

dent under subsection (a) of section 8066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Edmund F. O'Connor, [xxx-xx-x-xxxx] (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

U.S. NAVY

Rear. Adm. Marmaduke G. Bayne, U.S. Navy, having been designated for commands

and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

Lt. Gen. John R. Chaisson, U.S. Marine Corps, when retired, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general

in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

In accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5232, Maj. Gen. Foster C. LaHue, U.S. Marine Corps, having been designated for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while so serving.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WEST VIRGINIA'S 109TH ANNIVERSARY, JUNE 20, 1972, IS SIGNIFICANT DATE FOR OUTLINING PROGRESS IN MOUNTAIN STATE

### HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, 109 years ago, President Abraham Lincoln signed the proclamation which created the 35th State of the Union. On this anniversary, I invite Senators to join with me in marking this significant birthdate of the State of West Virginia.

Much that has been written about the Mountain State in recent years has served to obscure the richness and diversity of its human and natural resources. We read of disasters and of economic upheavals. These have occurred in West Virginia and in other States in varying proportions.

We have a good heritage. The lands that now make up West Virginia were once the outward reaches of American civilization. Old Fields, near Moorefield, was one of the earliest settlements on the western frontier. West Virginia is the fourth richest State, minerally speaking, in this richest Nation on earth. Its deep reservoirs of coal and oil and natural gas, timber, and limestone and silica sands undergird our great eastern industrial complex. Over the past two decades, the complete mechanization of our mining industry has strengthened West Virginia's role as a major producer of bituminous coal.

With its plethora of natural resources, the Mountain State has attracted in increasing numbers the major industrial companies of America. From this industrial base has sprung a broad diversity of industry.

But West Virginia's richest resource is its people, who were committed to shaking off the economic agonies of the 1950's, when the transitions of coal mining from hand labor to machinery ended thousands of jobs. I should note that this mechanization process is now affecting other major industries throughout the Nation, and the experiences of West Virginia can be of great benefit to all.

Today West Virginia is alive and well, with new job opportunities opening along a network of interstate and Appalachian developmental highways which provide new accessibility to its natural resources. Its lofty mountains and sparkling streams have long attracted knowing tourists. Today, these and other attractions have actually created an immigra-

tion of new citizens seeking the serenity of the open spaces. West Virginia is in the forefront in environmental concerns, facing such current issues as surface mining and stream pollution and timber management early in the game.

In their commitment to strengthening the economic and social resources of our State, West Virginians are following a heritage that compounds into a bright and golden page in history. When, after Fort Sumter, the Southern States seceded one by one from the Union, and formed a separate nation, the people of what was then western Virginia chose not to go along. As some historians still say, it might have been an illegal act on their part, their breaking away from the rest of Virginia. But they felt constrained not to compound a greater wrong. They formed a new State, because they felt that America as a Nation was worth saving. And they contributed heavily to that salvation in both manpower and resources.

Mr. President, my colleagues and many other Americans, do recognize that this 109th birthday of the State of West Virginia is in a sense a year of challenge for us, as well as a time of looking back. We are working to build a better West Virginia as a part of a better Nation and a better world.

### CANADA'S CONTINUING EFFORTS TO GET A CANADIAN PIPELINE ROUTE CONSIDERED

### HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Government has made strenuous efforts—so far unsuccessful—over a long period of time to get the U.S. Interior Department to seriously consider a Canadian route to the Midwest for both natural gas and oil pipelines.

I would like to include in the RECORD today an excerpt from the Commons Debates of the Canadian House of Commons on June 9, 1972. This excerpt summarizes very well Canada's continuing, if frustrating, attempts to get the Interior Department to undertake an objective, thorough analysis of the relative merits of a Canadian route. The excerpt follows:

A massive leak from a pipeline, difficult to construct and maintain over and through the permafrost territory, could in itself destroy the northern ecology. In conjunction with

the ecology problems, the two transport methods and routes would have to be weighed in light of the economics of getting the product to the consumer. In brief, which method and route would be more beneficial to Canadian consumers, and indeed to the ecology of North America? It is just that simple a question, but it requires a decision. I hope the minister will make an announcement today. As I said, Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives for some time have recommended that a study be carried out.

Tanker oil pollution near the western shoreline of Canada, in conjunction with the increase in the price of gasoline, are among the foremost problems facing Canadians.

You cannot divorce oil pollution from unemployment or the economic growth of the nation, but it can be done with judgment, with rules, regulations and decisions based on facts. As I said, Mr. Speaker, there is an increasing demand for fuel and gasoline throughout the world.

Now, I want to turn for a few moments to deal with the question of the dangers that have arisen simply because no decisions have been made. On February 15, 1970, the Liberian tanker *Arrow* was wrecked on the Cerberus Rock in Chedabucto Bay off Nova Scotia. Only 1.3 million gallons, of an estimated 2.5 million spilled into the water, were recovered. The remainder contaminated 190 miles of shoreline in the bay, miles of beaches on Sable Island 100 miles away, and 4,800 birds lost their lives. The *Arrow* was Canada's major oil spill disaster. What happened? Who paid the shot? Read the Henderson report. The Canadian taxpayer paid the shot. They cannot determine who owned the tanker. There has been no way of measuring the damage, and so the taxpayer has paid the shot.

At the beginning of May U.S. Interior Secretary Morton issued preliminary approval for a go ahead of the TAPS tanker system to ship oil from Prudhoe Bay to Valdez by pipeline and from there to the west coast by giant oil tankers. One terminus for these tankers is Cherry Point in the state of Washington, which is exactly 20 miles away from the place in Canada which is polluted today. The tanker *Arrow* was 18,000 tons dead weight. The tankers for the TAPS route are to be over 100,000 tons dead weight. What will our shoreline be like if one of these large tankers is wrecked? Where will the government be then? Where will its supporters in British Columbia be then? It is a sad story.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. LANIEL): Order, please, I regret having to interrupt the hon. member, but the time allotted to him has expired.

Hon. DONALD S. MACDONALD (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the opportunity to follow the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) in this debate because I can put to him directly the very extensive record, which has already been outlined in this House, of work done both with regard to the question of the Mackenzie Valley pipeline route and the dangers involved for Canada's west coast because of the TAPS route.

[Mr. WOOLLIAMS.]

The hon. member made a number of points,

saying there has been no indication on the part of the government of its views with regard to the TAPS route, that the government has not undertaken any feasibility studies with regard to the Mackenzie route, and has failed to let the United States government know its views. I am glad to have this opportunity to point out to the hon. member, from documentation tabled in the House, and from statements made in the House and outside it, that on all three points he is dead wrong and his assertions to the House are all false.

Dealing first with the question of feasibility studies, he said that the Conservatives for some time had recommended a feasibility study. If the hon. member was on the ball and was doing his job. Mr. Speaker, he would know that on April 18, 1972, I tabled in this House copies of documents dealing with 30 various aspects of a feasibility study preparatory to informing the two agencies of government concerned with regard to the Mackenzie valley pipeline.

Some hon. members: hear, hear!  
Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): These are studies that have been under way for the past three years, and that we would hope to have finished by the end of the summer season. This has been indicated repeatedly. I suppose the only way to get a message across to the hon. member would be to have a chisel, engrave the message on a tablet of stone, and hit him over the head with it, because he does not learn easily. This question has been under extensive study. Over \$15 million have been expended to put the government into a position to make a judgment about the Mackenzie valley pipeline. As I have said repeatedly in this House, Mr. Speaker, at the end of this year when the companies themselves are ready to come forward, we will be in a position to evaluate proposals for a Mackenzie valley pipeline. So, on the first of the hon. member's points that there has not been any preparatory work, he is dead wrong. If there has been any lack of preparatory work it has been by the hon. member in preparing for his speech. He just has not done his homework.

