talk.

KLIV, which gives political candidates free time—in 60-second packages—every time there's a local election, would have to have to give up this free service. We disagree with those who say that short messages lead to "confusion" and "distortion of issues." Real communication—even on issues more serious than tooth paste and breakfast cereals—can be created in sixty seconds or less, if the writer really works on his message.

As we have on this one 58 . . . 59 . . . 60.

I also think that a letter written by Mr. Kieve under date of May 25 to Mr. Gardner would shed further light upon this very important subject. I therefore include the text of the letter at this point:

DEAR MR. GARDNER: The New York Times Sunday section recently published a quotation which suggests that you support the movement to prohibit political broadcasts which are not five minutes in length or longer.

I am dismayed by this movement, and I beg you to consider my reason: People will listen to one-minute talks; most people will not listen to five-minute talks. Couple this axiom with the fact that radio and television are mass media and should therefore effectively reach the masses, and you have a good argument in favor of one-minute talks.

Responses to the arguments against the one-minute talks are equally good: 1. Argu-

ment: You can't adequately discuss an issue in 60 seconds.

Response: You can. It isn't easy. But you can do it. Over the past twelve years, I have written hundreds of brief radio editorials that do discuss issues—and, I hope, not without some effect. Two editorials—on the issue of this letter—are enclosed.

2. Argument: *It's those one-minute and 30-second spots that create sophistry and dishonesty in political advertising.*

Response: So wrong! It's not the medium that creates dishonesty; the medium merely carries the message. The creator of the message creates the dishonesty—and he can do that even more easily if the medium is a five-minute talk than if it's a one-minute talk. Everything is easier in five minutes than in one.

But, illogical as this argument is, it carries a hint of the real problem: the one-minute spot does indeed encourage half-truths—but not because it's brief; rather, because it makes use of the production aids that tend to distort truth. Music, sound effects, visual effects—these, if used skillfully, can indeed distort truth even more easily than can the spoken word. So, if, in order to discourage the not-very-new trend toward exaggeration and distortion in politics, you are willing to go so far as to impose prohibition on forms of expression, those prohibitions should be directed not against the length of political announcements, but rather against their form. The prohibition should be against the use of music and sound effects and visual effects; and political candidates and the supporters of political candidates should be permitted to speak on behalf of those candidates for five minutes or fifteen minutes or thirty seconds—or whatever unit of time is offered by the broadcasting station.

What do you think of these responses? I value your opinion. And I fear your support of a movement which I consider so misguided. Is it possible that you may change your mind?

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. KIEVE,
President.

Mr. Speaker, the world is full of people who set themselves up as the conscience of mankind. I certainly would not make a sweeping allegation that Mr. Gardner belongs to this group but certainly with his suggestion that he alone should have the right to censor radio broadcasting and determine what is good for the American public he is in one instance at least joining the above mentioned group.

A NEW CONSTELLATION—AMERICA

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, this illustrious body enacted a resolution 193 years ago today which specified the colors and arrangement of the stars and stripes for the American flag. That resolution ended with the statement that the white stars in the blue field represented "a new constellation."

What was then a new constellation is today the brightest star in the world of nations, representing a freedom unknown in many other countries of the world community.

What we are honoring here today is not a piece of red, white, and blue cloth

with stars and stripes. It is a nation, a people. It is the history of a success story in the long struggle of mankind to achieve a land flowing with milk and honey.

Ours is not a perfect nation. We have yet to reach that great American dream of providing every opportunity for each individual to attain his greatest potential.

But the light in this constellation of ours which insures that it will glow throughout history is that we have the freedom and spirit to overcome the problems which confront us today and to make this country, which is the greatest free republic in the history of the world, even better.

That flag, Mr. Speaker, is symbolic of our struggle for and achievement of freedom, just as our Nation is the symbol of freedom to the rest of the world.

Upon his return from Moscow, President Nixon described his feelings when he saw the flag of the United States of America flying over the Kremlin. That flag symbolized the efforts of our Nation in seeking a solution to our common problems of disease, poverty, and war.

That flag flies over U.S. missions in more than 100 foreign countries.

It has flown for nearly 200 years and as long as it remains, it will symbolize what we Americans have built for ourselves and what we are working to build for the rest of the world.

CONGRATULATING THE BLACK NEWSPAPER NETWORK

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, the black declaration of independence and the black bill of rights have been distributed throughout America's black community. Because this document was presented to the National Democratic Party as a result of demands by the Congressional Black Caucus' national constituency, its tenets have already been widely accepted by black America.

The black newspapers are to be heartily commended for disseminating information about this document. In my own city of Cleveland, the Call and Post printed the entire manifesto on June 10, 1972. That same edition carried an editorial upon the significance of the black declaration of independence and the black bill of rights.

The editor, Mr. W. O. Walker, analyzed the fact that the Congressional Black Caucus' demands had been presented only to the Democratic Party. He expressed the hope that the demands be included in the Democrat's platform next month.

Mr. Walker's analysis is, as always, perceptive and intelligent. I would like to share it with my colleagues today.

The editorial follows:

BLACK BILL OF RIGHTS

On the presumption that millions of black Americans look to the 13 black members of

the United States Congress as their legitimate spokesmen on national issues, the thirteen have hammered out a Black Declaration of Independence and a Black Bill of Rights to be presented to the National Democratic Party, suggesting that the concerns and specific demands contained therein be incorporated into the official Democratic Party platform.

Since all 13 of the framers of the document are registered Democrats it is logical that it is from that Party that they should reasonably expect maximum consideration of their views, and while the document contains no direct threat to Party loyalty in the event of Party default, some of the language strongly suggests that adverse treatment of the expressed "concerns" may result in much the same kind of walkout as characterized the 21st Congressional District Caucus, which in a measure inspired the Congressional look-a-like.

"The new political mood permeating Black America makes it imperative that the Democratic Party address itself to the hopes, aspirations, concerns and rights of Black Americans—if that party expects to continue to receive the support of Black voters. Benevolence and paternalism are unacceptable and will not be tolerated. The torch has passed to a new generation of Blacks who no longer accommodate but confront; who no longer plead but demand; who no longer submit but fight."

These are strong and noble words to be uttering to a convention that will struggle to select a potential winner in a candidate who can win the approval of Governor George Wallace, the political Archie Bunker of our time.

But these 13 are strong and articulate persons who undoubtedly feel that they can wield an important influence on the direction of the black electorate come November.

The demands and concerns are not new. They incorporate such yearnings as a Welfare System with a guaranteed annual income system; an end to the Vietnam engagement and any foreign involvements; a boycott of the African governments still engaged in apartheid; the right of every American to live in a decent neighborhood, ad infinitum.

Since continued black support was never more vital to the survival of the Democratic Party than at this moment in history, it is to be hoped that most of these basic recommendations will find a place in the Democratic Party platform.

If not, the gallant 13 will have to come to grips with the inevitable question:

"Where do we go from here?"

FLAG DAY TRIBUTE TO OLEG Z. ZALESKI

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today is Flag Day, a day which we traditionally set aside to pause and pay tribute to the Stars and Stripes.

This is a very special Flag Day for the city of Detroit and the surrounding communities in my congressional district which are served by the Port of Detroit.

On May 5, 1972, the President of the United States issued a proclamation in which he directed that the United States flag:

Shall hereafter be displayed at all times during the day and night, except when the

weather is inclement, at U.S. ports of entry which are continually open.

I am happy and proud to say that the idea from which this proclamation originated was originally proposed by Mr. Oleg Z. Zaleski, a customs inspector of the Port of Detroit, which serves as one of Michigan's three 24-hour ports.

For this reason, the Port of Detroit has been selected as the site for a special flag raising ceremony being held today, in which the Presidential proclamation will be posted. Both Commissioner of Customs Vernon D. Acree and the Regional Commissioner of Customs Jack Lacy of Chicago, Ill., will be in Michigan to participate in this ceremony.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to commend Customs Inspector Zaleski for his efforts in bringing about this Presidential proclamation.

This proclamation will make it possible for those entering our country to see our proud banner whether they arrive at night or day, and I trust that they will pause and reflect upon the deep heritage that is represented in the red, white, and blue of our U.S. flag.

CUBA SI, YANKEE FOUNDATIONS NO!

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, in Castro's radio broadcast from Bogotá, Colombia, during the 1948 revolution, he said:

This is Fidel Castro, this is a Communist Revolution. We've captured the army headquarters, we've taken over the navy, the President has been assassinated and most of the cabinet members that have not been killed have been captured.

As former Ambassador William D. Pawley, an eyewitness to that revolution, described it recently on the Manion Forum:

It took 2500 lives and they burned down over 400 buildings . . . the killings in the street were just unbelievable.

Today, Castro is still training guerrillas and planning revolutions in Cuba, with our own country now one of his primary targets. Examples follow:

First. John Masfield, senior British official responsible for airport security, told an international airport security conference recently:

Havana in 1966 organized a school for hijackers. Between 1930 and 1966, hijackings throughout the world totalled 55. In the next three years, the total was 220—four times the previous 36 years. The results of that outrageous Havana Congress were extraordinary and malevolent.

Second. In the Condade area of San Juan, P.R., in November 1970, six bombs were exploded in a two-block area between Howard Johnson's and Blackton's women's wear store, with \$8,000 damage. The Castro-supported Federation of University Students was held responsible.

Third. Angela Davis and Bernardine Dohrn both visited Havana in 1969. We

know where Angela is, but Bernardine Dohrn is a fugitive, possibly in Havana. She went to Cuba with 20 others and returned to organize hundreds of thugs for the "SDS days of rage" in Chicago during October 1969.

Fourth. In 1962, Red Chinese opium was seized in Miami. According to Charles Siragusa, former Deputy Commissioner of Narcotics:

That became the first concrete evidence that Cuba was being used as a base for opium smuggling.

Fifth. Some 3,000 U.S. students have visited Cuba so far, most of them ostensibly to harvest sugar cane. U.S. sources estimate that each American student harvests \$83 worth of cane. Since travel for each student costs Communist Cuba \$272, they lose \$189 on the deal. Testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee reveals their real purpose. The students were trained in assassination and sabotage and urged to bomb draft boards, "bring the clergy into your struggle, stockpile weapons, ambush pigs—policemen—blow up Government buildings and develop inside the United States a fighting front for world revolution."

Today, according to Cuban patriotic resistance sources, Marie Airport is under the command of a Russian colonel who supervises the replacement of Russian nuclear submarine crews for the major Russian naval base at Cienfuegos, where the Russians are now about to complete an airfield of their own. Also in this area, the Russians have taken over the Portugalete sugar mill and are building a missile base, which will include radar, missiles, and heavy artillery. No Cubans are permitted in the area and the missiles are considered "long range." This could lead to another Cuban missile crisis.

Despite Castro's continuing commitment to this kind of terrorism and aggression, on November 7, 1968, the Ford Foundation announced a grant of \$125,000 of its tax-free money "to help increase the fund of knowledge in the United States and other Western countries on contemporary Cuba. Funds will principally support scholars invited to undertake research in Cuba." The Ford Foundation further explained that—

The Foundation's appropriation for research on Cuba was prompted by growing evidence that the Cubans are waiting to establish professional relationships with the North American academic community. Several U.S. scholars have recently been cleared by Cuban authorities and by the State Department for travel and study in that country. In addition to paying travel and research expenses of scholars invited for extended periods to Cuba, the funds will support conferences and seminars among North Americans, Europeans and Cubans.

What was planted by the seeds of the Ford Foundation 3½ years ago is now bearing fruit in Congress. On April 19 and 20 of this year several Senators and Congressmen sponsored a conference to condition the American public to recognizing the Castro Red regime soon, thereby once again making it American policy to strengthen Communist governments instead of trying to help liberate

the people they have enslaved. It is inexcusable that the official powers of our Government are actually being used to prevent Cuban exiles from liberating their homeland. The free Cuban rallying cry should be: "Cuba Si, Yankee Foundations No!"

H.R. 9970—TO ALLEVIATE THE CRISES IN THE ELECTRIC POWER INDUSTRY

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, hearing after hearing, meeting after meeting, article after article have appeared and disappeared which dealt with the so-called energy crisis. But few really appreciate the dimension of the problem. It was, and is, only one among a host of crises with which we are confronted with every day.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Communications and Power of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I have been involved on a continuing basis with different aspects of the energy crisis, and have come to appreciate the complexity and seriousness of the problem. At the same time, I have become increasingly dissatisfied with industry initiatives, or the lack of them, to deal with the problem.

Recently I ran across an article in the New York Times entitled: "Lindsay Seeks Ban on New Electric Heating in City." The mayor apparently feels that no more electric heating should be installed in Consolidated Edison's service area because—

The continued use of electric resistance heating on an "already overloaded Consolidated Edison system heightens the probabilities of brownouts."

While this reported request is not critical taken by itself, I believe that other aspects of the energy crisis make it so. The fact is that in many areas of the country, new consumers are being denied access to natural gas as well.

Oil, the next most desirable energy source for house heating, is increasingly short in supply, due at least in part to the artificial restraints of the oil import quota system.

The fact is that we in the United States face the prospect of a critically worsening energy supply situation, short and long term. A large part of the responsibility must be assumed by the electric power industry, which has historically failed to engage in the kind of intensive continuing research which would enable it to meet the ever growing demand.

I am the author of a bill, H.R. 9970, which would alleviate the crisis in the electric power industry. It would establish a national power grid which could move large blocs of power to energy starved areas like New York City in a way that would enhance both economy and efficiency. It would pioneer in the

development and implementation of techniques which would enable us to meet the need for electric power in a way compatible with the environmental values which are so important to us in maintaining a decent quality of life. Yet no action has been taken on this proposal in the year since I have introduced it.

An adequate supply of electric power, Mr. Speaker, is a prerequisite for making progress in many areas of public concern, from cleaning up the environment to strengthening the economy. The time for consideration of H.R. 9970, the only way the demand for electric power can be met in an environmentally acceptable way, is now.

I insert the article from the New York Times to which I referred in the RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

LINDSAY ASKS BAN ON NEW ELECTRIC HEATING IN CITY

(By Edward Ranzal)

Mayor Lindsay urged the State Public Service Commission yesterday to restrain Consolidated Edison from supplying electricity for heating new buildings under construction or about to be constructed.

The Mayor contended that the continued use of electric resistance heating on an "already overloaded Consolidated Edison system heightens the probabilities of brown-outs."

"Priorities must therefore be established for the use of a diminishing supply of electricity available," Mr. Lindsay said.

Acting on the recommendation of his Interdepartmental Committee on Public Utilities, the Mayor wrote Joseph G. Swidler, the commission chairman, urging public hearings on the matter.

A spokesman for the P.S.C. said its chairman would have "no comment" on the Mayor's letter, but indicated that the entire Commission would take up the question of a possible public hearing. A Con Edison spokesman said the company disagreed with the city's assessment of the situation but would have no objections to public hearings on the matter.

The use of electricity for heating new buildings, the Mayor's committee reported, "jeopardizes" the availability of power essential to "the very existence of the city."

Milton Muscus, chairman of the Mayor's committee, said there were 15,381 dwelling units in the city under construction or in planning stages designed to be heated by electricity.

He said that some of these dwellings would have room air-conditioners and all would be centrally metered, with no direct tenant incentive for conservation of electricity.

Mr. Muscus said he had been in constant touch with Con Ed to urge the restriction of electric power for heating during the present shortage. He warned that the growing practice of installing electric heat because of lower installation costs "wastes fuel and saddles the tenants with the high costs because of the rising rates for electricity."

JOHN MARTIN EDMONDSON

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to express my profound

sympathy to my colleague and longtime friend, the Honorable Ed EDMONDSON.

As we are all painfully aware, Ed and his family have recently suffered a tragic personal loss. Their son, John, was killed early last Friday morning in an accident near Muskogee.

I knew John almost all of his life, and he was certainly a fine boy. I know his mother and father were very proud of him and his parents had great expectations for a fine future.

His loss was really a shock and my heart goes out to the entire family. The Edmondson family has suffered a great deal of tragedy in recent months and even though words cannot be adequate at a time like this, I know everyone concerned also feels this great loss.

POPULATION EXPLOSION: THE ROLE OF DEVELOPMENT

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, over the last several years there has been a great deal of discussion of the world population problem. Most of us now understand the threat implicit in the rapidly expanding rates of population growth. The Overseas Development Council, a private, nonprofit organization with headquarters in Washington, D.C., has been studying the effects of social and economic development on population growth and their work has shed important new light on this issue.

The council's recent communique, written by William Rich, addresses not only the problem, but also some of the steps which may be taken to reduce it. Mr. Rich's conclusions bring to focus the reasons why all of us need to increase our commitment to alleviating the basic problems of poverty throughout the world, and I commend this work to the attention of each of my colleagues.

POPULATION EXPLOSION: THE ROLE OF DEVELOPMENT

(By William Rich)

The limits of man's natural habitat are suddenly being recognized, adding urgency to the quest for stabilization of the earth's population. As the importance of reducing population growth becomes more apparent, however, the difficulty of achieving the goal is becoming equally clear. Family planning programs have been most successful when supported by improvements in the welfare of the poor. It is important, if not essential, to establish certain levels of social and material well-being before family size will be voluntarily reduced. In light of these facts, it is time to take a fresh look at the population problem, to consider the conditions of the human environment on which it is based, and to determine how development efforts can contribute to improving those conditions.

A SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC THRESHOLD TO LIMITED BIRTHS?

Births have been described as "functions of total life." The decision to have children obviously is affected by many factors. There are persons at every economic level who are either particularly fond of, or simply are not interested in raising children. There also are cultural or political factors which can either

stimulate or deter parents from having additional children. In various combinations, however, improvements in social and economic welfare have consistently led to reduced birth rates. Societies that create social and economic conditions conducive to limiting family size have created, in technical terms, a "socio-economic threshold" to reduced fertility.

Demographic and economic researchers have not yet produced a mathematical formula to represent the socio-economic conditions which lead to a reduced family size. Literacy, sanitation, health, nutrition, opportunities for employment, housing and education are all contributing factors whose effects will vary with changes in the total social environment. An indication of the ways in which development can affect family size, however, is now available.