The hon. member also said that I have made no speeches in the House on this question. I spoke extensively, in fact probably too extensively on it, in the Throne Speech debate. I reviewed the question extensively—

Mr. Woolliams: Not on this.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): On this and the question of energy, and I dealt at length with the matter of studies before the standing committee. Further, I dealt with the question of energy policies during an opposition day debate. Once again there is lack of preparation. Mr. Speaker, but it has been lack of preparation by the hon. member for Calgary North who has been lying down on the job.

The hon. member also suggested that members of the government have not been in the position to set before the House, the country, and the United States government its position with regard to the proposals for a tanker route and the Mackenzie valley pipeline. I would like to take a few minutes of the time of the House to go through the very extensive documentation on this point, to show just how badly informed is the hon. member.

As a start I should like to bring to his attention the statement made by my predecessor, the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Greene) in a debate in this House on March 12, 1971. He said:

As I have said, the Prudhoe Bay oil discovery was disclosed in June of 1968. As early as within one month from the time of that declaration the chairman of the National Energy Board met with the presidents of the oil companies who owned that oil—Arco, Humble and BP—and pointed out to them that the Mackenzie Valley line had advantages, as an alternative and should be considered by them.

Mr. Speaker, previous to that, in a state-

ment made to the Canadian Club in Vancouver on February 12, 1971, my predecessor also said:

The Canadian government is not opposed to the construction of oil and gas lines from Alaska through Canada to the continental United States and the government of Canada has already acted in a broad way to define the national goals of such a development. On August 13, 1970 I announced some definitive guidelines to assist industry in their planning.

He went on to say to that audience.

Personally, I think that the United States oil industry has been too hasty and too unplanned in its decision to move Alaska North Slope oil across Alaska from Prudhoe Bay to Valdez and then by sea to receiving points in the U.S. northwest. Too hasty, because they did not give proper care and attention to the problems of the physical security of the oil line, the security of the environment in Alaska, the protection of the Alaska, British Columbia and Washington coastlines from sea-going tanker disasters, and to the question of the long term economics of the operation of such a line—

Once again, Mr. Speaker, my predecessor the hon. member for Niagara Falls made the government's concern about the risks to the coast amply clear. He also made it clear that the government was taking careful steps to make certain that it knew all about Arctic ecology and the impact of a pipeline in northern Canada before going ahead to issue permits.

My colleague, the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp), made reference to a series of meetings he had with officials of the United States government. To the hon. member who asserted that no attempt had been made to bring to the attention of the United States government the views of the Canadian government, I would refer an aide memoire delivered by the Canadian Embassy in Washington to the United States authorities on June 29, 1971, precisely on this issue, which reads in part:

"At a meeting in Washington, D.C., on June 10 the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the Minister of the Environment expressed to the U.S. Secretary of State, the great concern of the Canadian government regarding proposals to move oil by tanker along Canada's Pacific coast and to the Puget Sound area. The Canadian ministers held the view that because of the virtual certainty that oil spills would occur if the proposed tanker movements were permitted in these confined coastal waters, present plans should be reviewed with the objective of diverting these oil shipments to destinations other than Puget Sound."

The aide memoire continues:

"The Canadian ministers drew attention to the widespread public concern in Canada about the environmental risks involved in the proposed Alaska oil movements. This concern has been expressed by the unanimous approval given in the Canadian House of Commons on June 21 for the adoption of the third report of the special committee on environmental pollution. A copy of this report is attached."

That unanimous approval, Mr. Speaker, must have been in the absence of the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) or maybe he was here and as usual did not know what was going on. The aide memoire goes on to indicate to the United States government the proposed line of discussions to deal with the oil tanker problem and to carry out additional research into the possible damage to fish and bird life, the question of monetary damages, the question of shipping control—all proposals that dealt with these questions long before the United States government had made its decision to go on with this route.

The aide memoire of June 29 was followed by an aide memoire to the United States government on August 20, 1971, in the following terms:

The great concern of the Canadian government regarding proposals to transport oil by tanker from Alaska to the Puget Sound area has been made known to the United States government on a number of occasions during the course of this year. This concern is based upon the certainty that any movement of oil by tanker on the scale which has been proposed will eventually result in oil spills. The most recent occasion was at a meeting of United States and Canadian officials in Washington on June 29. At that meeting a proposal was elaborated in an aide memoire for detailed consultations to be held as soon as possible,—

The aide memoire goes on to say:

In general terms, as outlined on earlier occasions, the Canadian government is convinced that if the full economic costs of the substantial environmental risks are taken into account it will be found desirable to avoid introducing large and hazardous tanker movements into the inner waters of the Pacific Coast. The Canadian government is concerned, however, that there has so far been no indication of sources of oil supply for the States in the Pacific northwest. In order to explore this aspect of the question the competent Canadian authorities would be prepared to discuss the technical and other factors which might affect the continuing contribution to the oil needs of the region from Canadian sources.

Mr. Speaker, coupled with my responsibilities as Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, I had the opportunity to meet with the United States Secretary of the Interior, under whose jurisdiction this comes, on March 30 of this year and to point out to him the great concern of Canadians as echoed unanimously by this House with respect to the danger of heavy movements of oil in the northwest Pacific coast area, particularly Puget Sound, the progress that has been made by the Canadian government in the studies I have referred to, the progress that has been made in defining the area for a Mackenzie Valley pipeline—

Mr. Woolliams: Who did you meet with?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The United States Secretary of the Interior, the member of the United States government responsible for the pipeline.

Mr. Woolliams: What was his name?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Rogers Morton. The hon. member seems to be as ignorant of that as he is—

Mr. Woolliams: I wanted to find out if you knew.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): What is your name, do you know?

Mr. Nielsen: Who the hell are you?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): In my letter to Secretary Morton of May 4 this year, I said:

I found most useful my meeting with you in your office in Washington on March 30 last, and appreciate greatly your courtesy in discussing with me certain aspects of the interesting decision you have under consideration in connection with an application for a permit to construct an oil pipeline in Alaska.

At the time of our conversation, you suggested that you would like to have more insights and information into the Canadian interest in having such an oil pipeline constructed through Canada from Prudhoe Bay.

In four pages, the letter goes on to cite in detail the arguments in favour of moving the oil down through the Mackenzie Valley rather than through Alaskan waters. The document has been made public, but of course one cannot make documents like that public for the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) because he is too idle to do his homework on these important questions.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has said that the government has done no feasibility studies. I pointed out by a document laid before this House, and it must have been available to the hon. member, that there has



been an expenditure of \$15 million over the last three years for defining the problems involved in building a Mackenzie Valley pipeline and for the purpose—

Mr. Woolliams: Would the hon. Minister permit a question?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): By all means.

Mr. Woolliams: I have listened to the argument and—

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Ask your question.

Mr. Woolliams: I will ask my question if you will be patient. Have you then concluded, and have you reached a decision or made an agreement with the United States government that TAPS in fact will not be built, that the crude petroleum and natural gas will be carried by pipeline down the Mackenzie Delta? Answer that question.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Of course there is no agreement because the American administration has decided that they are going to move American oil through American territory and international waters down to the American markets. The hon. member, who is supposed to be a lawyer, should know that there is no legal action that the government of Canada can take to prevent that.

Mr. Nielsen: The government has not decided that, industry has. The government gave a permit.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): If Secretary Morton is not the government, who is?

Mr. Nielsen: All he did was issue the permit; industry moves it.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): He issued the permit to build the line. The hon. member knows better than that. The hon. member for Calgary North has suggested that our position has not been made clear to the United States government. I pointed out that repeatedly in personal meetings between various members of this government and members of the American administration, and in aides memoire placed before that government and, as long ago as 1968 within a month of the time that the Prudhoe Bay field was disclosed to the public, representatives of this government already proposed the Mackenzie route as a favourable one for bringing the oil to market. It seems to me that little more need be said about the contribution of the hon. member for Calgary North in this debate.

Several points raised by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) require a reply. The hon. member said, raising the same rather incredible proposition put forward by the hon. member for Calgary North, that in some way we should get inside the American jurisdiction and the Canadian government should prevent that government from making a decision with regard to oil coming from within its territory and going to its markets.