The spread of education often has been related to reduced birth rates. In the first place, education and literacy help people learn about contraception. Secondly, changes in the norms and values of educated persons are known to affect family size. Moreover, extended education often causes a delay in marriage, as well as a longer period in which the child is dependent on parental support. In some cases, parents will have to decide whether to have fewer children with, or more without an education.

Some persons have attributed the population explosion to improved health conditions. While it is true that health services, accompanied by improvements in nutrition, sanitation and education have helped to reduce death rates, it is also certain that expanded health services contribute, albeit more slowly, to birth rate reduction. These services offer a natural springboard for family planning programs. Furthermore, in many countries high survival rates must be assured before births will be limited. In India, for instance, where social, economic and religious factors virtually require having a son alive at the time of the father's death, it is still necessary to have six children in order to be relatively certain that one male will survive. Under such conditions, improvements in child survival are a likely prerequisite to acceptance of family planning.

Availability of employment is another factor which influences the birth rate. In many cases, full-time employment is the key to other opportunities for improved welfare. Employment, savings and family planning are all directly related to each other. Women who work may postpone marriage, postpone having children, or decide to have only one or two. Sending children to school instead of to work can also affect family size. As these patterns of child labor change, the cost of rearing children increases. Psychologically, employment and child-bearing are both factors which tend to connote adulthood; satisfaction of one may reduce the need for the other.

Mobility, in both the social and geographical sense, is likely to affect decisions to have children. Mobile youths may postpone marriage, and as young people move from villages to cities or from town to town, family ties will be broken. In some cases, husbands leave their families for extended periods of work in another section of the country. As women gain independent social status they become increasingly active outside of the home, and are inclined to limit family size as a result.

The factor which may do the most to create an environment conducive to family planning is based on the expansion of interests and satisfactions beyond the traditional family. A couple living in poverty, without fully productive jobs, without social aspirations or belief that they can contribute to the progress of the society, might find child-bearing and rearing the most important and enjoyable experiences in the lives. The perception by both women and men

that one can improve one's well-being, or that of the whole community, will not in itself change the value of having children. However, such additional routes to human satisfaction might provide a viable alternative to having large families.

ALTERNATIVES IN DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES

Better health and education, less unemployment, "modernization" . . . on the surface, this formula seems to offer nothing new. It merely reinforces the idea that the "less developed countries need to develop." But isn't that like telling a starving man to get something to eat? Socio-economic development, however, is not synonymous with growth of the Gross National Product (GNP). It also means devising a strategy which, while using a given level of resources, will deal with problems of poverty, unemployment, and malnutrition so as to bring as many people as possible to a socio-economic level conducive to family planning.

Changes in the birth rate occurred slowly and at relatively high income levels in the U.S., but there are alternative strategies which offer hope for a more rapid transition. In Korea and Taiwan the "threshold" at which the birth rate began dropping rapidly, was reached at income levels under \$200 per capita. In China, the same phenomenon is probably occurring on a massive scale with even lower income levels.

One of the chief tools of socio-economic development strategy is careful distribution of scarce resources in order to reach a broad segment of a given population. Take, for instance, the issue of health care. The traditional approach is to build hospitals and to train medical doctors at an advanced level. The side effect of such programs, however, is often that those economically well off in the cities become more healthy while the condition of the poor, particularly in the rural areas, remains virtually unchanged. A recent report from the Agency for International Development on foreign assistance for the 1970's includes in its section on health the following observation: "A.I.D.'s forty-some client governments are spending about \$15 billion annually on health services. This expenditure has little effect on the lives of most people. [Health] Service delivery systems reach 10 percent of the people or less. The copying of developed country health apparatus has been expensive and inappropriate, and has had comparatively little to do with reductions in mortality or ill health in the less developed countries." For a given investment, numerous village medics with minimal skills may contribute more to the health care of the people than a relative handful of highly trained doctors or hospitals modeled after those in the United States.

Similar analogies can be drawn from agricultural development. One traditional option is to invest in tractors, which often simply replace hand laborers. The relatively large-scale farmer will benefit from such a program. The employment of farm laborers, however, will be drastically reduced and small-scale farmers may be driven out of business. An alternative investment could be made in irrigation pumps and wells or fertilizer, offered on credit to small-scale farmers, who could in turn expand their more labor-intensive production.

The central feature of such alternative strategies is that opportunities to improve conditions are made available to a large proportion of the population. All too often development efforts have concentrated on sophisticated technological or capital-intensive projects. Such programs provide direct support only to a small elite with the expectation that the benefits would eventually trickle down to the great majority of the population, as has happened in much of North America and Western Europe. But this has not been the result. Joblessness is rising in many less developed countries. The population

is growing faster than the benefits are being distributed, and the welfare of the poor is not improving.

MEXICO AND TAIWAN: DIFFERENT STRATEGIES AND DIFFERENT RESULTS

Examples from Mexico and Taiwan illustrate how alternative development strategies affect birth rates. The following table presents selective indicators of conditions in the two countries.

	Taiwan	Mexico
Population growth rates (percent):		
1951	3.8	
1955		3.5
1963	3.0	3.4
1970	2.2	3.4
Income per capita (1969)	\$334	\$606
GNP growth rates in the 1960's	10	7
Ratio of income (richest 20 percent to poorest 20 percent):		
1950	15-1	10-1
1969	4.5-1	16-1
Literacy (1970) (percent)	85	76
Infant deaths per 1,000 births (1970)	19	68
Unemployment and underemployment ¹	negligible	serious

¹ Reliable measures of underemployment are not available; however, conditions are substantially different in the 2 countries.

As a result of socio-economic improvements in Taiwan the birth rate dropped from 46 per thousand in 1952 to 36 in 1963 at which time a vigorous family planning program was introduced. It fell even faster thereafter to 26 in 1970, which reduced the population growth rate to approximately 2.2 percent. In Mexico, on the other hand, the birth rate has only declined from 44 per thousand to 42 during the period 1952 to 1970. While the birth rate is declining in a few areas, this trend has not affected the majority of the Mexican population. Highly uneven distribution of income and social services as well as religious constraints and a lack of government support for family planning programs have all contributed to Mexico's sustained population growth.

In terms of productivity, both countries can be described as "successful." The poorest 20% of the population in Taiwan, however, improved their economic standing by over 200% in the last two decades, while the income level of the same group in Mexico fell by 20%.

Both Taiwan and Mexico have enjoyed the benefits of the "green revolution," the agricultural breakthrough which has yielded vast increases in grain production. In Mexico, however, improved wheat harvests have contributed little to help alleviate poverty. In 1960 over half of this country's total agricultural output was produced on only three percent of the Mexican farms. The same three percent accounted for 80 percent of the increase in agricultural production between 1950 and 1960. Owners of the large-scale, capital-intensive, irrigated farms were by far the largest beneficiaries of the new wheats. In a ten-year period, the number of landless laborers increased 43 percent, while the average of days worked each year dropped from 194 to 100.

In Taiwan, on the other hand, land reform has put strict limits on individual land holdings, so that the average farm has only about 2.2 acres. There is also an extensive system of farm cooperatives to provide credit, markets, and new technology. As a result, small-scale rice farmers have been able to take advantage of the new crops; they have almost doubled their output in the past 20 years, while at the same time providing employment for rural dwellers.

Cultural, geographic and political conditions in Taiwan and Mexico are vastly different. The impact of these various factors on birth rates is unclear. The differences in development strategies, however, certainly appear to be linked to differences in family size.

THE CHINESE MODEL

Birth rates in China also appear to be falling, and this drop may well be related to a combination of socio-economic progress and family planning similar to that found in countries such as Taiwan, Singapore and South Korea. Although total economic activity, as measured by indicators such as the GNP, is still quite low, major social changes seem to have dramatically altered the life of the average individual, and appear to have created a living environment increasingly conducive to successful family planning programs.

The most extreme forms of poverty have been mitigated in recent years and there has been a notable improvement in the standard of living of the poorest half of the population. China has stressed rural employment, rather than industrial development, a strategy which has brought major social changes to the population group that in most other countries has been the last to change.

A number of innovations played a role in this reduction in births. With respect to social services, China has supported "barefoot doctors", medical workers with minimal training, who appear to have brought basic health care and family planning services to a large part of the population. Another innovation is the Chinese commune—or, alternatively, the production team—which generates financial and social security, formerly the province of a strong family structure. Where the new system is successful and stable enough to be depended on, it is no longer necessary to have a surviving son in order to be sure of receiving support during old age, thereby reducing the need to have children and causing the "socioeconomic threshold" to drop.

Finally, official propaganda has encouraged individuals to delay marriage and has stressed the ideal of the small family. The combination of all these changes, within the Chinese context, is apparently providing a successful start to stemming China's population growth.

HOW SHOULD THE U.S. RESPOND TO POPULATION PROBLEMS?

The most basic decisions relating to both poverty and population growth will be made by the particular nations concerned, but the rich nations of the world control resources which can affect both when and how other nations across the socio-economic threshold. The U.S. must address two principal issues if the population explosion is to be effectively checked. In the first place, the distribution gap which separates rich countries from poor must be narrowed, so that more resources are made available to accelerate development in the poor countries. Secondly, the transfer of resources should take place in a way that facilitates improved distribution and employment patterns within the less developed countries.

As the United States confronts new issues in trade, monetary and resource policies, it must continually seek ways to make the tools for development more available to the less developed countries. Without such an effort, the gap between rich and poor, within and between countries will certainly widen, and population growth may well continue unabated. Questions of capital transfer, in turn, must be linked to questions of the distribution of wealth within the poor countries. What will be the effect of a given capital investment: will it be beneficial to the poor, or will it be inappropriate to the country's economy because it displaces labor while adding to the coffers of the country's economic elite? Introducing advanced technologies into poor countries is also a questionable policy where these countries need labor-intensive production to achieve a high level of employment. The difficulty of these problems, however, should not be an excuse

for ignoring the basic need for resource transfer.

Finally, efforts to deal with poverty and development should be complemented by vigorous support for population programs and family planning research. The need to integrate family planning programs with other development projects is critical. Families which cross the "socio-economic threshold" need ready access to family planning services if the birth rate is to be controlled.

CONCLUSION

In the long-run it is difficult to imagine how population growth can be stemmed unless we confront the problems of widespread poverty and rising unemployment. Social justice may well be an indispensable key to the eventual reduction and stabilization of population growth. As the limits of growth become apparent, and as we understand population problems more clearly, policies that bring health, education and jobs to the poor become more than a humanitarian ideal; they also emerge as a pragmatic necessity.

April 13, 1972.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION COMMITTEE ISSUES REPORT ON PREVENTION OF URBAN CRIME

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the American Bar Association's Special Committee on Crime Prevention and Control recently released a report with a number of recommendations concerning the prevention of urban crime.

The several recommendations are worthy of the fullest consideration—especially the proposal for removing from the dockets of the courts the traffic violations and minor offenses which occupy and consume much time of our judges and which crowd out and delay the trial and litigation of serious charges.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important matter, I place in the RECORD an excerpt from the American Bar report on urban crime.

The report follows:

RELEASE REPORT ON STUDY OF URBAN CRIME

The ABA Special Committee on Crime Prevention and Control, chaired by Edward Bennett Williams, Washington, D.C., attorney, has released a 102-page report on its one-year study, entitled "New Perspectives on Urban Crime."

The report reflects the views of the committee only. It has not been approved by the House of Delegates or Board of Governors.

In its report, the nine-member committee unanimously recommended:

Creating a system of federally-financed narcotics treatment centers to dispense withdrawal, methadone and other treatment—even heroin as a last resort—in a controlled medical environment.

Consideration by legislatures of repealing "victimless" crimes, such as adultery, vagrancy, drunkenness, gambling, prostitution and homosexuality, so that courts can concentrate on crimes that have aroused citizens' fears for safety.

Eliminating mandatory grand jury procedures in typical street crime cases where the jury often has proved a dubious safeguard and an expensive waste of time for the prosecution and the accused.

Increasing resources and speeding procedures in court probation offices so that defendants can quickly be given appropriate sentences on conviction.

Ending high-bail policies and discouraging more "preventive detention" laws, because keeping defendants in jail frustrates the rehabilitative process that could begin before trial in many cases.

Halting the time-consuming practice in many courts of questioning prospective jurors individually.

Tighter court administration experiments with computerized transcripts, fewer written briefs in criminal appeals lacking novel points of law, and shorter written opinions by appellate judges.

The nation's narcotics control policy has been "a dismal failure," the committee said, adding that what is needed is "a bold new policy which recognizes heroin addiction not as a moral problem to be dealt with through harsh penal actions, but as a disease for the individual addict and a health crisis for the rest of society."

The main function of the criminal justice system would be to identify addicts and channel them into the rehabilitative process.

The committee said the handling of victimless crimes should be transferred to non-judicial agencies, such as detoxification centers, narcotics treatment centers and social service agencies. "The handling of other non-serious offenses, such as traffic violations and housing code violations, should be transferred to specialized administrative bodies."

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF HARPERS FERRY, W. VA.

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the year 1972 marks the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service. In celebration of the event, the service sponsored an arts and crafts show at Harpers Ferry, W. Va., over a period of several days in the early part of June. Thousands of visitors accepted the invitation to attend. The featured address of the occasion was made by the genial and influential senior Senator from West Virginia, the Honorable JENNINGS RANDOLPH. Senator RANDOLPH has given much time and attention to the promotion of park service operations. His interest in Harpers Ferry may be taken for granted, since it is a part of what was once his congressional district, and is now within the area I am most happy to serve.

It is matter of coincidence that 1972 is also the centennial year of Harpers Ferry as an incorporated town. Its importance historically covers a longer period. It was the gateway from the North and East to the South and West. Pioneers from Pennsylvania and New York reached the Great Valley of Virginia in colonial days through Harpers Ferry. In the early days of the 19th century a canal along the Potomac River and the first railroad built in the Nation helped to open up the Great Plains to settlement and development.

Harpers Ferry is still the passage way to modern vehicular traffic. And a magnificent portal it is. People travel to Europe to view juxtapositions of mountain

and stream and valley no more breathtaking.

The historic significance of Harpers Ferry is augmented by the fact that here the great struggle between the North and South began. Possession of the site was the key to the success of the contending armies.

This combination of circumstances makes Senator RANDOLPH's address well worth reading. I feel that it will be of interest to a wide variety of readers, and I therefore request that it be printed in the RECORD.

SPEECH BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH

We are gathered in a historic area with a magnificent array of nature's good works spread before us to enjoy. The rivers rushing along, the trees that cover the earth, and the rolling farmlands that provide food, are here for all of us to appreciate and use.

I can conceive of no finer setting in which we could meet to enjoy. The arts and crafts of our mountain heritage and commemorate the centennial of the National Park Service. We place particular emphasis on the programs being carried forward at Harpers Ferry National Historical Park. This is indeed an appropriate location for recognition of the vital work of the West Virginia Artists and Craftsmen's Guild and the employees of the National Park Service who share a mutual bond of significant contributions to the enjoyment, education, and realization of millions of our citizens. It is especially satisfying for me to witness the use of Harpers Ferry as a focal point for the display of the handwork and talents of our artists and craftsmen who strengthen and enhance understanding and appreciation of our past. For nearly three decades, I have been involved in the park development of Harpers Ferry. I think we all agree that it has been a tremendous success, and we can look forward to even greater achievements.

I introduced legislation to designate Harpers Ferry as a National Historical Monument, and my involvement has been more than that of a legislator. In addition to wishing all that is good for our State, I have an emotional attachment to this town and to this area that transcends the usual affection of a man for his homeland and its people.

The History of Harper's Ferry goes deep into our Nation's past. The town shared an important role in the development of the United States, first as a frontier outpost and later as an important point on the trail west. But Harper's Ferry owes its prominence today to the events that occurred here just over a century ago when the great social and political questions of that time were focused in this community.

Many of the dilemmas faced, not only then but now, can be more fully understood, if not solved, by a study of the history of this area.

There is, therefore, an historical heritage here—a heritage that we recognized years ago must be preserved as an important part of the American past. Harpers Ferry not only has much to tell about the maturation of the American nation, but from it we may learn partly how to cope with contemporary problems.

We owe much to the National Park Service for the skillful, sensitive and enthusiastic manner in which it has approached the preservation of Harpers Ferry.

It is through a long history of involvement with the places important to the Nation's past that the Park Service accumulated the talent that has been so much in evidence here in the creation of the National Historical Park, the Mather Training Center and the Interpretive Arts Center.

The National Park Service also is charged with great responsibilities in addition to its

stewardship of many of our most important historical sites. The Nation's greatest public recreation areas also fall within its jurisdiction.

In all 50 States, the National Park Service has direct management responsibility for 74 natural areas, 171 historical areas, 37 recreational areas, and the National Capital Parks—a total of 283 units in the National Park System. And visitation in 1971 for these units totaled nearly 201 million persons. It is estimated that in 1972 this figure will increase by 6½ percent to a total of over 213 million. Harper's Ferry National Historical Park received visits by 1,130,000 persons in 1971 and the projected increase for our park is ten percent annually over the next several years.

Clearly, the management task of the Park Service is one of great responsibility. With this responsibility, the Park Service is becoming increasingly concerned with respect to the creation and maintenance of a clean and wholesome environment.

Its jurisdiction and its expertise have placed the Park Service squarely in the thick of the environmental struggle that is taking place in the United States today.

The National Park Service's involvement in environmental improvement must of necessity be largely limited to the areas in which it has direct jurisdiction. But its influence, gained through years of experience in dealing with nature, can be widely felt.

There is, in fact, no unit of government—however small—no organization, no community, no individual that is immune from involvement in what must be the great, continuing challenge of our time.

Americans are concerned over the air they breathe, the water they drink, the land, the oceans, and the atmosphere. They have ample reason for their concern and they are making it clear that they will not longer tolerate the abuses of past years.

The ecology explosion has taught us that we cannot consider things in isolation. We must, instead, look at the world in which we live as a whole, with each activity and each part of nature relating to the rest.

This interdependence of man and nature and the long-range effects of our actions indicate that what you do here in the eastern panhandle is of concern to people living in Washington and even farther away.

This peaceful area, with its delightful pattern of life, may seem a long way removed from the problems of large metropolitan areas. But the nature of the topography and the way the Potomac River and the Shenandoah River flow carry the impact of your actions hundreds of miles away. If pollutants are dumped into the stream in their headwaters, they can easily find their way eastward to foul the water supply of millions of people.