The hon. member of York South said—and I appreciate his courtesy in indicating why he would not be present when I spoke—that we should have protested the construction of refining facilities in Puget Sound at the time they came into being. Mr. Speaker, the refining facilities in Puget Sound have been in operation at least since 1961. Ninety per cent of the oil used in those refining facilities in use comes not from overseas but is Canadian oil, Alberta oil that travels via the Trans-Mountain pipeline overland from Canada. The hon. member is really suggesting that the government of Canada should have protested the construction of oil refineries in Puget Sound built expressly to take advantage of hydrocarbons coming from Alberta. I can say one thing for the hon. member for Calgary North; at least that is one objection he did not raise.

Mr. Woolliams: I thank the minister for his generosity.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I should like to take this opportunity to repeat an offer I made in the House of Commons on April 19, 1972, as reported at page 1440 of *Hansard*—

the offer was repeated, as I have indicated to the United States government—namely, that we are prepared to put the United States in the position, with regard to the Puget Sound refineries, where not one ounce of oil need be brought by seaborne traffic to those refineries. Once they had established oil supplies which would come via the Trans-Mountain route and provided the oil requirements of those refineries, there would be no need to bring seaborne oil into that area. We are prepared to make that undertaking. We hope the United States government, which of course will have to seek and obtain approval of the courts with respect to these proposals, will take advantage of that offer and will meet the particular problem we face by using Canadian oil that is available via overland routes, thereby making it unnecessary for oil to be brought by sea which is the problem involved in this debate.

The government of Canada in the last four years has been active in this area. Commencing, as I said, immediately with the discovery of Prudhoe Bay oil, the government has indicated to American companies Canada's willingness to consider the Mackenzie Valley route and has set up the extensive feasibility studies necessary to determine whether a Mackenzie Valley pipeline for oil and gas can be constructed to transport these products through our country to the markets of the central continent.

Furthermore, the government has been active in putting forward, by diplomatic memoirs, by personal contact and by public statement both in this House and otherwise, the danger to Canada and to the American west coast which would result from the TAPS route. Of course we are disappointed. We regret that the American government notwithstanding this, has decided to go ahead with the TAPS route. We must acknowledge, however, that it is their decision and they have the right to do this. I would not go so far as the hon. member for York South and suggest that this is an unfriendly act.

Even now it is not too late for the United States administration, as an act of comity, to reverse its decision, to be prepared to halt construction of the TAPS pipeline and come forward with a new proposal; that is, to participate with the companies which probably today or early next week will be announcing their intention to go ahead with a Mackenzie Valley route. On that basis we could be assured that in future the kind of damage which occurred in Puget Sound and which has been experienced in Canada will not be caused to the west coast.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, would the minister permit a question?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): By all means.

Mr. Nielsen: The day before yesterday I asked the minister whether he had received an application from any company or consortium for the construction of a Mackenzie Valley pipeline, and he answered that no formal application had been received.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): That is right.

Mr. Nielsen: What he has just said comes as a startling revelation. He has indicated that he expects applications to be made sometime next week for the construction of a pipeline.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): No, Mr. Speaker, that is not what I said, as the hon. member will see if he reads *Hansard*. I said previously that we have received no formal application. However, we have received an indication that consortiums are getting together with regard to making an application. So my statement stands that no formal application has been made.

Mr. Nielsen: The minister said, "Next week." He suggested there would be an application next week.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I expect that next week or, shall we say, in the very near future there may be such application. There have been a number of indications to suggest that applications will be coming to the Min-

ister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development with regard to the land route. In large measure he and I will have to wait for those submissions to be made. We have reason to believe, from certain statements—the hon. member has had as much opportunity as I have had to gather this impression from news reports—that the consortiums expect to get together and make an application.

Therefore, it would be constructive and would help the proposal made by the hon. member for Fraser Valley East, and supported by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, if we put under the jurisdiction of the International Joint Commission the resolution of the problem regarding tanker shipments both in the east and in the west, both in the waters of Puget Sound and in the international waters of eastern Canada. I would therefore hope we might have the support of the whole House, not only for the resolution but for the amendment.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I am certainly glad that I was present today to hear the speech delivered by the minister, for it represented 30 minutes of exculpation without information. What it lacked in common sense is made up in vociferous delivery. I have always liked listening to the hon. member because one has no difficulty hearing what he has to say.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I am very glad to hear that.

Mr. Diefenbaker: This is an occasion that illustrates exactly the degree to which this House has been made to look ridiculous. The government either has not come with information or it has provided information that is not in accordance with the facts.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Not at all.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The minister laughs because he has been one of the main destroyers of this institution.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I have heard enough.

Mr. Crouse: The minister cannot take it.

Mr. Diefenbaker: His leaving is in keeping with the courage he has always displayed.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: He makes a speech, we listen to him, he realizes it is foolish, ridiculous and full of incongruous statements, and away he goes because he does not want to be present when one reveals his total lack of consideration for the rights of Parliament. He does not want to hear what one says and thinks, apparently, that no one else will hear it. His leaving means that two ministers out of 30 remain in the House. Ministers of the Crown have responsibilities, but they are not held although this is supposed to be a most serious debate.

Mr. Basford: They will be here for the vote.

Mr. Diefenbaker: There is no question about that. Those automatons who are controlled by the government will be here for the vote. I am glad to receive the admission from the hon. gentleman. That is a most irresponsible statement and shows the degree to which his government has polluted Parliament. In other words, debate is no longer important.

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION IN MARIN COUNTY

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, many valuable programs to clean up our environment have been started throughout

the country. I am always pleased to hear of individuals or local groups who initiate constructive action to enhance or improve our rapidly deteriorating environment.

In Marin County, Calif., just such a program has been run by Survival, Inc. This organization has set up a system of recycling centers and of distribution of ecological information to the public. The county board of supervisors has contracted with Survival to continue this dual program, and recently a \$25,000 grant was approved to enable the program to continue for another year. I am sure that the program will gradually expand as more citizens become aware of its value to the community as a whole.

I sincerely hope that Survival will serve the local people well, and I encourage other communities to follow the example of Marin County.

#### LATIN AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT

### HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, for some time many of us have been concerned as to our international priorities in recent years, especially in terms of our economic assistance policies. Our emphasis for the past two decades has been overwhelmingly centered on Europe, with mere residuals, as it were, being directed to certain of our less fortunate and less developed allies.

It is time, however, for these priorities to adjust to what I see as a new reality in our future economic relations with the rest of the world. As Europe and other past recipients of our beneficent policies have overcome the needs which prompted our policy orientation in the past, those who have been neglected must now move to the forefront of our list of commitments.

I have been working recently on a reorientation of our economic policy in Latin America. Past programs have foundered on the government interfaces which failed to deliver funding at a point where meaningful impact on the life of the "Campesino" was achieved. New and more effective instrumentation must be forged for these Southern Hemisphere nations. We have frequently suggested and again urge that an organization similar to the original European Payments Union be formed. Such a vehicle by undergirding trade could make more effective such institutions as LAFTA and the Central American Common Market. At the same time it could encourage stabilization of currencies and an ever-increasing trade. This mechanism could well provide the structural catalyst for a financial "unification" of the Latin American region.

One requirement of such a catalyst, however, is seed money. This we unhesitatingly provided in the late 1940's and early 1950's for the rebuilding of a war-devastated Europe. Still remaining in the original EPU fund is a sizable amount—\$123.5 million, to be exact. As noted in

the correspondence which follows, the Department of Treasury is of the opinion that there is "no longer a need for a European monetary organization such as the EMA." I heartily concur in this analysis and offer as well my full and active support to the Department's efforts to "recapture" these moneys and put them to a much more profitable, significant and vital use.

I include my correspondence with the Department of Treasury at this point in the RECORD:

MARCH 17, 1972.