Conversely, demands for water in the Washington area can dictate how river flows are controlled upstream.

Over the past year, for example, I have traveled to many parts of the country to discuss problems of the environment with many groups—students, business executive, government leaders, and individual citizens.

In each instance, I have stressed—and I do so again today—the importance of the individual in keeping our land clean and healthy. Government can do much. Industry can contribute immeasurably. But without individual responsibility exercised by every citizen, we will never reach the goals we have set.

A positive reaction is taking place, and there is noticeable progress in mobilizing citizen opinion and energy to remove the neglect of years and restore our Nation.

And there is a very vital role in that restoration for an understanding and appreciation of our cultural heritage. As I stated earlier, I can conceive of no finer setting in which

we could meet to enjoy the arts and crafts of our mountain history and living patterns. A more enlightened understanding of the history—the existence—of our forefathers, in my judgment, prepares us so much better to cope with the problems of the future. We necessarily must focus on the problems of a rapidly moving and fast-paced existence in this Twentieth Century. But that does not release us from our responsibility to search out and understand the greatness of our heritage. It does not lessen our responsibility to pass on to our children and young people this same understanding.

To study history from books alone has proven inadequate. There must be a humanization of our study and learning process. And it is in this area of focusing on the human element in our history—in focusing on the people—that the activities in our arts and crafts program are so vital. It is through the promotion of the handiwork and talents possessed and used by our forefathers that we gain the humanization and genuine appreciation of our history and heritage.

The enjoyment, enrichment, and education potential within our viable West Virginia Artists and Craftsmen Guild is truly unique. I know that it is a potential being used to benefit citizens—young and old. And I know also that there will be greater accomplishments and successes in the future.

Jefferson County is fortunate that it counts among its good citizens the people of the National Park Service and the Artists and Craftsmen's Guild. Their work in Harper's Ferry is a splendid, though not isolated, example of how beneficial improvements can be accomplished without detrimental side effects.

We commend them and extend congratulations to their friends and associates here whose contributions have made Jefferson County and the Eastern Panhandle of West Virginia and our Nation a better place in which to live.

JOINT RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH UNIFORM INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS TO PROTECT AIR TRAVELERS

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure our colleagues share my feeling of horror at the May 30 massacre of 25 persons, and the wounding of countless others, at Israel's Lod International Airport. This action, together with yesterday's bombing of a jet during takeoff in Detroit, adds to the growing number of such incidents around the world. Not only can the international community not condone such actions in anyway, but we can no longer delay in seeking solutions in this problem.

In the wake of this carnage, we must not sit back and hope for the best, leaving solutions to those concerned, for in a very real sense, we are all concerned. Threats to any air travelers constitute threats to all air travelers, as the Lod incident has graphically shown us.

Therefore, I have joined in cosponsoring House Joint Resolution 1222, directing the President to seek international agreements which will establish uniform standards for the protection of individ-

uals using airport and aircraft facilities. As such incidents constitute a very real threat to communications between nations, the world community has a collective obligation to institute measures tightening security for airline passengers. I urge my colleagues to join me in seeking a workable solution to this pressing problem.

MARVIN COX

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, Marvin Cox, a good friend for many years and a friend of many other Members, is retiring from Federal service later this month.

I first met Marvin when he was administrative assistant for my late and very dear friend, Prince H. Preston of Georgia. Our good relationship has continued through the years while Marvin has been a legislative liaison officer for USIA.

I wish to include with my remarks at this point an excellent article from Roll Call concerning Marvin Cox. The article was accompanied by a picture of Mr. Cox with the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) who are the only Members now serving who were serving when Marvin Cox arrived on Capitol Hill in 1931.

The article follows:

MARVIN COX

A Capitol Hill career that began as a Congressman's secretary during the Speakership of Nicholas Longworth when each Member conducted his Congressional business in a one-room office will end this month with the retirement of Marvin Cox as Congressional Liaison Officer for USIA, where he has handled Congressional matters since he left his post in the late '50's as Administrative Assistant to the late Georgia Congressman, Prince H. Preston.

Only two current Members, Wright Patman of Texas and Emanuel Celler of New York, were serving in the House when Cox began his duties with the late Homer C. Parker in 1931.

Cox "was there" when John Nance Garner was elected Speaker as the first Democrat in that post after 14 years of Republican control of the House, and he witnessed Franklin D. Roosevelt's first inaugural in 1933 when FDR told a despairing nation, "the only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

The allowance for Congressional "clerk hire" in those halcyon days was a flat \$5,000 per year to be divided between two secretaries, Cox recalls, and all Members were housed in the present Cannon House Office building, as the Longworth building "had not been completed, nor the Rayburn building even thought of."

A vivid memory of the retiring veteran's early New Deal days was the first political coup of Lyndon Johnson, then secretary to Rep. Richard M. Kleberg of Texas. The future President rallied the eager secretaries to the scores of new Members who had been swept into office in the Roosevelt 1932 landslide to have himself elected Speaker of the "Little Congress," an organization of House staff members which held weekly debates on cur-

rent legislative issues under the rules of the House.

"Tom Camp, secretary to Rep. Ramspeck, was due for election as Speaker under a long-standing tradition of rotation," Cox remembers, "but Lyndon organized those new staff people and swept that tradition into the waste basket."

The "Little Congress" has long since passed into limbo.

Cox, a veteran of many Georgia Congressional campaigns, expects a busy summer despite his imminent retirement. His lawyer-son, a six-year veteran of the Georgia State Senate, faces primary opposition in his race for re-election. "I expect to be back home licking stamps for Jay's campaign letters," says the veteran of Congressional activity under six Presidents, "so I won't have time to worry about being bored."

The latest of many legislative struggles in which Cox has participated over the years was the successful effort in the Senate to have \$45,000,000 cut from the 1973 USIA budget by the Foreign Relations Committee restored by amendment on the Floor. The USIA had the full amount restored by floor amendment, but Cox refuses firmly to talk about any phase of those proceedings.

The veteran Congressional staff man and liaison officer considers his years associated with the Hill both happy and productive. But he disclaims any profound knowledge that those years have brought.

"The only change I can think of that might improve the government," Cox says in his pronounced Georgia drawl, "is to move income tax day, April 15, to coincide with Election day in November. This might bring both candidates and voters into closer touch with the realities of government."

"I'm not starting any crusade to bring about this unlikely event," he hastens to add.

As to the future, the retiring veteran professes a desire to observe the workings of the British parliament to see the points of contrast between the way in which constituents are served by the British MP's and American Congressmen. "Just to satisfy my curiosity," Cox says, "I'd like to see just how the Parliament works as compared to our Congress. I don't mean the Constitutional theories; I mean the every day way the MP's get things done."

GENOCIDE DAY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, genocide, according to a leading dictionary, is defined as "the deliberate and systematic destruction of a racial, political, or cultural group." While it usually results in death for those at whom it is aimed, it can also be carried out in other ways, such as persecutions, confiscation of lands and other properties, jailings, and deportations. Once the victims have been removed by flight, transportation to less desirable regions, or imprisonment, their homes, farms, and businesses are turned over to those who are in the good graces of the ruling authorities.

Thirty-one years ago today, on June 14, 1941, the Soviet Union began to execute its policy of genocide in the Baltic States. These three small republics, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, had been annexed to the huge Soviet Empire a year earlier. Tens of thousands of the

CXVIII—1321—Part 16

Baltic people were killed and about a million were deported to Siberia and other areas.

During the following 4 years, the Baltic lands formed part of the battleground as the erstwhile allies, the National Socialists of Germany and the Communists of Russia, fought against each other. Those Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians who remained were terrorized by whichever of these vicious forces happened to be in the ascendancy. The final defeat and elimination of the Nazis left the Communists in undisputed and complete control.

While some of the Baltic peoples still reside in their ancient homelands, others have been replaced by Russians from other sections of the Soviet Union and still others have been scattered to other parts of the world. Many Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians have, during the past three decades, begun life anew in free America. As loyal and industrious citizens they have made important and lasting contributions to their adopted country.

Mr. Speaker, may I now quote from the words written by a prominent Lithuanian Jew. Once friendly to the Soviets, his 7 years spent in slave labor camps in Siberia made him a bitter opponent of the Communist regime. Listen to the words penned by Dr. Julius Margolin:

Until the fall of 1939, I had assumed a position of benevolent neutrality toward the U. S. S. R. . . . The last seven years have made me a convinced and ardent foe of the Soviet system. I hate this system with all the strength of my heart and all the power of my mind. Everything I have seen there has filled me with horror and disgust which will last until the end of my days. I feel that the struggle against this system of slavery, terrorism, and cruelty which prevails there constitutes the primary obligation of every man in this world. Tolerance or support of such an international shame is not permissible for people who are on this side of the Soviet border and who live under normal conditions. . . .

Millions of men are perishing in the camps of the Soviet Union. . . . Since they came into being, the Soviet camps have swallowed more people, have executed more victims, than all the other camps—Hitler's included—together; and this lethal engine continues to operate full blast.

And those who in reply only shrug their shoulders and try to dismiss the issue with vague and meaningless generalities, I consider moral abettors and accomplices of banditry.

Mr. Speaker, last fall, it was my privilege to serve at the U.N. and, during a discussion of the subject of the right of peoples to self-determination, I raised the question of Soviet control over the Baltic States. The point I made was as follows:

The Baltic States—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—represent a special case in point. They have been physically annexed by the Soviet Union and forcibly incorporated into the cluster of its "Socialist Republics." So far as the Communists are concerned, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia have ceased to exist as separate entities entitled to their own national identity and independence. These views are not shared by the United States, nor by numerous other countries. To this day, the United States accords diplomatic recognition to the representatives of the last legitimate governments of the three Baltic States.

Large numbers of Baltic peoples were transferred to the Soviet interior after 1940. There are indications that as many as 60,000 Estonians and 25,000 Latvians, and probably more Lithuanians, were deported or killed during the first Soviet occupation of the Baltic States in 1940-41. The largest deportation occurred on the eve of the German invasion. After the war several waves of deportations were conducted particularly from Lithuania, and chiefly in connection with the collectivization drives in the Baltic States.

Comparison of Soviet data on peasants in Latvia for the period from early 1947 to May 1949, shows that some 36,000 families or about 150,000 individuals were eliminated from the rolls during the period. Making allowance for migration to cities, it appears that over 100,000 Latvian peasants were deported to the interior. The figure for Lithuania may be assumed to be still higher. The Baltic peoples were evidently resettled in various regions of Siberia, as well as in the north.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that the Members of the House will keep in mind the legitimate aspirations of the Baltic peoples to independence and the right to again reside in their historic lands.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, may I direct the special attention of the House to House Congressional Resolution 416, which was adopted in the 89th Congress, which carries the following clause:

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That the House of Representatives of the United States urge the President of the United States—

(a) to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; and

(b) to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

This resolution passed the House of Representatives on June 21, 1965, and the Senate on October 22, 1966. This is, in fact, the position of the Congress. I do not believe that any developments since then have changed the basic congressional view. We should use every step possible to see that the illegal incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the Soviet Union is greatly contrary to international law and should be terminated. We cannot have lasting peace in the world unless all people, and this obviously includes the Baltic States, have the right of self-determination and government of their own choosing.

A SALUTE TO EDUCATION

HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, one of the major goals of government in America is to provide the conditions under which all citizens can partake of the bounty this Nation has to offer.

For many Americans that goal has been met, but for others and for all of our descendants, the goal remains ahead.

State and local governments have recognized the way to meet that chal

lence is to provide the best possible education for the greatest possible number of people. During this school year these governments are spending nearly \$47 billion for elementary and secondary education.

The National Government says it recognizes the same fact, but its expenditures for education are comparatively small, indeed. During the current fiscal year, for example, the Federal Government spent only \$3.4 billion for elementary and secondary education. The Federal budget proposal for the new fiscal year is only \$3.6 billion.

I think the Federal Government can and ought to do better than that.

Recently, the House Appropriations Committee added an additional \$301 million to the President's education budget and there have been what seem to me very valid efforts to add \$364 million more.

The bulk of this extra money would go to increase the Federal contributions to elementary and secondary education, and library services, all, in my opinion, areas in which the Federal Government ought to be doing more.

We have recognized our responsibility to provide education for the American people, present and future. Now I believe it is time to fulfill that responsibility.

TRIBUTE TO TOM BRADLEY

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, on Friday evening, June 23, a testimonial dinner will be given for my friend Tom Bradley to honor him for 34 years of distinguished service to the city of Los Angeles.

The second of six children, Tom was born in Texas; he came to Los Angeles with the Bradley family in 1924 when he was 7 years old; he graduated from the Los Angeles Polytechnic High School where he was a star athlete and an outstanding student; he attended UCLA on an athletic scholarship.

Tom Bradley joined the Los Angeles city police department in 1940, served as an officer for 21 years, and retired in 1961 as a lieutenant, the highest rank which had then been accorded to a black man on our police force.

In 1951, while continuing to perform his police duties during the day, Tom began taking night classes at Southwestern University Law School. He received his degree, passed the State bar examination, and was admitted to practice law in California 5 years later in 1956.

In 1961, retiring from the police department, Tom opened his own law office and became actively involved in politics. Two years later, in the racially mixed but majority white 10th district, he became the first Negro ever elected to the Los Angeles City Council. He has been reelected by overwhelming margins in 1967 and 1971.

Councilman Bradley quickly became

recognized as a leader in the field of regional planning. He has served as president of both the Los Angeles County Division of the League of California Cities and of the Southern California Association of Governments. For the 1970-72 term he was elected president of the National Association of Regional Councils.

Currently he serves as a member of the board of directors of the National League of Cities, as second vice president of the mayor's and councilman's section of the League of California Cities, as board member of the Los Angeles branch of the Urban League, and on a multitude of Federal, State, and local committees. He is the founder of the Urban Coalition of Greater Los Angeles.

In 1969, in a campaign that received nationwide attention, Tom Bradley ran for the office of mayor of the city of Los Angeles. He received 42 percent of the ballots in the primary election, far surpassing the votes received by any of the other 14 candidates, and was defeated in the runoff election when he fell 3.3 percent short of a majority.

Even in defeat, however, Tom Bradley captured the imagination and restored the interest in local government of hundreds of thousands of citizens from every section of Los Angeles who were moved by the dignity and competence of his campaign, and by the integrity and idealism which he projected.

In 30 years of service to the people of Los Angeles, Tom Bradley has been an uncommon man, a trail blazer, a balancing, conciliating, creative influence in our community. He has also been an inspiration to men and women of his own race, and to all races, that men of good will can make a difference in our society.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, it is with special pleasure that I direct the attention of the U.S. Congress to the career of Councilman Tom Bradley of Los Angeles and note that I will be joining his many friends at the Beverly Hilton Hotel on June 23 to show him something of our profound admiration, gratitude, and respect.

TAX "REFORM" IS A POOR SUBSTITUTE FOR ECONOMY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, because economy is, or ought to be, the watchword of good government, I insert an interesting editorial commentary from the June 12, 1972, issue of Barron's in the RECORD:

[From the Barron's, June 12, 1972]

UP FOR GRABS—TAX "REFORM" IS A POOR SUBSTITUTE FOR ECONOMY

(By Robert M. Bleiberg)

"No matter how much emotion a President may feel at all these aberrations of the democratic process, he cannot or, at least, should not display it lest he injure the process itself. There was a choice of two courses: The one was to battle publicly with the

Democratic-controlled Congress; or to do one's best to cooperate, consult, explain and implore, with the hope of getting somewhere. . . . The constitutional division of powers is the bastion of our liberties and was not designed as a battleground to display the prowess of Presidents. They just have to work with the material that God—and the voters—have given them."

Thus philosophically wrote Herbert Hoover in his Memoirs, 1929-1941. Whether and when President Nixon, who also must deal with a balky Democratic Congress, has sought enlightenment or solace in his predecessor's words, must be left to some future historian. Suffice it for us to say that many times during the past four years—and perhaps never more so than now—he would have found them remarkably incisive and to the point. In a no-holds-barred attempt to gain control of the Executive Mansion in November, the opposition in the House and Senate, both of which rejoice in an abundance of Presidential (and Vice-Presidential) timber, have chosen to play politics with the nation's tax structure. —, front-runner for the nomination, led the way in March, when he introduced his Tax Reform Act of 1972, a revolutionary set of proposals aimed, in the law-maker's view, at "closing \$28 billion in tax loopholes which now benefit the rich and the big corporations." Last month —, in what the astute Eliot Janeway called a "three-pronged power play," jumped on the bandwagon with his "Tax Policy Review Act," which, unless Congress takes affirmative action, would phase out every so-called tax preference, 54 all told, by 1976.

Like so many of his colleagues on Capitol Hill, —, evidently would rather be President than right. Even in an off year like 1969, so the record suggests, when nobody's running for office, the odds are against anything sensible emerging from either the Ways & Means Committee or a Democratic Congress. That was the year, readers may recall, when a great hue and cry arose over a few hundred millionaires who, one way or another, had legally avoided paying any federal income tax. The result was the Tax Reform Act of 1969, a complicated, ill-conceived piece of legislation now known unofficially as the Lawyers' and Accountants' Relief Act, which jolted the bond (notably municipal) markets and, while barely denting the number of untaxed economic royalists, did plenty of financial damage to far-from-rich, middle management folk trying to amass a little capital. To judge by the behavior of the stock market, which traditionally can't stand uncertainty, the latest spate of anti-establishment schemes may have an even greater impact on private and public purse alike. Meanwhile, the true grievance of all taxpayers, large and small—the frightful waste of money on futile programs, documented in a scholarly work by the far-from-conservative Brookings Institution—goes on and on with no apparent hope of redress. Tax reform may make an effective campaign slogan; economy is, or ought to be, the watchword of good government.

Demagogues, to be sure, tend to take a different view, one which has found expression in measures on the books as well as others now pending. A case in point is the Tax Reform Act of 1969, which, among a host of other things, repealed the investment credit, limited accelerated depreciation in real estate, reduced mineral depletion allowances, increased levies on capital gains and pension-profit sharing plans, and, in a thrust at those odious beneficiaries of great wealth, imposed for the first time a Minimum Tax on otherwise sheltered income.

— measure calls for repeal of the accelerated depreciation range system; taxation of capital gains at death; reduction of the oil depletion allowance from 22% to 15%; increase in the rates and lowering of

the exemption in the Minimum Tax cited above.