Mr. MICHAEL BRADFIELD,  
Assistant General Counsel,  
Department of the Treasury,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADFORD: I have been researching the status of the United States' contribution to the European Payments Union, predecessor to the existing European Fund, which was originally established under the Marshall Plan following World War II. My interest in these monies is directly the result of discussions of a program similar, both in form and goals, to the European Payments Union in Latin America.

My research reveals that approximately \$123.5 million of the original capital contribution of \$350 million has not been expended and is currently being held in a special trust account by the Department of the Treasury for the Secretary General of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation. Some doubts exist, however, as to the status of these funds and their susceptibility to redemption efforts by the United States—to wit: was it a loan or a grant?

Your assistance is therefore requested in two areas: first, the reactions of the Department to a redirection of these funds to a Latin America effort and, second, an analysis and report on the status of the funds.

Thanking you for your attention in this matter, I remain

Yours sincerely,

RICHARD T. HANNA,  
Member of Congress.

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY,  
OFFICE OF THE GENERAL  
COUNSEL,

Washington, D.C., May 23, 1972.

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HANNA: You have inquired as to the status of the United States contribution to the European Monetary Agreement (EMA) and to the reaction of the Treasury Department to a proposal to redirect the contributed funds for use in Latin America.

With respect to the status of our EMA contribution, these funds are an outright grant, although the United States retains some rights over the final disposition of EMA assets upon liquidation. In 1958 the United States committed \$271.6 million to the EMA. The origin of these funds was a grant of \$350 million made by the United States in the framework of the Marshall Plan in order to establish the working capital of the European Payments Union (EPU). When the EPU expired in 1958, \$148.1 million was transferred immediately to the EMA. The remaining United States contribution of \$123.5 million has never been called upon and is held in a special Treasury trust account, but is fully committed in a legal sense to EMA.

The United States does not have the contractual right to repossess its capital contribution or earnings attributable to this contribution. Furthermore, since the United States is not a contracting party of the EMA, we have no vote and thus no power to compel termination. However, the consent of the United States is required to any substantial modification of the EMA as a consequence of the agreement under which

we made available to the EMA the residual capital of the EPU.

Moreover, in the event the members of EMA decide to liquidate the organization, the agreement provides for distribution of the U.S. capital among the members in accordance with an agreed formula. The United States retains a veto over the application of this formula but must work out with the European members any alternative uses of the U.S. contribution.

It has been apparent to us for some years that there was no longer a need for a European monetary organization such as the EMA. Since the early 1960's we have from time to time considered devoting the U.S. contribution to other purposes, including the use of these funds in Latin America. However, these efforts proved fruitless. It appears now that the best approach is simply to seek return of these funds to the United States.

Discussions are once again in progress to determine the future of the EMA and the disposition of its capital. We are hopeful that we will see agreement by the end of the year on a proposal which will permit the United States to recapture its EMA contribution.

If I can be of further assistance to you in pursuing this matter, do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL BRADFORD,  
Assistant General Counsel.

#### FISCAL AND BUDGETARY INFORMATION FOR THE CONGRESS

### HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under the extremely capable leadership of my friend and colleague, Chairman JACK BROOKS, the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations has just completed an extensive review of efforts to create a modern fiscal and budgetary information and automatic data processing system for use by all branches of the Federal Government.

As Chairman Brooks pointed out in a speech at the annual conference of the Agency Management Analysis Officer's Group, Congress desperately needs not just more but better and more timely information about financial operations of National Government. I am delighted that Chairman Brooks and the joint committee are working to extend the information reach of the Congress in this area, as intended in title II of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970.

So that all Members may have an opportunity to familiarize themselves with this vitally important activity, I am submitting for the RECORD the full text of the chairman's remarks delivered on June 12, 1972:

#### FISCAL AND BUDGETARY INFORMATION FOR THE CONGRESS

The growth of Federal programs and activities—their size, number and complexity—has challenged our government's capacity to monitor their operation and evaluate the results.

No one who has served for any length of time in Congress, or elsewhere in the Federal establishment, is unaware of this problem.

Over the past decade, for example, outlays for Federal grant programs have jumped from



\$7.7 billion to \$38.3 billion—a 483 percent increase. In 1962, there were about 200 individual programs. Today there are more than a thousand. And their emphasis, meanwhile, has shifted toward innovative programs in the human resources and environmental areas, such as education, health, manpower training, community development, housing and public safety.

We are not equipped with the informational and analytical tools necessary to deal sensibly with this escalating quantity and complexity. Congressional inability to acquire, process, and apply sufficient policy-relevant information, a matter of grave concern during the 1960's, is even more painfully apparent as we enter the 1970's.

To narrow this intelligence gap, numerous provisions for development of new information resources were included in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. For instance, to strengthen our independent capability, we authorized additional staff and other assistance for the Committees. We also directed the General Accounting Office and the Congressional Research Service to provide more substantial—and sophisticated—research assistance. Both are working toward this now.

Tonight, however, I want to describe our efforts to carry out another of the Reorganization Act's provisions. In Title II, we directed the Executive Branch to establish—in cooperation with Congress—a standardized fiscal and budgetary information and data processing system for use by all Federal agencies.

As you know, there is a very long history of Congressional concern and legislation relating to federal accounting and reporting procedures. The basic assignment of responsibilities was made in the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921.

Since then duties and requirements have been clarified by additional laws, the objectives always being to improve the quality of information for managing federal activities. Changes and additions were made in 1946 as part of the Legislative Reorganization Act of that year, and in 1950 and 1956 as a result of the Hoover Commissions' studies. The requirements of the 1970 Act came out of the work of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, which began its deliberations in 1965, the same year that PPBS and similar efforts to enhance the planning and budgeting activities of agencies were being widely publicized.

What we are saying in Title II is:

First, that this effort must be continued, with Congressional participation;

Second, that the design and operating procedures of the standardized fiscal and budgetary system must provide adequately for congressional needs and applications; and,

Third, that government-wide standard classifications of programs, activities, receipts, and expenditures of Federal agencies must reflect and serve not only Executive requirements and purposes but those of the Congress as well.

In addition, both before and after the standardized system is in operation, provision must be made for Congressional access to—and full information about—fiscal, budgetary, and program-related data available in the Executive Branch.

The intent of the Title II requirement is clear:

We are not seeking to strengthen either the Congress or the Executive at the expense of the other. Our purpose is to supplement and overhaul existing fiscal, budgetary, accounting and management information systems to better serve the needs of both branches.

What we are looking for is a parallel development, to make more meaningful information more readily available to Congress and to other users throughout the Federal government.

Establishment of a Government-wide system is a large order. We realize that it won't be accomplished overnight, that dramatic breakthroughs are unlikely.

We have made significant progress, however, during the first year: The systems developers within the Executive, in the Office of Management and Budget and the Department of the Treasury, gained a better understanding of Congressional expectations. And the Comptroller General—who is the agent of the Congress for this project—moved forward with an extensive survey of Congressional information needs.

Perhaps understandably, the OMB started with a limited view of what was intended. Last October, as Chairman of the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations, I wrote to the Director, then Mr. Shultz, and questioned the pace and direction of their initial work. Development of the classifications—the critically important first step—had been assigned to several *ad hoc* study groups, without any ties to agency management. Priorities for development of the various classifications had been set, without reference to Congressional interests and needs.

Overall, there was no evidence that a broad-gauge plan for this project was either being worked out or contemplated. No plan or timetable for defining its scope, for implementation, for exchange of documentation, for incorporating congressional requirements, etc.

But it appears that the OMB is now rethinking its approach. In a statement submitted in April of this year, in connection with hearings held by the Joint Committee, the office conceded that—and I quote—"The scope of the system development effort as anticipated by the Congress is substantially greater than previously incorporated in our plans." Once Congressional needs are clearly defined, it was added, "A detailed plan to meet the expanded requirements can be developed."

Although belated, OMB's realization of what Congress anticipates is encouraging. Their willingness to consider and accommodate Congressional needs is constructive. We will give them all possible assistance in their further planning. We expect to work closely with them on this.