For sweep and daring, — bill makes everyone else look like a piker. Designated "a bill to insure Congressional review of tax preferences and other items which narrow the income tax base, by providing now for the termination over a three-year period of existing provisions of these types," H.R. 15230 in effect would put everything up for grabs. Thus, next year one third of the 54 "preferences," including income tax exemption of an employee's death benefit up to \$5,000, exemption of \$100 of dividends, capital gains treatment for lump-sum distribution from pension funds, and percentage depletion for minerals, unless re-enacted by Congress, would expire.

In 1974, another 18—notably exclusion of sick pay from taxable income, deduction from income of intangible drilling and development costs, capital gains on the sale or exchange of patents and deduction of non-business interest and taxes—would be under the gun. Finally, in 1975 would come the turn of the last 18, including the retirement income tax credit, tax exemption on municipal bonds, deductions for charitable contributions and medical expenses, and provisions on capital gains.

In an accompanying statement, — disclaimed any attempt to prejudice the issues. "I am in no way expressing an opinion about the merits or demerits of any of the provisions listed for review. In fact, many appear to me to be desirable under present circumstances." Sentiments worthy of Pandora, but scarcely reassuring to those who can remember as far back as 1969, when the House Ways and Means Committee, which originates all such legislation, took its last full-dress swipe at tax reform. Despite extensive hearings, which filled 15 large volumes with testimony, the legislative procedure was slipshod: on the day before the bill was scheduled to come up for a vote on the floor, the Chairman called an extraordinary session of the Committee at noon to consider the fate of seven million middle-income taxpayers who had somehow gotten lost in the shuffle.

In a dissenting report — was "severely critical" of the proceedings. He pointed out that not until July 28, six days before the report was written, did the Committee get a chance to view "any of the more than 360 pages of this very complicated legislation . . . on that day, just six days ago, we first saw and took under consideration a tentative draft of a part of this bill. On that day, we approved some 83 pages. This same rapid pace without any opportunity for the Committee to examine the language in advance was carried on for the rest of the week. . . . In my opinion this would be a near impossible feat for even the best informed. . . . In my opinion all of these matters are far too important for this type of deliberation and decisionmaking."

Small wonder that here and there things went awry. Take the untaxed millionaires—in 1966-67, according to retiring Secretary of the Treasury Joseph Barr, who inspired the whole affair, 750 people with incomes of more than \$100,000 per year, and 154 making \$200,000, paid no federal income tax. In 1970, despite passage of the 1969 "reforms," 394 and 100 people, respectively, in the same two brackets, also got off scot-free. While the original targets thus suffered only a glancing blow, others were hit harder. As reported out by the House, the 1969 measure contained a back-door provision for taxing the income on municipal bonds; though cooler heads ultimately prevailed, the threat for a time dealt the tax-exempt market a body blow. (In view of — pronounced dislike for this "preference," a rerun would come as no surprise.)

On the whole, here is how Raymond Saulnier, who headed the Council of Economic

Advisers under President Eisenhower, viewed the House version. "Specifically, the bill would impair the nation's capability for achieving vigorous economic growth by a number of provisions that would reduce incentives to save and invest, including the proposed treatment of capital gains and the reduction of incentives to invest in real estate and in minerals resources. It would further inhibit growth by reducing—in some cases eliminating altogether—ways in which business concerns reward management achievement under present tax law. And the balance of its revenue effect, which would become increasingly negative between 1970 and 1972, would favor consumption at the expense of investment, thereby weakening government efforts to overcome inflation as well as impeding economic growth. . . . One is impressed again and again that what we have here is a massive example of throwing out the baby with the bathwater—in this case, a whole family of babies, with a few cups of bathwater." (Last year, of course, Congress backtracked on some of the worst features of "reform.")

Despite all disclaimers, the new — bill is even more disquieting. As the National Association of Manufacturers stated last week: "Even if the intent of the bill is to assure review rather than repeal, the fact of the termination dates written into the law without any compensating adjustments will cause great economic uncertainty and damage the business recovery. To plan for new investment and employment opportunities—not to mention the government's own budget planning—requires at least some consistency in tax policy. The prospect of three years of turmoil in which critical provisions of the Code are in doubt such as the investment credit, depreciation treatment (all depreciation treatment, not just the recent ADR liberalization), capital gains provisions, and others could paralyze financial planning for many enterprises, large and small."

In conclusion, the NAM for once has pulled no punches. "Somehow the debate on tax reform must recognize the underlying fiscal problem of unfettered spending growth at all levels of government. This is what got the tax reform debate started again—the big federal budget deficits, the hints about raising taxes or introducing new taxes next year. While so much attention is being paid to shifting of tax burdens, very few appear concerned with expenditure control. In our view it makes much more sense to set termination dates for various spending programs. We understand the Administration has a list of 110 such programs which it feels are deserving of repeal. If Congress is to embark upon the uncertain course charted by H.R. 15230, it at least should apply the equivalent approach to the other side of the ledger. . . ."

RICHARD F. KLINE, SR.

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, last week, Frederick, Md., lost one of its most distinguished citizens, Richard F. Kline, Sr. Dick Kline was one of the most respected citizens of Frederick—an experienced businessman and civic leader who built a small company into a large and successful contracting organization. He will be missed not only by his family but by the entire community.

Mr. Kline was born in Frederick March

4, 1909, son of the late Thomas and Cora Grossnickle Kline. He was a member of the Centennial Memorial United Methodist Church where he was very active in the Otterbein Men's Bible Class. He was graduated from Frederick High School in 1928 and attended Devitt Preparatory School in Washington, D.C. and the University of Maryland.

He had served in many civic capacities. For many years he was a member of the board of directors of St. James School. He also was a member of the board of directors of the Maryland National Bank, Frederick. Mr. Kline was president and founder of R. F. Kline, Inc., and Kline Paving Co., and was also chairman of the board of directors of Frederick Asphalt Products. He was a member of the board of directors of the Maryland Highway Contractors Association and has served on the board of the American Road Builders Association.

Dick Kline was a man of many interests. His contributions to Frederick and Frederick County will be long remembered as will his warmth and generosity. I and all who know him will miss this outstanding citizen and friend.

NATIONAL OIL RECYCLING ACT

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the United States today is wasting fully one-fourth of its total production of lubricating oils by failing to take advantage of available used oil recycling technologies. This waste is a national disgrace, particularly since most of the used oil is disposed of in ways which are harmful to the environment. Additionally, as the possibility of a serious shortage of oil in the United States becomes more likely, this waste serves to undermine the national defense.

In light of this serious national problem, I introduced draft legislation on December 2 of last year, to encourage improvements in oil recycling. This legislation was consequently cosponsored by about 50 Members of the House and has been introduced in the Senate. Since that time, this legislation has been extensively reviewed by a number of conservationists, environmental lawyers, and the EPA. It is my understanding that the EPA has prepared a study on the need for legislation in this area and has indicated that while my original bill has weaknesses, it would be very useful legislation.

Therefore, I am today introducing a new and more comprehensive bill today, on which I have had the assistance of Dr. Arnold W. Reitze, a former law professor at Case Western Reserve University in my congressional district, and now a professor at George Washington University's National Law Center. Dr. Reitze is one of the Nation's leading environmental lawyers; he is currently attending the Stockholm conference. I would also like to thank two of his assistants, Mr. Dennis

Koehler and Mr. Jeff Howard, recent graduates of George Washington Law School.

MAGNITUDE OF THE PROBLEM

In the United States, approximately 2½ billion gallons of lubricating oils are sold annually for industrial and automotive uses. One-half of this oil is consumed during use, and the remaining 1.25 billion gallons are drained periodically to be replaced with new oil.

Drained oil which has become physically and chemically contaminated during use is termed "waste" or "used" oil. In spite of the fact that used oil can easily be recycled as much as 75 percent of all such oil available for recycling may be disposed of in some environmentally harmful fashion.

WATER POLLUTION

Because lubricating oils will not break down under the extreme temperatures and pressures for which they are designed, they do not break down when discarded into the environment. With the exception of recycling, virtually all "uses" found for waste or used oils are ecologically harmful. Oil dumped on the surface of the ground penetrates that ground; once this oil reaches the ground water tables, the water can no longer serve as a source of potable water supply. For example, in chalky rock or limestone areas, where ground water runs through fractures in the rock formation, there have been numerous cases where minute quantities of oil have irretrievably rendered wells unfit for human water use. Even if diluted to a ratio of one part of oil to a million parts of water, the taste of groundwater is affected by oil.

Annually 150 million gallons of used oil are spread on roads. Recent tests conducted by EPA, however, have indicated that used oil does not perform such dust suppression functions very well. It emulsifies quickly during rainstorms and washes off the road or penetrates into the ground. It appears that slightly larger initial expenditures to purchase an oil or other product designed specifically for road use would result in a substantial long-term saving and serve to reduce the environmental damage caused by such use.

Used oils which find their way into sanitary sewer systems inhibit bacterial growth at sewage treatment plants, and thereby decrease the efficiency of the plants. Oils entering receiving streams as effluents from sewage treatment plants, or directly from storm drainage systems tend to adhere to floating particulates in the stream and sink to the bottom. The resulting bottom pollution destroys bottom dwelling plants and lowers marine life—often irretrievably.

U.S. Oil Week quoted EPA's Harold Bernard on January 25, 1971, as saying:

We polled [the Federal Water Quality Administration's] regional directors. Six of the nine indicated that used oil, dumped into sewers, is a serious problem in the sewage treatment plants and has caused fires in these plants, as well as caused treatment upheaval.

Perhaps the best reason that can be advanced for not disposing used oils in

a manner which pollutes the environment is the economic one. EPA's Bernard estimates that it may cost \$1,000 to clean up a 100-gallon oil slick in a river. He concludes:

That's \$10 per gallon for a waste product that costs on the order of 5 cents per gallon to dispose of in an acceptable manner.

AIR POLLUTION

One alternative to dumping used oil is burning it for heat recovery. This creates a major air pollution problem, however, since the unrefined waste oils produce dangerous levels of metal oxides when burned. The January 1971 issue of *Fortune* magazine featured an article entitled "Metallic Menaces in the Environment." It quotes Dr. Henry A. Schroeder of the Dartmouth Medical School as saying:

Pollution by toxic metals is a much more serious and much more insidious problem than is pollution by organic substances. Most organic substances are degradable by nature; no metal is degradable.

A study prepared for the Association of Petroleum Rerefiners, shows that more than 1,000 pounds of metal oxides are released whenever 10,000 gallons of used motor oils are burned.

MASS MARKETING

The problem of waste oil disposal is further exacerbated by what has literally been a revolution in automotive oil sales—the shift from the service station to the mass marketer. Service stations, which in 1961 accounted for 70 percent of total automotive motor oil sales, saw their share of the market slashed to roughly 45 percent by 1971. The majority of the decrease has been taken up by the large chains and discount houses, which usually sell name brand lubricating oils direct to consumers at substantial savings.

The real environmental question posed by this change in motor oil sales patterns is: What are the people who buy their oil from these sources doing with their drained waste oils? Positive incentives must be developed to insure that they are not merely dumped onto the ground or into sewers, or incinerated before dangerous contaminants are removed.

OIL RECYCLING

A small industry of "oil rerefiners" currently exists in the United States. These rerefiners, operating their own collection facilities or contracting with independent used oil collectors, acquire used lubricating oils from varied automotive and industrial sources. They re-refine the used oil by subjecting it to physical and chemical processes similar in nature though not in scope to those utilized in refining crude oil. The re-refined or recycled lubricating oils, after the addition of appropriate oil additives and in some cases, after blending with refined virgin oils to meet certain used viscosity requirements, are substantially identical to new oils and are sold for same uses as new oils of comparable quality. In some instances, the recycled oil may even be superior for its intended use to many virgin oil products.

In 1965 there were approximately 150 used-oil rerefiners; today, according to recent testimony before the Joint Eco-

nomic Committee, there are approximately 50 remaining. The capacity of the rerefining industry was about 300 million gallons in 1960; today that capacity is less than 150 million gallons. A few years ago it was generally profitable for rerefiners and independent used-oil collectors to pay several cents per gallon for used oil; today those seeking to dispose of used oil often must pay several cents per gallon to have it hauled away. What has caused this decline in the oil recycling industry at a period when concern for the Nation's environment has grown tremendously? The answer seems to include adverse Federal Government actions and technological problems.

In 1965 the Excise Tax Reduction Act leveled a double-barreled blast at the rerefiners. Before that time there had been a 6-cent-per-gallon tax levied on the manufacturer of lubricating oil which was paid by the first user of that oil. Since rerefiners were exempt from paying this tax—the tax on the original oil had already been paid—the net result was a 6-cent-per-gallon competitive edge. The Internal Revenue Service changed all that in 1965, when it ruled that since these funds were to go into the Highway Trust Fund, off-highway users, notably railroads, could be refunded their full tax payments at the end of the tax year when they purchased 100 percent new lubricating oil. The IRS also refused to allow tax refunds on any new oils that were used in blending rerefiners. Thus the rerefiners lost their 6-cent-per-gallon margin in competing for the off-highway user market, and were required in addition to pay the 6-cent-per-gallon excise tax on all new oils purchased which are necessary in the re-refining blending process.

Also in 1965, the Federal Trade Commission ruled that all containers of re-refined oil produced for sale to the public had to be prominently labeled "previously used." While a true description as far as it goes, the obvious connotation of inferiority quickly plummeted retail sales of re-refined oil to half the previous level, and the industry never recovered its share of this massive consumer market.

The effect of the FTC ruling was increased by the lack of any objective methods for comparing recycled oil with new oil. Neither the Federal Government nor private oil interests have ever developed general performance standards or economically feasible testing procedures for new oils—let alone recycled oil—a failure which has largely frustrated the recyclers' efforts to convince the public of their products' comparative worth. Another result of this lack of comparison testing is the current Federal procurement policy that all Government purchase oil must be new and may not be used or reconditioned. It is clear that the reduced drain on the Nation's oil reserves which could result from recycled oil purchases by the Federal Government would be in the national interest.

The tremendous increase in the use of oil additives in recent years presents additional problems to the oil recycling industry. These additives, of course, have

performed some beneficial functions, most notably an increase in the life of certain types of oils. Automotive lubricating oil, for example, is now advertised as lasting for 4,000 miles, where several years ago oil changes were recommended every 1,000 miles. The longer useful "oil life" results in a relative decrease in consumption.

These same additives, however, must be removed in the early stages of the used-oil recycling process. The very nature of the additives—ability to withstand high temperatures, great pressures, and complex chemical reactions—makes them extremely difficult and costly to remove from used oil. Adding to this problem is the constant development of new additives; as soon as the oil recyclers succeed in removing one complex new additive from used oil, another, more complex oil additive appears on the market. There is no easy way out of this dilemma, except perhaps to discourage the use of new additives unless their total benefits clearly outweigh the total costs, including those of the oil recycling industry.

The final reason for the decrease in the amount of used oil actually recycled is environmental. Conventional re-refining technology yields a high percentage of acid sludge residue and other solid waste byproducts—as much as 30 percent of the total used oil processed. The recycling industry is finding that these unrefinable sludges pose serious waste disposal problems, and cannot be disposed of without some type of further treatment if—as they must—Federal and State pollution laws are to be complied with. Because the oil recycling industry's profit margins are generally low, the added costs of such treatment may prove to be prohibitive, forcing even more oil recyclers out of business.

Fortunately, new used-oil re-refining technologies may alleviate this problem. Preliminary results from an EPA grant funded research effort to develop such new recycling techniques indicate that the percentage of acid sludge residue can be reduced to as little as 5 percent of the volume of used oil processed, and can be of a type which satisfies sanitary landfill requirements. EPA believes that this new technology will prove to be more attractive economically than previous used oil recycling processes.

THE NATIONAL OIL RECYCLING ACT

In light of these environmental and energy problems, I am today introducing new legislation which I hope will go far to reduce the waste and environmental degradation caused by our failure to recycle used oil in significant quantities. This bill, rather than proposing new Federal laws making the dumping and incineration of used oils illegal, creates positive incentives which will lead to the recycling of a much greater proportion of the used oils now being wasted. Dumping and incineration of used oils, of course, which violates existing Federal and State statutes, remains illegal, and water pollution, air pollution, and solid waste control laws of the future may well result in tightened controls over used oil disposal. Meaningful enforcement of

any of these statutes will be difficult and expensive, requiring elaborate administrative control mechanisms.

My bill, therefore, seeks to minimize the need to expand the size of existing administrative police forces. Several short amendments to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 will simplify the tax treatment given lubricating oils, increasing Federal revenues by as much as \$75 million. Changes in Federal Trade Commission labeling requirements for recycled oil will not increase that agency's burdens. Requirements that retailers provide return and handling services for used oils can easily be enforced by spot checking conducted at the local government level. Provisions requiring the maintenance of records indicating the fate of used lubricating oils may increase the administrative burden somewhat, but such information is already required under existing laws and regulations of the Departments of the Treasury, Commerce, and the Environmental Protection Agency, as well as those of State agencies.

The bill contains several provisions which would amend existing tax laws covering lubricating oils. Basically, these amendments will result in a return to the uniform tax treatment accorded the entire lubricating oil industry prior to 1965, when the re-refiners were much healthier and when more than twice as much used oil was being recycled than is the case today.

The bill, if adopted, will equalize and simplify the tax on lubricating oil, requiring all producers of new lubricating oils, including hydraulic and cutting oils, to pay a 6-cent-per-gallon excise tax. In addition, no tax refunds or rebates will be granted to any users of lubricating oils. Recycled oil will continue to be exempt from any such tax.

By resubjecting cutting and hydraulic oils to the 6-cent-per-gallon excise tax under section 4091, and by removing the tax rebate currently given off-highway users of lubricating oil under section 6424, the bill will raise approximately \$75 million in additional tax revenue each year. These additional revenues will more than cover the cost of the other provisions of this bill. But more importantly, these amended tax provisions will serve to stimulate the purchase of recycled oil by industrial users. The removal of the 6-cent-per-gallon competitive edge now given to virgin oil refiners will once again enable recyclers of used oils to compete on the equal footing which existed prior to 1965.

The FTC labeling requirement will be changed by this bill so that the word "recycled" will be placed prominently on the face of all recycled oil containers. This is clearly preferable to the current FTC ruling requiring all recycled oils to bear the words "previously used" on their labels. Once the public is educated on the relative merits of recycled oil, and methods for quickly and economically comparing it with new oil are developed—the use of recycled oil should increase significantly.

Another provision of this bill makes it illegal for oil companies to prohibit their service stations or other lubricating oil retailers from stocking recycled oil prod-

ucts or selling the used oil that they collect.

Adoption of this legislation will also enable purchasers of automotive oils to return their used oil to the marketer in returnable, leakproof containers, thus further insuring that used oils are recycled. The bill also provides that all purchasers of automotive oil must pay a 10-cent deposit on all oil purchased in these returnable containers, regardless of their size. This deposit will be refunded when the container is returned to any marketer, regardless of whether or not it contains used oil. All marketers are required to provide ample disposal facilities on their premises for all used oil returned by consumers, and are encouraged to deliver or sell this collected used oil to the oil recyclers.

Other key provisions of the bill require all Federal Government officials to act within their respective authorities to encourage the use of recycled oils. When such oil is available at prices competitive with new oil, the bill requires that it be purchased and used by all agencies of the Federal Government, including the military, and by all private interests which are party to Government contracts. By conditioning Federal grants to the States on compliance with the provisions of this bill, the States are also encouraged to use recycled oil in a similar fashion.

PRESERVING OUR HERITAGE

HON. MORGAN F. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, both the Chicago Sun-Times and the Chicago Daily News recently featured editorials commending our colleague, DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, for his sponsorship of the Museum Services Act. This bill, H.R. 8677, which was cosponsored by Congressman JOHN BRADEMAs, would authorize funds for capital improvements to existing structures. It is an attempt to preserve many priceless treasures which would otherwise be lost forever.

In recent years a visit to the museum has become an increasingly popular American pastime. Increased attendance, however, has unfortunately not insured fiscal integrity, and museums have joined the ranks of the many institutions with rising monetary problems.

DAN ROSTENKOWSKI has recognized this situation, and he has acted to reinvigorate our museums. Both he and JOHN BRADEMAs deserve not only our praise but also our support.

I would like at this time to insert those editorials into the RECORD.

[From the Chicago Daily News, June 1, 1972]

TO PRESERVE OUR HERITAGE

The nation's museums have fallen on hard times. More popular than ever, attracting visitors by the millions, they are pinched by rising costs and increasingly conscious that the priceless collections they hold are threatened by theft, vandalism and such modern plagues as air pollution.

Meeting the costs of preservation and security by stiff admission fees is hardly an answer; the collections should belong to all the people. Private philanthropy continues to provide a major share of museum support, as do local public tax funds, but recent surveys indicate that more is needed. The National Council on the Arts warned early in May that "only a major concentrated effort . . . can restore and safeguard our heritage for future generations."

The federally funded council is moving to help where it can with matching grants for renovation and preservation. In Chicago, the Field Museum of Natural History, the Art Institute and the Oriental Institute at the University of Chicago have been named recipients of aid. But the council's grants through its National Endowment for the Arts are currently at a level of only \$1.2 million, and even if the aid is increased in the coming year, as the council hopes, it will fall far short of the need.

A broader aid measure is pending in Congress, co-sponsored in the House by Rept. Dan Rostenkowski (D-Ill.). It would provide up to half of the cost of special projects aimed at preserving and renovating cultural collections that otherwise might be lost. It would authorize \$40 million for that purpose.

The time has surely arrived when the museums should be regarded as the custodians of our national heritage, and as such receive national support. The Rostenkowski bill (H.R. 8677) deserves speedy consideration and wide backing.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, June 4, 1972]

PRESERVING PRICELESS TREASURES

It was fortunate that the Dead Sea scrolls were preserved in a cave, Nancy Hanks, chairman of the National Council for the Arts, recently remarked. If they had been kept in a museum they never would have survived.

This may come as news to many persons who understand and appreciate the need to preserve America's priceless museum treasures but who assume that once they are under a roof conservation is assured. Not so, says Miss Hanks.

Pollution, vandalism, bad storage and gallery conditions are destroying an irreplaceable part of our cultural heritage. Uncontrolled humidity, lighting and temperature can ruin the collections in our art, science and history museums.

Most museums are of local sponsorship but the items they house are of country-wide interest. The federal government has and should contribute to conservation costs. The National Council of Arts recently announced 69 grants, which must be matched by local funds, to museums and art institutions, including the University of Chicago's Oriental Institute, the Field Museum of Natural History, and the Art Institute of Chicago. Air conditioning to prevent deterioration is one of the important items needed in many museums.

More money will be needed next year and in years to come. A bill (H.R. 8677) has been introduced by Reps. Dan Rostenkowski (D-Ill.) and John Brademas (D-Ind.) to provide financial relief to the nation's museums. Rostenkowski noted that in 30 years the nation's 6,000 museums have increased attendance figures from 30 million visits a year to 700 million. Chicago institutions accommodate about 8 million annually.

The very increase in traffic puts a strain on the institutions, but that's what they are intended for—public education and use. The modern-day interest in museums, sparked by more leisure time for more people, requires more museum help and maintenance cost. We urge Congress to give priority to the Rostenkowski bill; the nation's cultural heritage must be saved.

THE LOGIC OF GUN CONTROLS

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD an excellent editorial which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on Saturday, June 10, 1972, on the commend the observations made in the editorial to the attention of all Members:

THE LOGIC OF GUN CONTROLS

It is a simple fact to those of us who must publicly deal with gun-ownership matters, that the mail generated will run three-or-four to one against gun control laws. Today's letters column is but a sampling of *con* gun control response. This mail is useful, because it indicates what is right and what is faulty in the public's reasoning about proposed gun control legislation.

The most dangerous misconception about gun-owning is that guns are good for self-defense. As gun law expert Franklin E. Zimring pointed out in a recent issue of *The Nation*: "Even though the great majority of handguns are kept for household self-defense, it is absolutely clear that the handgun in your house is more likely to kill you or a member of your family than to save your life. In Detroit more people died in one year from handgun accidents alone than were killed by home-invading robbers or burglars in four and a half years."

From the point of view of self-protection, the statistics show it would be better to get rid of one's gun than to keep it even in the face of rising general levels of gun ownership and housebreakings. There is a relationship between gun ownership levels and crime, which we will mention in a moment. But more significantly, most gun violence does not occur during robberies or other such criminal acts where strangers are involved. They occur between people who know one another, in a moment of anger or fear. And while it may be true that anything can be used as a weapon at such moments, guns are vastly more likely to lead to death—five times more so than knives. Further, among guns, the cheap Saturday-night special handgun—chief target of current gun-control efforts—is particularly lethal because of the kind of path its small-bore bullet traces on impact. Hence, on the self-defense issue, logic argues for not owning handguns.

Opponents of gun control regularly argue: Get at the criminal; the gun of itself commits no crime. As discussed above, this ignores the fact that most gun assaults or accidents occur when "crime" is not a factor, among persons who are not in the usual sense "criminals." Also, there appears to be a link between general gun ownership levels and the use of guns for crime. Again quoting Mr. Zimring: "As self-defense gun ownership increased in the '60's, so did the extent to which guns were employed in robberies and other criminal attacks. The most striking data on this trend come from Detroit, where racial disorders in 1966 and 1967 set off a wave of gun purchases. Accidental gun deaths tripled from 1966 to 1967, criminal gun attacks increased twice as fast as did all other types of attack, and criminal gun killings increased 10 times as fast as killings by all other means."

In our view, the estimated 200 million firearms in the United States are simply too many. Last year, at least a million cheap handguns were added to the total. We would like to see the number of guns reduced—particularly handguns which are nine times more likely to cause human fatality than

long guns and serve no real sporting purpose. There are proposals (Senator Hart's bill in the Senate forbidding handgun ownership, for instance) that would do just this.

But if such legislation is too much for gun owners to take, there is a variety of lesser measures to which they should not object. The licensing of gun owners and registration of all weapons, as some bills propose, would not keep sportsmen from owning bona fide sporting weapons.

Other, stricter legislation, such as Rep. Abner Mikva's bill, would end the sale of more handguns. It would enable those who own handguns to keep them in their homes if they must insist on such hazardous "self-protection." Yet it would in effect call a halt to the private firearms race in America and avoid the kind of emotional confrontation which outright confiscation might entail. This is a sensible legislative course, which Rep. Emanuel Celler, chairman of the key House Judiciary Committee has included in his own firearms control bill.

There are, then, legislative options which could help reduce the dangers of private firearms in America without doing damage to the interests of those who wish to hunt or for whom gun ownership is a matter of quasi-civil right.

Unfortunately, the whole issue is clouded in the public's mind by irrelevancies. (For instance, the analogy between auto deaths and gun deaths: By speed limits, traffic signs, vehicle and highway safety design regulations, government is acting to reduce auto fatalities, which is more than it is doing in the gun-control area.)

Pending gun-control proposals in Congress are reasonable, not radical. And the disproportionate flow of letters from those opposed to controls should not distract legislators, or editors and their readers, from the fact that the majority of citizens actually favor prompt passage of gun-control laws.

SPECIAL CEREMONIES ON FLAG DAY

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, across this Nation today many Americans are observing Flag Day with special ceremonies honoring this country's Stars and Stripes.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a special Operation Youth sponsored by Xavier University in Cincinnati, Ohio.

This is the 21st Operation Youth program to be held by that school.

The participants are high school students from the entire State of Ohio who have finished their junior year.

These young citizens are participating in a seminar on government and patriotism.

They will be active in mock political campaigns, conventions, elections and will have special speakers, many of them prominent Ohioans who will discuss the various aspects of government.

They will honor Flag Day with six color guards. Brig. Gen. Homer Long of Fort Knox, Ky., will be the main speaker.

I wish to commend the faculty and the students at Xavier University who have put forth the effort to develop such a

fine program which will surely increase the interest and dedication of our young citizens to participate in our Government.

FORD AND OUR FUTURE

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, few matters surpass in importance the pollution of our environment to present critical levels. Affluence has paid its toll in effluence. The necessity for abatement of this threat to our planet's health and well-being has not gone unheeded in our own lawmaking capacity. Congress created the Environmental Protection Agency and armed it with sufficient power to begin the task.

But I am alarmed by recent developments in the automotive industry which fly in the face of the intent of Congress, the EPA and the citizens of this Nation so deeply concerned.

Less than 2 years ago, emission standards were laid down for the 1972-75 period with each year reflecting a most stringent degree of control to result in dynamic reductions in pollution emission. Detroit lobbyists actively campaigned against these standards, spending more time and effort at legislative persuasion than at positive research and development. It now appears that the automotive industry may circumvent regulatory standards altogether.

Ford has volunteered information that will not qualify for full emission control certification by the EPA prior to the distribution of the 1973 models. Ford dealers, therefore, may not market the 1973 vehicles until EPA has certified Ford's compliance with the 1973 standards. I commend Ford for its integrity in disqualifying itself voluntarily, but I cannot close my eyes to the potentially disastrous agreement between EPA and Ford that will follow.

In lieu of marketing its 1973 vehicles, Ford plans to add 40,000 cars and about 65,000 trucks to its present model runs. The long-range effect of such a deal looks as though it possibly may continue production of its so-called present line through 1973, through 1974, and ad infinitum. EPA is naturally powerless against such an occurrence so it is our duty in Congress to legislate against the potentially destructive tactics which could very well be employed on a much greater scale than now contemplated by Ford for 1973 models.

I personally have grave doubts whether Ford or any other producer should be permitted to market even a limited number of 1972 vehicles after December 31, 1972, unless 1973 standards for emissions are met.

Time has come to recognize that we are between a rock and a hard spot. The June 8 issue of the Wall Street Journal speculates that quite possibly Ford will solve the dilemma by merely producing 1974's to the end of the century:

ONLY FORD TINKERS

Once again, the Environmental Protection Agency has demonstrated it will not swerve from doing its duty. It will allow Ford Motor Co. to produce its 1973 models, but won't let it sell them until full emission-control certification is granted. Once again, the environment is protected.

There's a slight hitch. Because Ford doesn't want to deliver to its dealers stacks of 1973 autos that the dealers can admire but not sell, it has decided to add 40,000 cars and 65,000 trucks to its 1972 model run. Now the emission standard for 1972 autos is less stringent than for the 1973s. Which means that Ford, which would really like to sell the 1973 while awaiting certification, is in a real sense being forced to further pollute the atmosphere with its 1972s.

It doesn't seem like the best solution, but at least EPA manages to punish Ford for its sins. We wonder, though, if Ford had not dutifully volunteered the information that some of its engineers were too fast on the screwdriver, would EPA have ever found out? Then again, good faith has to be assumed if this kind of program is to work without EPA having to hire thousands of tailpipe sniffers. So in the absence of a general round of confessions, it has to be assumed that of all the world's automakers, only Ford tinkers.

The worst part of the compromise, though, is that it may create a dangerous precedent. The really tough emission standards, which will add \$400 to \$500 to the cost of an auto, are due on the 1975 models. Remembering Ford's decision to extend this year's model run, an automaker might decide to dodge the new rules and at the same time gain a price advantage: He could keep right on building 1974s to the end of the century.

TRIBUTE TO DR. J. CUTLER ANDREWS

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I announce the passing of a highly respected scholar and professor, Dr. J. Cutler Andrews. The Chatham College community has lost a man of great intellect and humanity. His guidance and counsel will be missed.

Dr. Andrews, a man whose academic successes are world renowned, died Friday June 2. He was a noted historian in the field of journalism and author of a number of historical books and articles.

Two of the books, "The North Reports the Civil War" and "The South Reports the Civil War," won wide acclaim as the best works on the subject of the newspaper reporting of that war.

"The North Reports the Civil War" won the Kappa Alpha Tau Award for outstanding research in the history of journalism.

A graduate of Ohio Wesleyan College, Dr. Andrews received his doctorate in history from Harvard University in 1936.

He was a member of a number of historical associations including the American, Pennsylvania, Western Pennsylvania, and Mississippi Valley Historical Associations.

He also served as past president of the Pennsylvania Historical Association.

He was a member of the Phi Beta Kappa Honorary Society and the Mount Lebanon United Methodist Church.

Surviving are his widow, Dorothy Peterson Andrews; two sons, Kenneth and Malcolm; a daughter, Sharon; and one sister, Mrs. Mary DeGolia.

THE STARS IN OUR EYES

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, 1777, the Continental Congress declared the Stars and Stripes to be our country's national flag. There have been many stars added to our flag over the years, and I am proud that I can join with my colleagues and those in our country who recognize the many great things that our Nation's flag stands for, in this tribute on Flag Day.

There are many in our country, however, who would not only destroy our flag but our Nation which it symbolizes, as well. Unfortunately these few who have burned and desecrated our flag, and those who teach and practice revolution for revolution's sake, know little by personal experience of conditions in other countries. Those who have suffered as citizens of foreign countries less free than ours know the greatness of our country. To them the stars in our flag are symbolic of a heaven-sent blessing.

The price of freedom is vigilance and the willingness of our people to make sacrifices for God and country. We could lose our freedoms by taking our freedoms too much for granted. We should take time to remind ourselves that ours is a Nation under God despite the propaganda by those who would like us to believe otherwise.

Recently, on June 2, 1972, Yolanda Maurer, a reporter for the Fort Lauderdale News, one of the newspapers in my congressional district, wrote a very thought provoking article which reveals her feelings as one who immigrated to our country and became a citizen. Her anger at the recent desecration of American flags, by some, last Memorial Day is eloquent and thought-provoking. I commend this article to all patriots and non-patriots because it is worth thinking about:

TORTURE OFFENDERS: FLARE UP OVER FLAGS (By Yolanda Maurer)

I'm angry.

In fact, I'm boiling mad.

I've been mad and shaken with helpless anger ever since the news of the desecration of the flags on Memorial Day by local vandals came out in the paper.

Normally, I don't take too kindly to flag-wavers and patriotic speech makers.

I figure that love for your country is as natural as love for your family: you don't have to talk about it all the time to convince yourself or others of it.

Besides, I've seen too many dictators in my days use narrow nationalism in guise of patriotism not to be afraid by certain ways of waving the flag...

But for anyone to abuse the American flag—and on the graves of soldiers besides is too much.

If whoever did it is found, I think that fines or even prison would be ridiculous.

I think we should re-instate the good old torture system of the medieval days—and let them have a little of it at a time . . . for each soldier who died for that flag.

This may seem like a pretty violent reaction to you.

So maybe it is.

Maybe it is because I remember how I saw the American flag close-up for the first time.

It was through the bars of a military prison in North Africa, where the Germans had imprisoned a group of hostages. I was one of them.

We had been there for a few weeks, and we knew that our only chance of not being shot was if the Americans made it on time.

There had been the sound of battle raging outside all that night, and, at dawn, from inside the jail, we didn't know who had finally won . . .

Suddenly, there were shouts outside, trucks driving up, men getting off . . . men running through the corridors, doors banging open all the way down the halls . . . and suddenly, they were there!

The Americans were there . . . tall, handsome, dirty, smiling, grinning, kissing, looking to us like the Angels from Heaven themselves . . .

And behind them, in the bright sunlight of the courtyard, a sun we hadn't seen for many a day, there was a beautiful flag waving gently in the sun, a flag full of stars and stripes, the flag of America.

We had waited four long years of shame, frustration and anger to see this flag fly freely—with all that stands behind it.

Nothing since, except the sight of a loved face—has ever looked as beautiful to me.

This is perhaps why I take the desecration of the flag as a personal injury.

I am not American-born.

America is my country by adoption, by choice, so to speak.

Sometimes, people love their adopted children even more than their natural ones.

Because they didn't just happen to be born.

They were chosen, selected, desired, and wanted eagerly.

You have some of these same feelings when you "choose" a country and renounce that of your birth.

You can't stand to see it abused, debased or vilified.

This doesn't mean that you are blind and deaf to its shortcomings and its failures.

Which would be a form of stupidity.

It's just that, with all the things wrong with America—and believe me, I know them all—I still can see all the things right with it.

America—and the flag for which it stands—has fed half the earth in times of need, has spanned the cosmos to walk on the Moon, has built more courtrooms to keep its people free, and more classrooms to educate them than any one else, has made the world safe from disease, and continues to do so, has been the first to come to the rescue of every country in the world struck by a natural calamity.