Meanwhile, in consultation with the Joint Committee, the Comptroller General began surveying Congressional information needs last August. Since then, his researchers have interviewed the staffs of all but one of the Committees as well as 68 individual Members of the House and Senate.

This survey is designed to help us in defining patterns of Congressional information use. Our needs are extensive and diverse, and continually change. They vary from Committee to Committee, from Member to Member, and from policy area to policy area.

What we are attempting to do is to sort out one-time information needs from those which reoccur and can be met systematically; to identify those which can be met, periodically, with printed documents and those which may require immediate response, perhaps on-line through a computer terminal; to describe the various Committee's requirements in terms of content, format and frequency of use.

Federal accounting systems cannot be set up to meet, without clerical manipulation, all Congressional data requirements. We must specify which elements of basic information are to be acquired and reported within the various classification structures adopted Government-wide.

To indicate the scope of this project, let me summarize some of the findings of our hearings and the Comptroller General's preliminary survey report:

Fiscal, budgetary and program-related data is now acquired within and reported by a maze of classification schemes and information systems. Comparisons between data produced by these systems are at best difficult

to make. At worst, they are misleading. Because program terminology and coding procedures differ from Agency to Agency—and even between bureaus within Agencies. Both necessity and common sense dictate the requirement for standard definitions and uniform accounting procedures, so that we can identify and review programs and activities which have similar objectives but are operating in different agencies.

Highly generalized program information which may be suitable for use in the Executive Office of the President is not necessarily sufficient for most Congressional committees. We will require program and project classification structures to provide the kind of detail included in such documents as agency justifications.

This means that standardization and systems compatibility will have to extend deep into the Departmental hierarchy, where the transactions are, at the project manager and operating level. For example, we will need a uniform method of linking projects and funding status, the amount provided by Congress and the amount actually spent by the Executive.

So-called "impoundments" should not be covered up by semantics or defined out of sight. I do not see why we cannot devise procedures to notify Congress automatically—and immediately—whenever any Executive action effectively precludes the obligation or expenditure of appropriated funds. And Congress should be provided regular summaries of such actions, including the amounts and projects or activities involved.

In many instances, Congressional committees review individual grants, loans and contracts. The classification structure will have to permit us to easily acquire financial and program data about these, individually or in groups, from numerous operating organizations in the Executive Branch.

Federal grant programs are of particular concern to us. The Federal Domestic Assistance Catalogue, much improved in recent years, is a useful tool in identifying grant programs and in informing the American people of their objectives and application procedures. But this document should be brought up to date and published on a regular schedule, probably more frequently than at present. Moreover, a printed document alone will not meet all our needs in this area. For sensible review of these programs we should have available, on demand, current status information, including funds available and applications on file.

Congress needs to be able to identify programs and projects with the Executive organization responsible for their day-to-day management. We must also link programs and projects to their legal base, not only classifying them by appropriations but by authorizations and committee jurisdictions as well. For more intensive program review, as intended by the 1970 Act, we must be able to compare performance with the objectives and criteria intended by the Congress in authorizing and appropriating funds.

Looking to the future, as research techniques for performance measurement and evaluation become more fully developed, we will need classifications for impact data, by target groups and by geographic areas. Because of their complexity, these structures must be given extra effort now. The target group concept must be carefully defined, and a wide range of geographic area definitions must be considered, including regions, urban and rural, states, counties, and cities.

Finally, there is access. Without this—ready availability of information, as needed—we will be right back where we started. Precisely what mechanisms and procedures will ultimately have to be devised can only be determined when the systems plan has been more fully developed.

Meanwhile, we must begin assessing the capabilities of existing sources of fiscal, budgetary and program-related data. Unless

we know what presently is available, our efforts could lead to duplication of reporting procedures and unnecessary costs.

Last year, in May, the Director of the OMB and the Acting Secretary of the Treasury asked Executive Department heads to provide "a brief description of any inventories of data available . . . that could be used to meet" Title II requirements. OMB reported, in July, that "virtually none of the Agencies have composite inventories of data available within their systems."

An inventory of sources is essential—now. We understand that OMB, the Treasury, and GAO are working on ways to accomplish this. We expect them to come up with realistic and feasible alternatives in the very near future.

As I indicated earlier, we are fully aware that development of the Government-wide system envisioned in Title II is a major undertaking.

Much remains to be done. Some of the Congressional needs we have identified thus far can be met through minor adjustments in existing Executive plans or practices. Others will require the sustained attention of the Congress—particularly on the part of the Committees—plus a long-term commitment by the Administration, and the active cooperation of agency managers throughout the Executive Branch.

The costs of this project will be substantial. But these costs will be only a minor percentage of its benefits to the taxpayers.

We are all in this together. You and I are being asked today to anticipate problems before we become bogged down in them; to make decisions, more quickly, in response to pressing and increasingly complex social and human needs.

You and I are being asked to conserve the Nation's tax resources, by eliminating Federal programs that are no longer needed and replacing them with ones that are, by terminating those that do not work and starting ones that do.

There are many ingredients essential to creative public policy decisions. Reliable, timely information is one of them. We must work together to meet this vital need.

#### BAD TIMING

### HON. WILLIAM S. CONOVER II

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. CONOVER. Mr. Speaker, the Pittsburgh Press recently published an editorial concerning the poor timing of the efforts in Congress to legislate a quick end to the Vietnam war.

It is hoped that this body will follow the recent vote of the Foreign Affairs Committee which endorsed the President's policy.

I include the editorial below:

#### BAD TIMING

Congress is debating new efforts to legislate a quick end to the Vietnam war at a particularly bad time.

In the House, the Foreign Affairs Committee has rejected a resolution to order withdrawal of all remaining U.S. military forces from Indochina by Oct. 1. Instead, it approved by a 19-18 vote a resolution endorsing President Nixon's Vietnam policy.

However, some Democrats say they will carry the fight for the end-the-war resolution to the House floor.

Most Americans probably would like to see us out of Vietnam even sooner than Aug. 31. But yanking 62,000 U.S. troops out of there in so short a period—and in the midst of a

continuing North Vietnamese invasion of South Vietnam—seems militarily unwise.

Such a development would undermine the morale of the South Vietnamese army and risk its collapse.

Also, Sen. Mansfield's amendment proposes to end all U.S. ground, naval and air operations in South Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos if the Communists agree to return American prisoners and not fire on our departing forces. In effect, Sen. Mansfield is saying to Hanoi: "Give us our prisoners and let us go in safety. As we leave, you may, of course, continue to shoot at the South Vietnamese who fought on our side for so many years."

That is far from the honorable end to America's involvement in Vietnam that President Nixon has been promising.

Mr. Nixon's latest offer to Hanoi, which is extremely fair, calls for a complete American withdrawal from Indochina within four months of a cease-fire and a release of prisoners.

Under the President's plan, the United States at least wouldn't be walking away while its allies or friends in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia were getting shot up. And, in the context of a cease-fire, it would leave the political future of Indochina to be worked out by the people who live there.

Ironically, Sen. Mansfield's most drastic end-the-war move comes when the desperate military situation on the ground in South Vietnam seems to be improving and there are background maneuvers toward a resumption of peace talks.

From all this, the Senate should see that this is no time to ban the use of U.S. airpower and the presence of American advisers, which are our highest bargaining cards. It is the time for steady nerves and quiet diplomacy not for the legislative meat ax.

#### DE FRANZO VFW POST CELEBRATES 40TH ANNIVERSARY

### HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 40th anniversary of VFW Post 2346 in Saugus, Mass. The history of this fine post has been an interesting one, and I would like to take this opportunity to share some of that history with my colleagues here in the House of Representatives.

The post was chartered in 1932 in memory of Maj. R. Gordon, a veteran of World War I. The first home of the post was the Grand Army Hall, Webb Place, Saugus Center. However, soon the quarters there became too crowded and the post was relocated in the old fire station on Lincoln Avenue. The membership continued to grow rapidly, and another move was made to Pythian Hall. The next post home was the old West Cliftondale Improvement Association Building, and just prior to this relocation the Post was renamed in honor of the first man from the North Shore area to win the Congressional Medal of Honor, S. Sgt. Arthur F. DeFranzo of Saugus.

At its new location and bearing its new name, Post 2346 became very active with a large increase in membership. By 1951, it was apparent that larger and more permanent quarters were needed and over the next 3 years funds were

raised so that plans could be formally developed.

Plans were drawn up by President Alfred Walker, Vice President Flore DeFranzo, Clerk William Merrithew, Quartermaster Charles Cooper, Directors William Smith, Norman Hanson, Henry Romie, Richard MacDonald, William McGrath, and Stanley Wladkowski.

On Sunday, April 24, 1955, the new quarters at 190 Main Street were dedicated. Membership in the Post continued to grow, and to such an extent that within 3 years the mortgage was completely paid off, and plans were begun for additional space. In 1963, a \$100,000 addition was completed to the quarters. By now the Post was one of the largest in the Commonwealth.

Then, on the morning of April 4, 1971, a fire completely destroyed the upper floor and all its furnishings. Later that same day Corporation President William Muldoon called a special meeting of the Board of Directors, and their tireless efforts to renovate the building began immediately.

An architect and contractor were engaged and rebuilding was completed on February 29, 1972. The building was rededicated on April 9, 1972, and the inscription reads:

With the help of God we will always truly honor the dead by helping the living.

This inscription accurately embodies the spirit of the S. Sgt. Arthur F. DeFranzo Post 2346. In each of the last 10 years, the Post has received an award for community service. Their contributions to the people of Saugus and to the entire State of Massachusetts stand as examples of their dedication to this goal.

I would like to take this opportunity to make their achievements known to my colleagues and to congratulate Post President George Hickey, Clerk Ed Heartquist, Vice President William Merrithew, Cmdr. Andrew G. Busalacchi, and president of the Ladies Auxiliary Rita Hannify for their efforts. After visiting the Post on several occasions, I realize that the 1,300 members of the Post and of its Ladies Auxiliary should be commended for their wholehearted cooperation and untiring support.

I am personally proud of their work and urge them to continue in the fine tradition which they have established for themselves.

#### STOP THE PERIPHERAL CANAL

### HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, a proposed public works project that will have a great and potentially damaging effect on the environment of northern California—the Peripheral Canal—may soon be before the Congress.

A recent editorial on KTVU, an Oakland television station, I think demonstrates the true views of the people of northern California about the dubious merits of this project. I am hopeful that



the Members who will be studying this project are aware of the preponderance of unfavorable public opinion to its authorization and construction.

The editorial follows:

#### OUTLOOK: PERIPHERAL CANAL

In case you thought the Peripheral Canal was a dead issue, it's not. That's the scheme to ship northern water by canal behind the Delta and on to the south, allowing some to leak into the back stretches of the Delta.

The idea is great for Los Angeles and it's bad news for us. But when the legislature and the governor's office are both controlled by Southern California, you can understand how that can happen.

The fight will be won or lost in Congress, and we call on all Northern California congressmen to form a coalition to plug up all the plans to build the Peripheral Canal.

#### FREEDOM OF THE PRESS— A LICENSE FOR BIAS?

#### HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, "bias" is an interesting word, and one definition according to the dictionary calls it "a tendency of a statistical estimate to deviate in one direction from a true value."

Of course, everyone in this world is biased in some way or another. Any person who would claim not to be afflicted with this human frailty would, of course, be either lying or frightfully ignorant of his mortal limitations. Sometimes bias can be constructive; other times, not. Bias can take the form of pride in one's self, his community, his company, his school, or his Nation. Within limits bias can promote a spirit of competition and stimulate a feeling of camaraderie among those who share a distinguishing kinship. However, without control or direction, bias can be a negative and insidious force, lashing out at those who become the targets of suspicion or blind prejudice. We all know and recognize the standard forms of bias—bias against a certain religion, race, or creed. These forms of intolerance are rightfully to be rejected as they are counterproductive to the society as a whole.

However, there is another type of bias, equally bad, but far more subtle—and that is the blind vendetta of journalistic bias which masquerades as "freedom of the press." Perhaps more than anyone else, Vice President AGNEW is to be commended for pointing out for all to see the unquestioned prejudice and slant of the liberal-dominated news media in this Nation. No one questions the right to freedom of inquiry in an open free society. But the anti-American, anti-Government vindictiveness of a great many of our news disseminating organizations is unparalleled in example anywhere else in the world. Every day our fellow citizens are fed a diet of disaster and told what is wrong with this society. It is this bias of our news media against our own Nation which is most puzzling, and, in my

opinion, destructive and divisive of the best interests of our Nation.

The liberal news gathering agencies attempt to heighten and promote dissension and emotionalism and to divide and segment our people into clever but melodramatic categories. The media is quick to offer a stage to forces in this society which represent the offbeat, the bizarre, and the misfit. But demand "equal time" for those who support and defend our Nation, and immediately the cry goes up about "censorship," and Walter Cronkite bristles about ominous threats to the "freedom" of the press.

It is a modern tragedy that this good land is worthy only of contempt and scorn by faithless and fickle elements within our news media who will stop at nothing to vent the wrath of their own frustrations and ineptness upon the American public. These people have expanded the concept of "yellow journalism" in that they will not hesitate to drag the entire Nation through the mud or to condemn our most sacred institutions if it will help expand their audience or increase circulation.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that the news media of this Nation is guilty of bias—and I use that word in a negative and accusatory sense. Regrettably, those journalists who are a credit to their profession must feel an extra measure of frustration that their credibility and sense of ethics are threatened and undermined by the reckless and abusive acts of certain of their colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, it is an old wise proverb that says, "He who knows not that he knows not is a dangerous man." Most tragic of all, our liberal-dominated news media is so caught up in its obsession with "freedom of the press" that these people are not only biased, which they vehemently deny, I believe many of them do not even realize they are biased. The lack of this realization is not only injurious to the journalistic profession, it is detrimental to the welfare and best interests of all the American people. And that cannot be allowed to continue.

A most interesting editorial appearing recently in the Amarillo Sunday News Globe identifies specific examples of bias in news reporting, and offers some suggestions to remedy the situation. If only the New York Times could read and heed:

[From the Amarillo Sunday News Globe, June 4, 1972]

#### WE CAN HEAL A NATION

While waiting for the President's helicopter to touch down on the Capitol grounds Thursday night, TV network reporters prowled the corridors beneath the big dome, asking members of the Congress for their views on the Nixon visit to Russia.

Among those interviewed was Sen. Edmund Muskie of Maine. What did the Senator think of the disarmament agreements signed by the President?

The gentleman from Maine felt his way cautiously. After all, members of the Congress did not yet have the full story. But obviously some progress toward peace and cooperation had been made.

The interviewer was Bob Clark, White House man for ABC; and he sounded a bit impatient when he asked, "But what about the failures?"

That may not have been the precise expression. But reporter Clark did use the word

"failures," and it was obvious he wanted something controversial as his contribution to the evening's grist of television news.

And right there we may have the big clue to the national "sickness" so many Americans deplore.

"But what about the failures?"

Howard K. Smith, commentator for the same network, and a member of the Nixon press party in Moscow, offered a similar diagnosis earlier in the week in a comment just before leaving for home.

He had picked up a copy of the New York Times, freshly arrived from the states, and found it filled with accounts of American doubts and fears and failures. After spending several days in a nation, regarded in many quarters as our enemy, whose people were proudly putting their best foot forward, defending their own country and its system while ignoring its manifold failures, this journalistic self-flagellation was particularly glaring.

One area in which the determination of some correspondents to emphasize the negative is especially galling is the Vietnam war. Kenneth W. Clawson, deputy director of White House communications, took sharp issue a few days ago with a New York Times report from Correspondent Anthony Lewis who is now—or was until quite recently—visiting North Vietnam.

"In contradiction of all journalist standards," Clawson said, "the New York Times is guilty in at least two specific instances of being a conduit of enemy propaganda to the American people."