America, rebuffed by other ideologies, forgetting that it is the mightiest of them all, still tries with good faith and humility to build a bridge to live with others in understanding and peace.

Its President, putting pride aside, takes the first steps and covers the world in search of that peace and understanding.

What other country could you pick to "adopt" that would make you prouder?

And, when hippie-like, I say: "Keep the faith, baby", the kind of faith I mean is in America—and the flag which stands for it.

Those who have forsaken even this faith must know inside, the darkness of Hell.

GO SLOW ON THE FAST BREEDER REACTOR

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the House Appropriations Committee is in the process this week and next of marking up the 1973 appropriations bill for the Atomic Energy Commission. Among the issues which the committee and the House must face on this bill is whether we should commit the United States to rapid development of a demonstration project on the liquid metal fast breeder reactor—LMFBR. Although the Nixon administration and the AEC are pushing such action, responsible scientific and public opinion has raised serious questions concerning the hazards to public safety and the environment from construction and operation of the LMFBR. I share their concern and last March urged the Joint Atomic Energy Committee not to move beyond the R. & D. stage on the fast breeder reactor, but to pursue actively alternative sources of energy, including a demonstration of coal gasification and making feasible the use of solar energy and nuclear fusion.

Two articles which concisely detail the problems with the LMFBR are "Another SST" prepared by the Committee for Environmental Information which appeared in the July-August 1971, issue of *Environment* and "The Breeder: Abort It Before It Multiplies," by Sam Love, which appeared in the April 1, 1972 issue of *Environmental Action*.

I commend both of these articles to the Members for their serious consideration.

The following is the text of the articles on the liquid metal fast breeder reactor:

ANOTHER SST?

On May 26, THE Scientists' Institute for Public Information (SIPI) filed a complaint in federal court charging the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission with violation of the National Environmental Protection Act. This action was announced at a press conference by Dr. Margaret Mead, president of SIPI. We have asked the U.S. District Court of the District of Columbia to require the Atomic Energy Commission to consider alternatives to its program for the development and proliferation of a new type of nuclear power plant, a program which is to cost at least two billion dollars in federal funds, and to issue a statement required by the National Environmental Policy Act describing these alternatives and the potential impact of this program on the environment. SIPI is represented in this action by attorneys associated with the Natural Resources Defense Council, a public-interest law firm.

The program in question is the development and proliferation of the so-called Liquid-Metal-Cooled Fast Breeder Reactor (LMFBR), which is a kind of nuclear power plant in which plutonium serves as fuel. This type of power plant will have a number of serious disadvantages, primarily because of the use of plutonium. Nuclear power plants of the type now being constructed rely on the splitting of uranium atoms to produce the heat that is ultimately turned into electricity. Although present nuclear plants have drawbacks, the way in which they are designed includes safety features. The splitting of uranium atoms in the fuel relies on the presence of water to slow the

neutrons that perpetuate the process. Any severe overheating or mechanical disturbance would expel the essential water and end in the plant's shutting down.

The LMFBR, however, relies on plutonium fuel, and the slowing of neutrons is unnecessary—it is called a "fast" reactor for this reason. Any outside force disturbing the fuel, or any agent which leads to overheating, may cause compaction of the plutonium, so that nuclear reactions, instead of being halted as in present plants, may be accelerated. The consequence might be a nuclear explosion, which would release enormous quantities of radioactive materials, including plutonium, to the general environment.

Plutonium is one of the most toxic materials known, and even without a severe accident, the existence of a large number of LMFBRs could result in plutonium contamination of the environment. The chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Glenn Seaborg, estimates that in 30 years, at which time he expects LMFBRs to generate a large share of the country's electric power, almost 100 tons of plutonium will be produced annually.

This enormous production of plutonium and the resulting fuel efficiency are actually the principal motives for the construction of LMFBRs, which are designed to produce more plutonium than they burn. The reactor itself will consist of a central core, in which plutonium will be split to produce heat, and an outer "blanket" of uranium-238, the common form of the element. Neutrons produced by the splitting of plutonium will slowly transform the uranium in the blanket into more plutonium, which can be extracted and burned as fuel.

Uranium, therefore, is the actual source of energy for the LMFBR, as it is for current nuclear plants. The LMFBR, however, converts the uranium into plutonium, which is burned as more plutonium is made.

The advantages of this process are economic. Only a small fraction—less than one percent—of uranium as it is mined is suitable for nuclear fission. To serve as fuel, the proportion of this "fissionable" material—the rare isotope uranium-235—must be increased at great expense.

In the LMFBR, however, ordinary uranium, the common isotope uranium-238, is converted into plutonium, which serves directly as fuel in the plant. The expensive separation of the two uranium isotopes is avoided and, presumably, the LMFBR would be able to produce correspondingly cheaper electricity. As a side benefit, reserves of uranium would be conserved.

These economic benefits are highly speculative, since the design for a working LMFBR has not been chosen. The first commercial effort to build such a plant, the Enrico Fermi Nuclear Power Plant near Detroit, Michigan, has been a financial and technical failure. It has not succeeded in producing more than a trickle of electric power (a fossil-fueled plant has been built to supplement it), nor has it produced any plutonium. It was shut down in 1966 after an accident, and only recently has begun to operate again on an experimental basis.

Assuming that a commercially attractive LMFBR is designed, it will depend on an expanding power industry. Calculations showing economic benefits from the LMFBR assume that electric power production will continue to grow at roughly its present rapid rate well beyond the end of the century. Should the power industry cease to grow or even grow very much more slowly over the next 30 to 50 years, the LMFBR would become a financial liability. Its attraction lies in the rapid production of more plutonium for further power plants—but if new plants are no longer needed, the fuel will be unnecessary, and the plants themselves will be more costly than their predecessors.

It is by no means necessary or certain that

electric power production will continue to grow at present rates. The limited ability of the environment to absorb waste heat and pollutants will compel a slowing or even a reversal of this growth. The Atomic Energy Commission, however, by conducting a massive program on the assumption that growth will continue, is actually helping to fulfill its own prophecy. A massive federal investment in new power production facilities is a partial assurance that they will be used.

The desirability of such rapid and continued growth is questionable on many grounds. The development of the LMFBR, which is justified by continuation of this growth, would therefore seem to be open to question.

Even assuming the continued growth of electric power production, however, there are a variety of energy sources which do not suffer from the considerable drawbacks of the LMFBR. The production of plutonium carries with it a unique risk of contamination of the environment through catastrophic accident and through routine carelessness. The shipping, handling, and long-term storage of radioactive wastes from nuclear reactors will be a massive environmental hazard for generations succeeding ours. An additional hazard, perhaps a more serious one, is of illegal diversion of plutonium to military uses. The Atomic Energy Commission itself has called attention to the hazards of a black market in plutonium, which Glenn Seaborg predicts when the electric utilities have been converted to what he calls "the plutonium economy of the future."

Alternative methods of producing electric power without these hazards range from different designs of nuclear power plants to solar, tidal, and geothermal energy, which draw on the pollution-free resources of sunlight, tides, and subterranean heat. More efficient and cleaner means for utilizing coal, oil, and natural gas are also under development. Perhaps most significant for the long term is the development of fusion reactors, which would not produce the quantities of dangerous wastes associated with today's reactors and the LMFBR. Research and development of fusion reactors have been reduced as a result of the crash program to develop LMFBRs.

The AEC is promoting the LMFBR to an extent unmatched by any other program, public or private, for developing new or improved means for generating electricity. The great expense and long lead-times associated with the development of new energy technologies will give the LMFBR development program an irreversible momentum unless environmental hazards and alternatives to LMFBR are considered now.

The National Environmental Protection Act requires the Atomic Energy Commission to consider these alternatives before proceeding with its program for the commercial development of LMFBRs, and to publish its considerations, along with its judgment of the environmental impact of the proposed program and alternatives, in a statement to be circulated for public comment and review and to accompany its request for funds from Congress.

SIPI believes it is of the greatest importance that the environmental impact of the LMFBR development program and the alternatives to that program be given full consideration, and has therefore taken legal action to compel the Atomic Energy Commission to do so. The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) became effective in January 1970, and in our view the AEC should have prepared the required statement last year in connection with its proposal to Congress for funding of the LMFBR program. But no such statement was prepared. The shortness of time and the agency's unfamiliarity with NEPA perhaps provided some excuse for the AEC's neglect last year. However, NEPA has now been effective seventeen months, and the AEC has

made its second round of authorization and appropriation requests to Congress since the act's passage. Again these requests were not accompanied by a NEPA statement as the law requires. As a result of the AEC's neglect of this important nondiscretionary duty, the public and the Congress have been deprived of the careful assessment and robust public discussion that NEPA was designed to stimulate.

While the AEC has committed itself to circulate NEPA statements on individual nuclear reactors as they are built and licensed, such statements are quite inadequate for considering the LMFBR program as a whole and in comparison with the appropriate alternatives. Although necessary, an investigation of individual reactor facilities and siting is no substitute for the timely and thorough assessment of what has become the nation's highest priority energy program.

THE BREEDER: ABORT IT BEFORE IT MULTIPLIES (By Sam Love)

Some time in the next few months Congress will decide whether funds should be voted for an Atomic Energy Commission program to commercially develop and proliferate a new type of nuclear reactor, the Liquid Metal Cooled Fast Breeder Reactor (LMFBR). Its salesmen at the AEC tout this reactor, which can make more fuel than it uses, as the realization of mankind's dream of finding a perpetual motion machine. Its critics find its potential for environmental destruction staggering.

At a time when the new chairman of the AEC, Dr. James Schlesinger, is publicly stating before such audiences as the Atomic Industrial Forum that his agency is no longer in the business of promoting nuclear energy, the LMFBR program is being promoted to an extent that is unmatched by any other program. This salesmanship plus at least two billion dollars of federal funds by 1980 will give the breeder reactor a momentum that is much greater than any alternative energy source.

This year Congress is being asked for over \$230 million for breeder research and for the construction of a demonstrator plant. This electrical generating plant will be built in cooperation with a private utility for the purpose of demonstrating the commercial feasibility of the breeder. According to the AEC, two or three such units should be operating by 1980.

Research on the LMFBR and other breeder designs has been underway for years but it is only recently that the decision has been made by the AEC to give top priority to an LMFBR cooled with liquid sodium. As the agency's plans for the commercial development of the LMFBR have become known, the controversy has heightened.

On May 26, 1971, the Scientists' Institute for Public Information (SIPI) and the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) filed suit in federal court charging that the AEC had violated the National Environmental Policy Act by not preparing a statement on the environmental impact of the breeder program. A few months later, President Richard Nixon released a statement of support for the LMFBR program and said that the AEC would prepare a NEPA statement on the individual demonstrator plants.

The decision by the AEC and the President to prepare a statement on individual plants did not answer the charges of the SIPI suit. The issues raised by the scientists' group deal with the environmental impact of constructing large numbers of plants (the AEC projects 600 LMFBRs will be on line by the year 2000), the dangers associated with shipping large amounts of radioactive plutonium, the waste problems associated with the breeder and other questions. The SIPI-NRDC motion to get an environmental impact statement on the program has been denied by a district court judge, but an appeal

of the decision is being considered by the scientists' group.

If the court rules that an environmental impact statement on the entire program is necessary, more information on the AEC's breeder program plans will be available for public scrutiny. Enough information is available now that a considerable number of scientists believe that a commitment to the LMFBR as our principal future energy source is a mistake.

The very process which makes the breeder attractive is also its most controversial feature. It is unique because it potentially can create more fuel than it consumes. This is possible because non-fissionable uranium (U-238), which cannot be used by the present generation of nuclear reactors, can be converted in the breeder into a man-made fissionable element, plutonium. Because U-238 is more abundant than the isotope U-235 which is used by present reactors, the breeder requires less mining of uranium. Also, it will not need to have its fuel prepared by the expensive isotope separation process necessary to create fuel for present reactors, so the AEC envisions breeders producing electricity at a lower cost than conventional methods of production. Because a price reduction is dependent on proliferation, the AEC contends that a large number of breeders is necessary.

But as America has found out with the present reactors, everything that glows is not golden. Proliferation of the LMFBRs will necessitate the movement of large amounts of plutonium between reactors, fuel reprocessing facilities and waste disposal sites. If some plutonium escapes into the environment through accident or sabotage, the results could be disastrous. With a half-life of 24,000 years, plutonium is radioactive far longer than the relatively short half-lives (about 15 years) of the by-products of today's light water reactors. It is also far more dangerous—a speck on the lungs can be fatal.

At this point it appears that the LMFBR may have a greater potential for accident than the reactors in use today. An article in the September 10, 1971 issue of *Science*, entitled "Radiation-Induced Swelling of Stainless Steel," outlines how the intense neutron bombardment which occurs in the LMFBR produces changes in the size of the structural materials which surround it. This can result in swelling of metals used in the construction of the reactor core. These changes in the tolerances in the core can affect coolant flow and they might precipitate the overheating of the core and the melting of the plutonium.

Another problem which plagues breeder designers is fuel handling. The advantage of the breeder is that plutonium will be generated, but retrieving the newly-created radioactive substance necessitates much more frequent fuel handling than is necessary in today's reactors. The systems for handling the fuel are described by the Atomic Energy Commission in their LMFBR feasibility study as "the most complex feature of an LMFBR." Their study suggests that fuel handling features should be given top priority for research.

Once the plutonium is lifted from its birth place in the reactor core, it must be transported to a fuel reprocessing plant so that it can be made into new fuel elements. Should an accident occur—a major concern of those critical of the LMFBR program—plutonium could leak out of the cylinders during transit. Another fear surrounding plutonium movement is that some of the material may be diverted for use by unauthorized parties. The diversion of a relatively small amount is all that is needed to construct a nuclear bomb. This is a point of serious concern in the SIPI lawsuit and in an April 9, 1971 article in *Science* entitled "Plutonium: Reactor Proliferation Threatens a Nuclear Black Market."

In referring to the problem of safeguarding plutonium, Ralph Lumb, chairman of a 1967 AEC advisory committee on safeguard-

ing materials, said in *Science* that it is "like any other business . . . the more you have of something, the more you're going to lose." At a present price of \$10,000 per kilogram, plutonium is five times as costly as heroin and ten times as expensive as gold.

AEC studies on the possibility of black-market diversion are classified, but enough information has been made public to reveal that diversion of plutonium for nuclear weapons construction is a definite possibility if the breeder proliferates. But until large quantities of plutonium are available, the problem will not be as serious because fuel cores for present reactors contain uranium enriched to only three percent whereas bomb-grade uranium requires about a 90 percent enrichment.

The problems of thermal pollution and waste disposal which plague present nuclear reactors will also curse the breeder. Although the LMFBR will generate a slightly smaller quantity of radioactive waste material, its waste will contain more plutonium than ordinary waste. This plutonium residue makes it more dangerous than our present radioactive legacy of over 100 million gallons.

The amount of thermal pollution the LMFBR causes will also be slightly less than our present reactors because of its unique liquid metal cooling system. Liquid sodium will be circulated in 2 closed loops inside the reactor. Sodium has been selected because of its heat transfer properties, low vapor pressure, and ease of circulation. In addition to its engineering pluses, however, it has a major drawback—it explodes on contact with air or water. Sodium has been chosen as the liquid metal coolant even though the AEC feasibility study completed in 1971 said: "Sodium-cooled reactors can be built and operated. However, here is no experience with large, central station, sodium-cooled fast breeder reactor systems. These larger plants will require a much broader technology than now available."

The study also said that the "state-of-the-art for detecting, locating, and containing sodium leaks, and for fighting sodium-air or sodium-water reactions is rudimentary."

Even though the AEC has officially endorsed the liquid sodium coolant, there is strong feeling inside the agency that other cooling system designs are superior. Although no one who works on breeder development is publicly attacking the decision to opt for liquid sodium, rumblings of discontent about the choice have been heard from inside the agency.

These rumblings are coming from those who have watched the breeder program since it began with the construction of the first Experimental Breeder Reactor (EBR-1) in 1951. The AEC heralds this event as a landmark occasion and has had the site declared a Registered National Landmark by the Interior Department. Even though it did prove the validity of the breeder theory, it also demonstrated its hazards. During an experiment in 1955, an accident occurred because an operator made a mistake. No one was hurt, but the temperature in the reactor core rose to over 2000 degrees Fahrenheit and the fuel rods melted. Such a meltdown could trigger a small explosion under certain conditions.

An official AEC publication, *Breeder Reactors*, describes the experience with EBR-1 this way: "Although years of hard work and further research lay ahead in applying the breeding principle to larger reactors, the EBR-1 demonstration gave a tremendous psychological boost to the scientists and engineers working toward breeder reactors and moved the breeder concept from the realm of hope to an area of more solid scientific foundation."

Another highlight in breeder history glossed over by the AEC is the experience with the Enrico Fermi plant located near Detroit. *Breeder Reactors* ends a three-sentence description of the plant with, "Al-

though a series of operating problems delayed sustained power-demonstration runs, the Fermi plant has provided valuable insight into some of the problems that may face large, commercial breeder plants." Those "operating problems" included major equipment failures, defective accident warning instruments, and a core meltdown which released radiation in the plant and put it out of operation for about five years. Now, it is operating again at low power.

In spite of all the problems that surround the breeder, Congress appears ready to give a full go-ahead to the AEC's plans to let the breeder become the flag ship of America's alternative energy fleet. One reason the LMFBR is receiving the red carpet treatment in the halls of Congress is the scare-talk of blackouts that the utilities have used to camouflage the issues of energy waste, and the production lag which has resulted from earlier AEC projections that have not been realized. Years of AEC and utility salesmanship have conditioned the public and Congress not to question energy production plans; yet, the real answers are only going to be found when the light of public discussion illuminates the blackout issue.

U.N. LAW OF THE SEA REPORT: SECTION 3

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, on Monday and Tuesday of this week, I have placed in the RECORD, sections 1 and 2 of my report on the upcoming Law of the Sea Conference, including part of a statement by the Honorable John R. Stevenson, legal adviser to the U.N. Seabed Committee. To conclude my report, I wish to submit today the balance of Mr. Stevenson's statement, concerning preparations for the 1973 Law of the Sea Conference, as follows:

U.N. LAW OF THE SEA REPORT

PREPARATIONS IN THE SEABED COMMITTEE

The General Assembly will decide the precise date and agenda of the 1973 Law of the Sea Conference next fall. In the meantime, there have been three meetings of the U.N. Seabed Committee since it has been charged with preparations for the Conference. The Committee now has 91 members.