"In a report from Haiphong featured on Page 1, the Times said that independent sources confirmed North Vietnam claims that the enemy is clearing American mines from Haiphong harbor and moving ships in and out."

"That claim is entirely untrue. In answer to a query the Times was told in advance by the American government that no ship has entered or left Haiphong harbor since May 11."

Which makes us wonder—what country is the Times serving? North Vietnam or the United States?

Concluded Clawson: "... The Times stooped to bad journalism when it published a long irresponsible propaganda line indicating there is ship movement in and out of Haiphong."

Another outspoken critic of some recent weighted news from American correspondents in Vietnam is the publication "Monday," issued weekly by the Republican National Committee. A week or so ago it published this complaint:

"On the evening of May 6, 1972, CBS evening news viewers were greeted by anchor man Roger Mudd telling them: 'The South Vietnamese suffered two more defeats today ...'"

NBC, however, according to the "Monday" account, reported one of the same attacks and stressed that the Communists were unsuccessful in overrunning the firebase involved and were "beaten off" by elite South Vietnamese airborne units.

"Monday" also cites chapter and verse of many other recent reports slanted toward emphasis on enemy successes and derogatory to the efforts of the ARVN, the U.S. supported force arrayed against General Giap's Communists from the north. It is no secret that many of our newsmen are openly contemptuous of South Vietnamese efforts.

In a speech not long ago at Kenyon College in Ohio, Robert Novak, a syndicated columnist, explained it this way:

"Both the correspondents in Saigon and their editors back in Washington and New York share, in overwhelming numbers, axiomatic beliefs about the war."

The correspondent consciously or not, tends to look at the worst side of things. The editor, consciously or not, tends to select news that is negative."

Are things so bad with us; are the times so cruel and events so overwhelming, that we have nothing but evil to report? Or is the sickness within ourselves?

We, the American people, need healing and we can heal ourselves. We can refuse to listen to slanted news reports; refuse to read newspapers that display the failures and minimize the successes of our system. We can use our own common sense to reason that a people which for three generations has shared its own largesse with the world and has lifted millions of human beings to new levels of freedom and awareness, cannot by the most tortured twisting of logic be accused of failure.

The United States is a success. We must proclaim this with pride and abandon the nit-picking, grubby search for problems and failures.

Then our sickness will go away.

RICHARD C. VAN DEUSEN

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, the name of Richard C. Van Deusen, Undersecretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, is one of the most respected names here in the city of Washington, and indeed across this entire Nation. He has served with distinction in one of the most challenging jobs in this country—as a guiding force in the enormous task of providing decent housing for all Americans.

I would call Mr. Van Deusen the perfect model of the complete dedicated civil servant, but he is even more than that. He came to Washington at a great personal sacrifice, not only financially, but even more significantly in his family relations. He was a partner in one of the finest law firms in Detroit when he was asked to take up the task of Undersecretary, and on February 7, 1969, his appointment to that position was announced by President Nixon. He knew that in accepting this position he would have to give up so much of his personal life with his wife and his three young daughters, but he came with the same spirit of intelligent enthusiasm he had given every other venture in his life, and all of us must be grateful for the work he has given us.

Richard Van Deusen was born in Jackson, Mich., on July 18, 1925. He attended Deerfield Academy and the University of Minnesota, from which he was graduated cum laude. He played on the Minnesota football team, was selected as captain of that team, and was chosen on the All-Big Ten.

He served his country in the U.S. Navy during World War II from 1943 through 1946, and upon release as an ensign in the Naval Reserves, attended Harvard Law School. Following his graduation in 1949, he joined the Detroit law firm of Dickinson, Wright, McKean & Cudlip, and remained with that firm until his appointment as Undersecretary.

He entered vigorously into the community activities. He served in the Michigan State House of Representatives from 1954 through 1956. He was a director of the Detroit Bar Association, the Michi-

gan State Chamber of Commerce, the Automobile Club of Michigan, the Detroit Automobile Interinsurance Exchange, and the Boy's Republic of Farmington, Mich. He served also as a trustee of the Cranbrook, Kingswood, and Brookside Schools in Bloomfield Hills, Mich.

He served also as a delegate to the Michigan Constitutional Convention in 1961 and 1962, when that convention was called to reform the State's archaic constitution. It was in this position he became closely associated with the president of American Motors, who was to become Governor of Michigan and who, as Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, was to call upon Mr. Van Deusen to lend his many talents to the service of all Americans.

We are losing a most distinguished public servant in Mr. Van Deusen. I have had so many occasions to work with him at HUD. I found him most intelligent, most deeply committed, and above all most dedicated to a program of action to provide the housing for America.

I know that he and his wife, the former Barbara Congdon, and their three daughters, Amanda, Lisa, and Katy, will find relaxation away from the very demanding job as Undersecretary. But I want all of them to know that we will miss sorely Richard Van Deusen. He has served his country with distinction in time of war and in time of peace. I wish his God-speed through all the days of his life.

TOM BRADLEY

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, this Friday the citizens of Los Angeles will be honoring City Councilman Tom Bradley at a dinner at the Beverly Hilton Hotel. Tom has served the people of Los Angeles well for 30 years, first as a member of the police force and then, for the past 9 years, as a member of the city council.

I have worked closely with Tom for many years on legislation and projects relating to metropolitan problems. As chairman of the State, County, and Federal Affairs Committee, he has cooperated often on Federal legislation affecting Los Angeles.

One of his special areas of interest concerns the need for a more regional approach to the problems of cities. Tom has been a leader in this field and is presently a member of the Southern California Association of Governments, an organization formed for the purpose of developing greater cooperation and efficiency among the governmental units of our area.

When more and more Americans are moving to the cities, it is fortunate that we have leaders like Tom Bradley who are devoting their talents to finding solutions to the many problems that have arisen in our growing and congested metropolitan areas. I know that concerned Angelinos will join me in honoring this outstanding councilman.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT REFUSED NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES' HELP ON ALASKA PIPELINE

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today a letter from the President of the National Academy of Sciences to Interior Department Secretary Rogers C. B. Morton, dated March 2, 1971, noting the Academy's special interest in Arctic environmental problems and volunteering to help the Interior Department assess the expected environmental impact of the proposed 780-mile pipeline. Unfortunately, the Interior Department refused to help fund the Academy study and, thus, it was never undertaken.

This important document raises very grave suspicions about whether Interior believed its conclusions in favor of an Alaska pipeline could stand up to close scrutiny. It is another important piece of evidence that the Interior Department has gone out of its way to avoid getting the facts on the Alaska pipeline issue.

I urge those of my colleagues interested in this important issue to read the National Academy of Sciences' letter which follows:

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES,  
March 2, 1971.

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON,  
Secretary of the Interior,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I write to you, Mr. Secretary, concerning our views with respect to the proposed trans-Alaskan pipeline and to offer our assistance as an organization that was established by Act of Congress to provide advice to the federal government on matters of science. As you may know, the National Academy of Sciences has a long standing interest in problems concerning Alaska and the arctic region, and we have followed with interest the problems that have emerged in connection with plans for utilizing the oil resources of the Alaska North Slope area.

As an example, a committee of the Academy, acting at the request of the federal government, exhaustively studied the 1964 Alaska earthquake and is now publishing a series of volumes on various scientific aspects of that event. Another example of our interest is the continuing work of the Committee on Polar Research on scientific problems of the polar regions and on specific problems relating to Alaska. We also are currently establishing, in cooperation with interested government agencies, an Arctic Assessment Group to consider ways in which an interdisciplinary framework can be established to assist and augment efforts by government for systematically assessing emerging economic development problems in northern Alaska. More specifically, the Environmental Studies Board, a joint undertaking of the National Academies of Sciences and Engineering, has followed closely the problems of the Alaskan pipeline and was thoroughly briefed by Dr. William T. Pecora and his associates on these developments in October 1970.