Areas of broad agreement

During the section 3 meetings of the Seabed Committee, almost all members have indicated their general views. While the United States has not agreed with all the views expressed, the discussions to date indicate at least the broad parameters of a possible eventual agreement consisting of the following elements:

- (a) a 12-mile territorial sea, with freedom of navigation and overflight beyond that limit;
- (b) coastal State economic controls over fisheries and seabed resources beyond 12 miles;
- (c) an international regime for the seabed beyond the area of coastal State economic jurisdiction.

Unsettled issues

The key unsettled issues on which the success or failure of the 1973 Conference will doubtless hinge are the following:

- (a) How far beyond 12 miles should coastal State economic jurisdiction extend and should it be exclusive or subject to international standards and accountability.

- (b) Free transit through and over international straits.

- (c) The nature of the international regime and machinery in the area beyond coastal State economic jurisdiction.

- (d) The nature of the legal regime for the control of marine pollution beyond 12 miles.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I will be happy to supply the Committee, for the record, with copies of certain statements we have made explaining our position on these substantive issues in greater detail. However, in view of the widespread interest among developing countries in a 200-mile exclusive coastal State economic zone beyond the territorial sea, and the fact that some have included pollution control within this concept, I would like to outline our principal objections to such exclusive resource jurisdiction and to comment briefly on the pollution question.

Problems with the Exclusive Resource Zone

First, let me make it clear that we are not opposed to delegating extensive controls over resources to coastal States in broad areas beyond the territorial sea as part of an agreed Law of the Sea settlement.

However, it is our view that these controls must be based on an express delegation of authority from the international community, must take into account community interests, and must be accompanied by coastal State accountability to other members of the community. International standards and compulsory dispute settlement are accordingly essential. Exclusive coastal State economic jurisdiction tends to disregard the existence of community interests in the area, particularly as regards other uses such as freedom of navigation, overflight, and scientific research. There is a danger that exclusive economic jurisdiction may be expanded to interfere with such other uses.

Secondly, fisheries are more than just an economic resource. They are a vital source of animal protein for the world. There is, accordingly, a community interest in assuring that coastal State regulation is accompanied by accountability to the community for conservation and for ensuring maximum utilization of fisheries consistent with sound conservation practices. As a practical matter, there should be an agreed international formula regarding historic fishing activities of other nations in coastal areas.

Thirdly, fish do not observe arbitrary lines in the ocean. As a rule, fishing activity for particular stocks should be subject to the same management regime. Thus, coastal State regulation of coastal and anadromous species should be based on the migratory habits of such species. Moreover, certain species of fish such as tuna are highly migratory, frequently crossing entire oceans. Accordingly, we believe such migratory species can only be effectively managed by international and regional organizations rather than coastal States.

Fourthly, one of the important objectives of an international seabed regime is to provide for equitable sharing of benefits from seabed minerals. Most petroleum and gas resources are located in the continental margins off the coast. With few exceptions, these margins would be largely embraced by a 200-mile exclusive resource zone. Revenues for the international community as a whole from seabed minerals will not be very meaningful unless payments for this purpose are made not only with respect to the deep seabed exploitation of hard minerals contained in manganese nodules, but also, at least in some measure, with respect to the exploitation of the petroleum and gas resources of the continental margin beyond the 200 meter depth line. It is estimated that approximately one-half of the offshore petroleum lies beyond the 200-meter depth.

Finally, we believe that minimum interna-

tional standards for protecting other uses of the sea, as well as protecting the marine environment itself from pollution arising from seabed exploration and exploitation, are in the general interest, and that these should be applied to the continental margin beyond the 200-meter depth.

Pollution issues

As I indicated, a number of coastal States have urged that pollution jurisdiction should accompany coastal State resource jurisdiction in the area beyond a 12-mile territorial sea. This will doubtless continue to be an important area of discussion and negotiation.

First, let me indicate the areas where there seems to be agreement. Coastal State jurisdiction over marine pollution emanating from land is clear. Moreover, it seems generally understood that coastal State economic jurisdiction over seabed resources, including such jurisdiction in an intermediate zone, will include coastal State controls over pollution from exploration and exploitation of such resources. The issue is the extent to which such controls should be subject to international standards, inspection, and dispute settlement, including minimum standards promulgated by the international seabeds organization for this purpose.

There is difficulty in dealing with the question of pollution from vessels. On the one hand, the interest of coastal States in protection from such pollution is clear. On the other hand, the international interests in freedom of navigation could be seriously compromised by coastal State controls over vessels and their movements. Moreover, the fact that vessels by their very nature move over large distances tends to raise serious practical questions regarding the effectiveness and harmonization of different coastal State measures. At present, as I indicated, the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization is very active in the field of preventing pollution from vessels by agreed international arrangements, and has produced a number of Conventions on the subject. With respect to IMCO's future activities in this area, at least two problems must be addressed:

First, the role of IMCO in continuing to develop international standards, and the extent to which this role needs strengthening to protect the interests of coastal States.

Second, whether additional measures for international cooperation in enforcement are desirable, and the extent to which these should involve IMCO, coastal States, or both.

If I could summarize what I have said about coastal State resource jurisdiction and related pollution problems, it would be that the existence of strong international and non-coastal interests must be taken into account in determining the nature and extent of coastal State controls, but that there need be no inherent or inevitable conflict between the two if the problems are addressed by all concerned with precision and in a spirit of mutual accommodation.

The March meeting of the Seabed Committee

I propose to conclude with a review of the March meeting of the Seabed Committee held in New York.

With respect to seabeds, the meeting was encouraging. Debate was structured, and tended to highlight the issues discussed earlier. A working group was established on principles that would form the first section of seabeds articles; additional working groups on machinery are contemplated for the summer meeting in Geneva.

One disturbing element was the revival of the divisive issues inherent in the so-called "Moratorium Resolution" passed by the General Assembly in 1969 over the opposition of the United States and many others. That Resolution purported to declare a moratorium on all exploitation of the seabed beyond the limits of national jurisdiction.

Without defining those limits. Among its other undesirable features, such a resolution encourages coastal States to expand their jurisdiction at the expense of the international area—and indeed, one of the strongest supporters of the Resolution did just that. We believe that the development of technology will not prejudice options regarding a seabeds regime if we proceed on schedule with treaty negotiations. Moreover, recognizing the need to preserve such options, the President stated in 1970 that all exploration and exploitation beyond 200-meters should be subject to the international regime to be agreed upon. Accordingly, it is to be hoped that the Subcommittee will not permit itself to be diverted by attempts to revive the moratorium issue at the expense of constructive and timely work on the seabeds regime.

The second Subcommittee, charged with the more traditional law of the sea subjects, spent virtually the entire session waiting for three regional groups to complete a proposal on a list of subjects and issues that would form the basis for discussion. It was introduced in the last week and contained certain unbalanced formulations that most, if not all, delegations knew from the outset could not be accepted by others on a consensus basis. These formulations would, in effect, prejudice the ultimate resolution of the issues before substantive consideration of them was completed. Moreover, while certain delegations made very useful substantive statements in the Subcommittee—particularly on fisheries—others seem to exclude the possibility of substantive progress on any issue in the Subcommittee until the list has been agreed and there has been general discussion of the list as a whole and the priorities to be assigned for discussion of different subjects.

Since there is no substantial disagreement regarding the comprehensive nature of the list, but only regarding the wording of certain items, further work on the list should not be permitted any longer to impede substantive progress. Moreover, if possible a text of the list should be prepared in informal consultations prior to this summer's meeting that can be agreed at the outset of that meeting. The Chairman of the Committee has agreed to arrange for such consultations. A copy of the proposed list, as well as the U.S. proposed amendments, will be submitted for the record.

Despite the unfortunate aspects of the list exercise, a wholly negative interpretation is unwarranted. We now see more clearly the political parameters of the negotiation, and all delegations have a better understanding of each other's positions and the options available. This had to occur; what is unfortunate is the way it occurred and the amount of the time involved.

The third Subcommittee, charged with the subjects of pollution and scientific research, spent considerable time discussing the coordination of various international activities regarding marine pollution, and trying to identify the areas in which the Law of the Sea Conference could most usefully concentrate its efforts. Some delegations have been urging complete treatment of all aspects of marine pollution at the Law of the Sea Conference, including pollution from land-based sources. Others have emphasized the important responsibilities of other international organs in this field, and have taken a more cautious approach to the scope of the Law of the Sea Conference in this regard.

Mr. Chairman, while the preparatory work thus far has not fully met our expectations, we remain convinced that these negotiations and the Conference should continue on schedule. Technology is not standing still. Unilateral claims are proliferating. The essential element for success lies in the difficult political decisions that governments must make to reach agreement, not in technical work that can be completed expeditiously once such decisions are made. It is our view that delay will only increase the difficulty of reaching such decisions.

The oceans are not a remote and largely inaccessible part of the planet or the universe. They are an integral part of our entire existence. The interests at stake in resolving a new legal order for the oceans are diverse, immediate, and vital to almost everyone. If we can bring the collective will and collective procedures to bear on providing new and effective international law and international institutions for the oceans, this could well point the way to a new dimension in international relations and new confidence in the ability of the international community as a whole to come to grips with its most pressing problems.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT WOULD PUT EFFECTIVE CONTROL ON PURSE STRINGS

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleague from Michigan (Mr. ESCH) in sponsoring the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1972. Before enumerating the provisions of this comprehensive legislation, I wish to reflect for a moment on why I believe Congress must revise its procedures for controlling the purse strings of the Federal Government.

At the present time, much of the responsibility for Government fiscal policy has fallen into the hands of the executive branch by default. Congressional spending and budgetary procedures are far too disorganized and stop-gap to enable us to effectively plan and monitor our multibillion dollar budgets. As Congress has failed to update its appropriations procedures, more and more of the task of setting budgets straight and of setting spending priorities has shifted to the White House. That is not where the responsibility belongs.

Where have we failed? First of all, Congress has failed to respond to our inability to complete action on all appropriations measures before the fiscal year begins. We simply are unable to sift through about 14 massive appropriations bills between the end of January and the June 30 deadline. Unlike earlier days of 6- or 7-month sessions and smaller budgets, we now find ourselves considering legislation 10, 11, and even 12 months a year. Frequently, less than half of the appropriations are acted upon before the beginning of the fiscal year—leaving Federal agencies to operate under stop-gap continuing resolutions which undermine efficient planning and spending of funds.

Mr. ESCH and I have worked for several weeks on the draft of this bill. Our reason for including a change in the fiscal year to coincide with the calendar should not imply criticism of the Appropriations Committees of Congress responsible for reviewing budget requests.

On the contrary, under the very difficult time schedules imposed upon them, these committees and subcommittees do an excellent job of sifting through the myraid of complex spending requests which add up to over \$245 billion for the coming fiscal year. As an example of the Appropriations Committee's effort to complete as much of its review as possible before June 30, we had a request on the floor today for permission to bring up a complex appropriation measure next Tuesday—a measure not expected to be finally reported by the full Appropriations Committee until late Monday.

Under a calendar year fiscal year setup, there would be no need to ask Members of Congress to take final action on a large spending measure with no more than a few hours to study the details of the bill in advance. This kind of time schedule is nothing short of chaotic. It does not permit intelligent review of decisions to spend billions of taxpayers dollars. It is unfair to the Appropriations Committee which has spent several months preparing its report to the House, and it is unfair to the Federal agencies and the recipients of their programs—all of whom must live with the hasty result of this rush congressional action on their budgets.

I first proposed changing to a calendar budget year in the 90th Congress, back in 1968. Last year, I testified before the Joint Committee on Congressional Organization in favor of this change, and I am continuing to urge that the Government Operations Committee, on which I serve, take up this legislation. Despite my separate bill on this subject, I think the calendar budget year is a necessary and desirable inclusion in the Federal Fiscal Responsibility Act. For only if we have a reasonable time frame in which to consider Federal spending can we take an intelligent look at the budget as a whole.

Present appropriations procedures place fiscal responsibility last on the priority list. In acting on individual spending bills, each house of Congress makes separate decisions on whether more or less money should be allocated for programs than was budgeted by the administration. Through this procedure, we may add funds to an education bill or subtract funds for a defense project, but there is no mechanism which forces Congress to look at the entire budget picture at once. While many of us try to balance our own votes for high and low priority items, the actions of Congress as a whole usually do not balance spending with available dollars. Frequently, the administration responds by holding up, or impounding funds for specific programs in direct opposition to the intent of Congress. Here again, our powers over spending priorities have shifted to the Executive by default.

Mr. Speaker, the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1972 would restore to Congress a viable role in establishing budget priorities. It addresses four major areas in need of reform.

First, the bill reestablishes the fiscal year to coincide with the calendar year. This adjustment would give Congress 6 extra months to review the budget and

would greatly reduce the need to resort to continuing funding resolutions.

Title II of the bill requires Congress to set an annual expenditure limitation 45 days after the President has submitted his budget. This would force Congress to consider the state of the economy at the beginning of each budgetary cycle and to weigh various priority programs competing for limited dollars. In addition, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget is required to report to Congress at the end of the second and third quarters his estimate of how well Federal spending policies are complying with the expenditures ceiling. If the Director estimates that spending will exceed the ceiling for the current fiscal year, he can establish pro rata reductions in all Federal departments to bring spending in line with the limitation. Upon submission of the report, Congress would have 30 days to specify or exempt appropriations categories where the reductions shall be made. As a result, Congress would have an ongoing responsibility to monitor spending levels and to stay within its own spending limit.

Title III of the bill establishes a Federal impoundment procedure and distinguishes between pro rata impoundments and those targeted at specific programs. If the President decides to institute a pro rata, across-the-board reduction in any agency, he must immediately notify Congress of his impoundment. Either House of Congress would then have 60 days to disapprove the action. In cases where the President targets his impoundment to one budget category or program, he must notify Congress 30 days in advance and either House of Congress would have 30 days to disapprove the proposed action. By distinguishing between pro rata and targeted impoundments, Congress would be assured of prior consent to any withholding of funds for specific programs. This section of the bill also includes provisions to encourage prompt disbursement of Federal funds to State and local governments and to private contractors. If additional costs are incurred by the recipient of Federal funds because of a delay of 60 days or more, the Federal Government becomes liable for those extra costs.

Finally, the Fiscal Responsibility Act establishes a Commission made up of the Comptroller General and key members of the appropriations committees, the Senate Finance Committee, and the House Ways and Means Committee. The Commission would be charged with studying the entire authorization-appropriation process and recommending further steps to modernize congressional procedures.

Mr. Speaker, the people of America expect Congress to watch over the purse strings of Government and to set Federal spending priorities. Of all branches of Government, Congress is the closest to the people and it should be equipped to respond to these demands. But unless we adopt comprehensive reforms, we will continue to fumble our fiscal powers away—along with the tax dollars of our citizens.

The Fiscal Responsibility Act offers responsible alternatives that would help put both the budget and the powers of Congress back into balance. I want to commend our colleague, Mr. Esch, for the leadership role he has taken in this area, and I urge each of my colleagues to work with us to gain action on this measure.

RIGHT TO "FREE" LEGAL COUNSEL AT TAXPAYERS' EXPENSE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the new justice theories by those presently occupying the seats of the Supreme Court are beginning to hurt—not hurt the criminals but rather the taxpayers. Thus far the right to free legal counsel in misdemeanors does not take into consideration the increased cost to the taxpayers caused by additional judges and courtroom facilities which will be made necessary because of the additional trials and delays resulting from the egalitarian theories of judges.

An example of what is to come may be indicated by a report from nearby Virginia that the right to free legal counsel in any trial which can result in a jail or prison sentence is expected to affect some 3 million people and cost the taxpayers of that State \$15 million a year.

I ask that several newscippings follow.

[From the Evening Star, June 12, 1972]

COURT BROADENS DEFENDANT RIGHTS

The Supreme Court today ruled that the right to a lawyer applies to persons on trial even for minor crimes if they face jail or prison.

In a 7 to 2 ruling, the justices declared that any person put on trial for any kind of offense which may lead to a jail term, no matter how short, is entitled to a lawyer if he wants one.

The decision, in an opinion by Justice William O. Douglas, broadened a 1963 ruling guaranteeing an attorney for trials of serious crimes.

"Under the rule we announced today," Douglas wrote, "every judge will know when the trial of a misdemeanor starts that no imprisonment may be imposed . . . unless the accused is represented by counsel."

This apparently means that a crime leading only to fines, and not jail or prison terms, is the only kind of case in which the right to a lawyer does not apply. The court said it was taking no action on cases involving only fines.

Today's ruling is expected to have its heaviest impact in about half of the states. At present, two dozen states, the District, and the federal government guarantee the right to a lawyer in every case where jailing or imprisonment could result.

There were no outright dissents from the ruling. However, the two newest justices, Lewis F. Powell Jr. and William H. Rehnquist, said they would not have gone so far as the majority.

Instead, they said in an opinion written by Powell, they would provide that judges could decide on a case-by-case basis whether a person accused of a petty offense is entitled to an attorney.

Chief Justice Warren E. Burger, in a brief

separate opinion, suggested that the ruling "may well add large new burdens on a profession already overtaxed," but he concluded that "the dynamics of the professions have a way of rising to the burdens placed on it."

Today's decision grew out of the famous "Gideon" Decision of 1963, which held for the first time that the right to a lawyer applies in states as well as in federal criminal trials. Until today, however, the court had never indicated whether this right reached cases involving even such petty offenses as traffic violations.

[From the Evening Star, June 13, 1972]

RIGHT-TO-LAWYER RULING COSTLY IN VIRGINIA

(By Alex Preston and
Lyle Denniston)

A new Supreme Court decision giving any person a right to legal counsel in any trial which can result in a jail or prison sentence, will affect some 300,000 persons a year in Virginia and cost the state about \$15 million a year, State Atty. Gen. Andrew P. Miller said today.

Miller called a news conference in Richmond on the eve of the annual meeting of the State Bar Association, whose members already are talking about a special session of the General Assembly to make wholesale revisions in the state's misdemeanor laws.

Arlington County Commonwealth's Atty. William J. Hassan said Virginia had anticipated the court's ruling when the legislature earlier this year set up a six-member commission to study feasibility of establishing a public defender system.

MEETING THURSDAY

The study commission, scheduled to meet Thursday, will designate three localities to serve as pilot projects for the public defender system which entitles all persons to legal counsel.

The high court held, in a 7 to 2 decision yesterday, that any person is entitled to an attorney, even in relatively minor crimes, if a jail or prison sentence is a possible penalty. Virginia, like Maryland and about half the states, imposes an "either, or both" penalty for many misdemeanor offenses; that is a stated maximum fine or a jail term or both."

The impact on Maryland probably will be less than on Virginia. Maryland Deputy Atty. Gen. Henry Lord said his state has a public defender system and as a matter of policy has provided counsel for defendants in cases involving jail terms of 90 days or more.

"This (court decision) simply narrows it down from 90 to 1 (day)," Lord said.

But in Virginia, the ruling could be "catastrophic," according to C. Wynne Tolbert of Arlington, president of the State Bar. "The crowds of people that clutter the halls of our courthouses for cases in lower courts is unbelievable," he said.

"This decision could make the situation worse. I can't help but believe that the judge should be given more discretion in appointing attorneys to represent indigent persons."

Hassan said that mandatory jail terms are provided for certain types of traffic offenses, such as operating a motor vehicle on a suspended or revoked driver's permit.

"Although we had anticipated this decision," Hassan said, "we thought it would be more restrictive to certain types of offenses."

FISCAL PROBLEM

Under present law, Virginia provides attorneys for indigent persons accused of felonies—more serious offenses which carry penalties of one year in jail or \$1,000 fine or both. But no free legal counsel is provided for indigents in misdemeanor cases.

"This landmark ruling presents Virginia with a staggering judicial and fiscal problem," Miller said. He added that it seemed "incredible for such an opinion to come down

without any mention of its retroactivity. Do we have to free those currently serving jail sentences on misdemeanor convictions imposed without the participation of defense lawyers?"

Miller said his office has already compiled a list of offenses under Virginia law that could carry a jail sentence; the number is well over 1,000, including drunkenness and certain traffic law violations.

Arlington County Court Judge Thomas W. Dodge foresaw "a very significant expense to this county, with lawyers possibly being needed for 1,500 additional cases a year at a cost of about \$50 per case."

BURGER AGREES

In this vein, Chief Justice Warren E. Burger, in a concurring separate opinion, suggested that the ruling "may well add large new burdens on a profession already overtaxed" but he concluded that "the dynamics of the profession have a way of rising to the burdens placed on it."

The court said it was taking no action on cases involving only fines.

Several suggestions by the federal government, to make it easier for the states to adjust to the new ruling, were ignored by the court's opinion.

The key proposal by the Justice Department which favored yesterday's result, was that the court postpone the effective date of its ruling for a year, or perhaps until July 1 of next year.

But the states were given no option by the court except to adapt within about three weeks, which is the time it will take for the court to issue a formal order carrying out its suggestion.

OUR NATION SALUTES THE COURAGE AND FORTITUDE OF OUR HANDICAPPED

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1972, I had the great privilege of participating in the Humanitarian Awards program of the National Society of the Handicapped and the Joint Handicapped Council during the National Conference on the Employment of the Handicapped here in Washington. As I looked about me during the presentation ceremony—and later in warm person-to-person discussions with our handicapped visitors from my congressional district and the State of New Jersey—the distinction and honor of being one of the recipients of their "National Humanitarian Award" gave me great personal pride in having the opportunity here in Congress to vigorously support legislation to help meet the needs and work toward providing a better standard of living for the handicapped citizens of our nation. Of even greater significance is the heart-warming knowledge of the magnitude of the unselfish dedication, free spirit, silent courage and noble work of all of our handicapped fellow citizens.

During this 92d Congress I have already sponsored considerable legislation on behalf of, and to benefit our handicapped citizens. I recently joined with the distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, WILBUR D. MILLS in sponsoring H.R. 15008 which

would provide an income tax deduction in the case of disabled individuals for expenses for transportation to and from work and additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer's spouse who is disabled. Some of the other significant legislation I have sponsored is as follows:

H.R. 6298, March 17, 1971, H.R. 8011, May 3, 1971: To amend the Wagner O'Day Act to extend its provisions relating to Government procurement of commodities produced by the blind to commodities produced by other severely handicapped individuals. This measure which was signed into law by the President—Public Law 92-28—on June 23, 1971, provides employment opportunities for severely handicapped individuals in the manufacture of products to be sold to the Federal Government.

H.R. 11236, October 14, 1971: To amend the Education of the Handicapped Act to provide tutorial and related instructional services for homebound children through the employment of college students, particularly veterans and other students who themselves are handicapped. Approximately 1 million youngsters in our Nation are homebound handicapped and for varying lengths of time, are unable to attend school, thereby suffering academically and emotionally. This measure makes a full commitment to these children in helping them to fulfill their potential by providing financial compensation to qualified college students to act as home tutors for these youngsters.

House Concurrent Resolution 436, October 21, 1971: Concurrent resolution expressing congressional recognition of a declaration of general and special rights of the mentally retarded. This measure calls attention to the plight of the mentally retarded in the hope that it will help dispel one of the major obstacles to helping and improving the circumstances of the mentally retarded: namely, the attitude of people toward the mentally retarded who are constantly facing dehumanizing abuses from a majority of this country who are unaware of their exclusion from rights such as education and training which the rest of us take for granted; unaware of the gray dullness of some institutions for the severely retarded; and unaware of the sweatshop pay that some retarded get for a good day's work. Approval of this resolution will place the United States in the leadership, in the discussion in the United Nations General Assembly, of a declaration of rights for the mentally retarded.

H.R. 11259, October 4, 1971: To amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize grants and loans to private nonprofit organizations to assist them in providing transportation service meeting the special needs of elderly and handicapped persons.

H.R. 11606, November 5, 1971: To amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to provide special services, artificial kidneys and supplies necessary for the treatment of individuals suffering from end stage renal disease. It is important to note that under date of March 20, 1972, the House passed by a record vote of 327 yeas to zero nays H.R. 8395, which ex-

tended and improved the basic Federal-State vocational rehabilitation program and added services for end-stage renal disease authorizing \$25 million during each of the fiscal years 1973, 1974, and 1975 for this purpose.

H.R. 12352, December 15, 1971: To amend title XVII of the Social Security Act to provide financial assistance to individuals suffering from chronic kidney disease who are unable to pay the costs of necessary treatment, and to authorize project grants to increase the availability and effectiveness of such treatment.

H.R. 13668, March 8, 1972: To provide for paper money of the United States to carry a designation in braille indicating the denomination.

H.R. 14337, April 12, 1972: To establish in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an Office for the Handicapped to coordinate programs for the handicapped.

House Joint Resolution 1159, April 12, 1972: Joint resolution to express the sense of Congress that a White House Conference on the Handicapped be called by the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, there is so much more to be done to help the handicapped of our Nation—and I call upon my colleagues here in the House to continue their dedicated efforts toward developing legislative proposals and action programs that will insure the handicapped of our Nation the quality of life with the highest standards of excellence which they so richly deserve.

I ask my colleagues to join with me in expressing our appreciation on behalf of all of the other recipients of the National Humanitarian Award in the highest commendation to the executive director of the Joint Handicapped Council, the Honorable Max Lupkin, who presented the awards. A handicapped person himself, he has given a lifetime of outstanding public service in sharing the burdens and seeking a better life for our handicapped as well as improved physical and mental health through social and vocational rehabilitation programs for the handicapped—we do indeed salute you, Max Lupkin.

Other recipients of the Humanitarian Award are as follows:

Distinguished Members of the Senate:
Hon. DANIEL K. INOUE, of Hawaii.
Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York.
Hon. RUSSELL B. LONG, of Louisiana.
Hon. ADLAI STEVENSON III, of Illinois.
Distinguished Members of the House:
Hon. HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana.
Hon. JOEL T. BROTHILL, of Virginia.
Hon. JOHN W. BYRNES, of Wisconsin.
Hon. JAMES A. BURKE, of Massachusetts.

Hon. HUGH L. CAREY, of New York.
Hon. MANUEL CELLER, of New York.
Hon. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, of Michigan.
Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS, of Arkansas.
Hon. WILLIAM F. RYAN, of New York.
Hon. AL ULLMAN, of Oregon.
Hon. CHARLES A. VANIK, of Ohio.
Hon. JOHN C. WATTS, of Kentucky.
Distinguished international dignitaries:

HRH Countess Marianne Bernadotte, Stockholm, Sweden.

Premier Golda Meir, State of Israel.

Distinguished citizens:

Hon. Andrew J. Biemiller, AFL-CIO.

Hon. William B. Gardiner, DAV.

Hon. C. L. Huber, DAV.

Hon. J. R. Nelson, I.A.M. & A.W.

Hon. F. M. Putterman, JWV.

Hon. F. R. Stover, VFW.

Hon. Maurice Ward, Joint Handicapped Council.

Distinguished organizations:

Accent on Living, Inc.

The National Star Newsletter.

The National Institute for Rehabilitation Engineering of New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to particularly commend Donald Selwyn, executive director and George W. Shultz, member of the board of directors of the National Institute for Rehabilitation Engineering of New Jersey who were present to receive the award on behalf of NIRE, the only New Jersey organization to receive the honor. I am especially proud of the fact that they are located in my congressional district. NIRE was selected for its work in socially and vocationally rehabilitating people who are severely handicapped. The institute, which was formed 5 years ago by Donald Selwyn, has an outstanding record of success in helping severely and totally disabled people to live independently, to work and to support themselves. NIRE specializes in the development of electronically operated devices and equipment to meet the needs of the handicapped, enabling them to function in an optimum independent manner in their daily pursuits. They also provide technical assistance to other handicapped service organizations, institutions, and agencies.

The Nation does indeed salute the courage and fortitude of our handicapped.

ANIMAL PSYCHOLOGY

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, during debate on the Interior appropriations bill yesterday, I indicated that the bill had increased funding for research in the habits of predators and behavior techniques which may be used to control them.

Our hope is that with such techniques we can avoid the use of large amounts of poison on public and private lands which ends up killing target and nontarget animals alike.

An article in the Wall Street Journal a few days ago indicated some of the research which is now being done in this area. It is encouraging, I think, for all those who realize that the more we can rely upon nonchemical and nonpoisonous controls for predators and insect pests, the better off we will all be.

The article follows:

INSTEAD OF POISONING ANIMAL PESTS, SOME GROUPS FAVOR USING PSYCHOLOGY

(By James E. Bylin)

LOGAN, UTAH.—Ground squirrels seem like cuddly creatures. But they like to munch on

alfalfa and corn, which makes farmers mad, and they might spread disease, which makes no one happy.

So how can their population be controlled? Traditionally, they might be poisoned. But other animals you don't want killed might eat the poison, too, thereby upsetting environmentalists as well as the balance of nature.

David Balph, who has watched squirrels for years, thinks that he knows a better way than poisoning for the squirrels—and for all sorts of predators and pests as well, including coyotes, rats and starlings. Mr. Balph, a behavioral ecologist here at Utah State University and acting director of its Ecology Center, is a leading exponent of waging psychological warfare in man's perennial battle to protect crops and livestock.

His chief ploy: Learn behavioral patterns and then manipulate inbred mechanisms so the animals "control their own population."

Consider the ground squirrels. "They're like a human family," he says. "The young stay around if the environment is good. But if there are problems, they get sick of them. They're susceptible to pressures." Overpopulation causes the problems, he says, and the pressure is applied in a strange way: Yearling males about to mate for the first time mercilessly bother juveniles. Not only do the youngsters tend to scurry to other habitats but the juvenile males become "psychological castrates," unable to mate when their time comes, and the females ultimately produce smaller litters.

THE PESTER PLAN

What Mr. Balph proposes, then, is to capture a few yearling males where squirrels are a nuisance, inject them with a special hormone and let them "pester the hell out of the juveniles. We might knock down the population by 20%," he says.

Mr. Balph and a growing breed of ecologists believe that such notions may be the basis for future controls. Although their theories haven't faced the test of field use, these ecologists are in a position now to prove their ivory-tower speculation. For President Nixon, under mounting pressure, recently adopted a task-force recommendation and suspended immediately the use of poisons in federal predator-control programs. Interstate shipments of many poisons have also been stopped to discourage private use.

Since 1951, the task force reported, some \$110 million in federal and contributed funds have been spent to wipe out wildlife, often indiscriminately and inhumanely. The report, in fact, contended that the poison program had never been justified by research. It chided federal researchers for concentrating on "the development of effective killing chemicals and devices" while neglecting needed research into "the gamut of ecological problems associated with predators," including "more effective, specific and economical control methods."

DRUNK AS A COYOTE?

Coyotes have been the No. 1 target for the poisons, and the Nixon ban has angered sheepmen, who allege that sheep are the No. 1 target for coyotes. No one apparently knows how much damage coyotes really do inflict, but Mr. Balph, long a resident of sheep country, suspects that it isn't as much as herders claim. "An old shepherd goes into the mountains, gets drunk and loses half his herd," he says. "It's human nature to blame the coyotes."

In any event, some researchers now are working on a "super stink" as an alternative to poisoning. The idea, stemming from the development of special odors to keep dogs out of gardens, is that some hideous smell will repel the coyotes from the sheep. Mr. Balph disagrees on the ground that the odor would have to be so overwhelming that "the sheep couldn't live with it either." He fig-

ures, "A coyote in the attack stage is a whole different bag from a dog urinating on a rosebush."

If anything, Mr. Balph speculates, a perfumy smell might be more effective. Meat treated with a powerful emetic, or vomit-inducing agent, could be staked out for the coyotes near the sheep. It is hoped, he says, that the coyote will eat the meat, fall ill and associate it with his sickness. Carrying this plan one step forward, Mr. Balph suggests dousing the meat—and the surrounding area—with cheap perfume. The coyote might associate the sheep's entire territory with vomiting and be "conditioned to avoid the area."

Even better and simpler might be to turn the coyote's own scent against him, he says. Coyotes, he explains, size up the scope of their competition by the number of "scent posts" in a given area. (The scent, left on bushes and the like, is a combination of urine and a secretion from glands along the base of the tail.) By re-creating this scent and applying it liberally around the sheep, "we might trick the coyote into thinking the (coyote) population is greater than it is," persuading the predators to take off for greener pastures.

Another tactic worth exploring, he adds, is to record coyote howls and play them when new mothers are feeding their young. The howls might again indicate overpopulation and upset the mothers during a critical period so she doesn't take proper care of her young.

The balding, 40-year-old Mr. Balph was raised in India, where he watched rats and other pests ravage food supplies. As far as

the U.S. is concerned, he considers rats and starlings as "our two most important problems."

A SCENT—THEN AN ABORTION

Rats, he ponders, might be controlled by another peculiar biological response. "It's wild," he says, but at a critical time early in their pregnancies, female rats will abort spontaneously when confronted with the scent of a strange male. Biologists suspect that the reason is to copulate with the new male. Anyway, Mr. Balph thinks a synthesized scent of a "strange male" might be used to "disrupt the normal breeding cycle" and lower the birth rate.

Under a small grant, Mr. Balph and his staff are experimenting on a starling-control technique that, he says, may also be applicable to rats. The prolific birds are a costly nuisance to feedlot operators. His approach is to drug some food pellets, once again with an emetic, and spread them around the feedlot. A key factor, he says, is that it takes about 90 seconds for the bird to vomit after eating the food. During the interim, the bird will have moved to other activities, meaning it possibly won't associate his sickness with the food pellet, which is just fine for Mr. Balph's purposes.

"He won't figure out why he's vomiting," Mr. Balph says. "We want to trick him into associating it with the whole feedlot. He'll think, 'My God, I'll have to stay away from this feedlot. Every time I get around it, I throw up my cookies.'"

If the technique is successful, he says, the number of starlings may dwindle; because

"life is so easy around a feedlot, that may be why the population builds up." He adds that there is "some evidence" that such information may also be passed along to the young in their training.

Mr. Balph is scrambling for research funds—federal, state and private—to test his theories. He acknowledges that they are "way out in left field," compared with traditional control methods. By spending \$200,000 a year for 10 years, he vows, "we could come up with some halfway decent control programs" for a broad spectrum of predators and pests. "We may be wrong, but we're just saying, 'Give us a chance, and we might be able to do some real good.'"

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 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?

SENATE—Thursday, June 15, 1972

The Senate met at 11:30 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. ADLAI E. STEVENSON III, a Senator from the State of Illinois.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, in the round of daily duties we lift up to Thee our hymn of grateful praise:

"For the beauty of the earth;
For the glory of the skies;
For the love which from our birth
Over and around us lies:
Lord of all, to Thee we raise
This our hymn of grateful praise

"For the joy of human love,
Brother, sister, parent, child,
Friends on earth, and friends above;
For all gentle thoughts and mild:
Lord of all to Thee we raise
This our hymn of grateful praise."

—FOLIOTT S. PIERPOINT, 1864.

We thank Thee, O Lord, that Thou art not only above and beyond and around us but in us and with us. Guide us all by Thy higher wisdom that in service to the Nation we may serve Thee. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter.

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., June 15, 1972.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. ADLAI E. STEVENSON III, a Senator from the State of Illinois, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
President pro tempore.

Mr. STEVENSON thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 14, 1972, the following favorable report of a nomination was submitted on June 14, 1972:

By Mr. FONG, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

John Y. Ing, of Hawaii, to be a Governor of the U.S. Postal Service.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 14, 1972, the following reports of a committee were submitted on June 14, 1972:

By Mr. HOLLINGS, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

S. 916. A bill to include firefighters within the provisions of section 8336(c) of title 5,

United States Code, relating to the retirement of Government employees engaged in certain hazardous occupations (Rept. No. 92-862).

By Mr. MCGEE, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with an amendment:

H.R. 12202. An act to increase the contribution of the Federal Government to the costs of health benefits, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-861).

By Mr. MCGEE, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with amendments:

H.R. 3808. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, as enacted by the Postal Reorganization Act, to provide additional free letter mail and air transportation mailing privileges for certain members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-860).

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday, Wednesday, June 14, 1972, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. STEVENSON)