I believe these examples will describe the interests of the Academy in the problems of Alaska and underscore its usefulness in providing assistance to both government and industry for mobilizing scientific and technological resources to deal with problems of national concern in that region.



Until recently, we have been reluctant to take the initiative in making inquiries concerning the technology assessment support that we might offer with respect to the considerations raised by the oil pipeline. This has been due to our awareness of the political complexities involved in plans for its construction. However, the request for comments on the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Trans-Alaskan Pipeline that was issued in the Federal Register on January 15, 1971, by the Bureau of Land Management, has invited comments from interested groups. Our Environmental Studies Board, at its meeting on February 12, considered this statement and voted to advise the Council of the National Academies of Sciences and Engineering of its concerns.

The Council, at its meeting on February 20, 1971, accepted the following resolution of the Environmental Studies Board:

"That the Environmental Studies Board recommends to the Councils of the National Academy of Sciences and National Academy of Engineering that the services of the National Academies be offered to the Council on Environmental Quality and the Department of the Interior for a review and assessment of the Section 102 Statement on the Alaska Pipeline, provided adequate time and funds are made available for such assessment. The Environmental Studies Board also calls attention of the Councils to the fact that the filing date of February 27 is completely inadequate for such an assessment, and that this particular project is of such national interest that it deserves a review."

The Council of the Academy has instructed me to bring this action to your attention, and I am taking this opportunity to do so before the record closes. I understand that the time for submitting statements for the record has been extended beyond February 27.

I would be very happy to discuss this matter further with you, particularly if you see a way in which the National Academy of Sciences could be of service to the Department of the Interior in problems that deal with the Alaskan pipeline. The Alaskan pipeline represents one of the great technological and environmental challenges of the day. We must find ways to bring our best effort to bear on this problem, and I hope that we can all work together for the greatest benefit of the nation.

Sincerely,

PHILIP HANDLER,  
President.

#### IN AID OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

#### HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, on May 8, 1972, I introduced H.R. 14822 which is aimed at providing a measure of protection for law enforcement officers who are sued in Federal court resulting from the performance of their duties. In addition to the support of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the National District Attorneys Association, and the National Association of Police Legal Advisors, I have received many letters of support for the enactment of this measure from Attorneys General, State Highway patrolmen, and policemen from all corners of the United States.

In response to the request of several colleagues to reintroduce this measure

so that cosponsors may be listed, I am doing so today and I commend to all of the Members of this House a thorough reading of this bill. With appreciation to those colleagues who have joined me in support of law enforcement officers, Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing, with cosponsors, H.R. 14822 and urge my colleagues on the House Judiciary Committee to promptly schedule this measure for consideration.

#### TRIBUTE TO WASHINGTON, D.C.

#### HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard stories of how travel and sightseeing has sometimes been a harrowing experience for visitors to our Nation's Capitol. It was not too long ago that the news seemed to be nothing but stories of crime and violence. That this situation has decidedly improved is evident from the firsthand report provided by a recent visitor to Washington, Andrea Reid, of Lansing, Mich., who was so impressed that she wrote a letter to the editor of the State Journal of Lansing, Mich., which appeared in the Wednesday, June 7, 1972, edition. While such positive statements and experiences somehow never seem to make the headlines, I believe that this letter should not go unnoticed in our Nation's Capital, and I am pleased to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The statement follows:

#### TRIBUTE TO WASHINGTON, D.C.

LANSING.—Recently, while on a vacation in Washington, D.C., my husband and I had the privilege of seeing the nation's Capitol, the White House and the many monuments and historic landmarks Washington boasts.

I had heard much about the slums of Washington and the demonstrations and filth, but much to our surprise we didn't find these things when we arrived. We saw lovely architectural masterpieces, monuments worth picture-taking, and breathtakingly beautiful gardens and grounds around the sights.

The White House is a magnificent structure with huge yards and lovely grounds, surrounded by a wrought iron fence, enclosing the area. The Lincoln Memorial stands impressively at the end of a long body of water with the Washington Monument gracefully reaching for the sky at the other end, showing its reflection in the water. The Capitol is as majestic as the name implies.

We were amazed at the scenery and the cordiality with which we were received by the people of Washington. Most of all, we were impressed by the fact that you can drive up in front of the Lincoln Memorial and the Washington Monument and others, and stop your car and get out and take pictures . . . You don't even have to put money in parking meters because there aren't any. It seems a nice gesture for tourists and they make you feel welcome instead of "no parking" signs posted all around these areas.

Our visit to Washington was most inspirational and very enjoyable. I feel much happier with the government of our country, knowing that they support such a lovely capital. I hope everyone treats it with the respect and dignity which it deserves.

ANDREA REID.

#### THE SHOOTING OF WALLACE: A NEW RETURN TO VIOLENCE

#### HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the shooting of Presidential candidate George Wallace, some weeks ago, gave rise to a wave of editorial protests in our Nation's newspapers.

One of the best of these editorials, which I read, was one written by Chuck Rathe, editor of the St. Cloud Daily Times in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District.

While deploring the shooting of Wallace, Editor Rathe pointed out that there is other violence which is just as deadly in preventing the effective use of the ballot.

For the edification of my colleagues and the thousands of other people who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I insert Mr. Rathe's editorial in that publication: THE SHOOTING OF WALLACE: A NEW RETURN TO VIOLENCE

It had all started off—this political year of 1972—with the bitter, divisive past behind. That was the hope. In fact, it was so tranquil the hope became the reality. The war that had festered into the raw political debates of four years ago appeared to be winding down. An America sick of a decade of fighting was almost euphorically lulled into a sense of well-being. The debate was to center on the economy—the wage-price freeze, Phase II and all that and a new populism marched to the fore. The riots that had scarred the cities had subsided and indeed disappeared. The demonstrations that tore up the political life were a thing of the past.

In a week all that changed. The shooting of Gov. George Wallace of Alabama came exactly a week after President Nixon announced the mining of North Vietnam ports and increased bombing raids which raises the threat of a direct confrontation with the Soviet Union.

A chill swept the nation as the pieces of a replay of the fearful days at the height of the war began falling into place. Protests and demonstrations in only the space of a few days followed, some of them near-violent, some of them erupting in bombings, burnings, loud and noisy shouting, and broken heads and tear gas and cops hit by rocks.

All the old fears that tear at the fabric of what we are doing here came rushing back with another act of political violence everyone was so sure that after the turbulent 1960s could never happen again. But it did.

In the agonized shock of a people trying to blot out what they cannot believe the first question is why. And then who. Why do they gun down a man who is taking his case to the people, however controversial? Who are these sickened people? Do they get guns too readily? Do they hear the noisy and angry shouts too loudly? Do they misread dissent and suddenly plunge into the ultimate violence? Who knows.

We all share the shock to the nation. We all share the grief of the family. We are all maddened, and saddened and alive to the treachery. This is to the way we pick our leaders. They would deny us the right to vote them in or out. And they alter the political process abnormally in one wrenching incident and we may all feel cheated they take things into their own hands. And we should. Who do they think they are that they preempt our collective prerogative to do what we want to do?

But unless we are a people morbidly turning this unjust act into a national hairshirt, we cannot all share the guilt. We have not all been guilty of a climate that may breed this. We cannot all be guilty of one man's finger on the trigger.

But this and the rising tide in the streets has thrown back into the center stage the angry word—violence—and there are those who can share the guilt in this.

There is something dark and sinister here when violence is used in any form to get a political end. The apologists may point, as they do, to the American Revolution, the Civil War, the history of our riots, the history of our warring and say, see, we are a violent people. But riding over the violence is another strain of the American mind and a people who have managed with the ballot what they cannot do with the bullet. Violence by itself does indeed alter the course of things but it is a twisting, unhappy thing that so futilely presupposes that shooting one man or another will change the way they want it changed. But it won't. Dissent, yes—it is the structure of compromise. Violence, no—it is mean and it is ugly.

We are back to the fear that political leaders can no longer in safety take to the streets, to the airport runways, the shopping parking lots to spell out their views and this alone is bad enough.

But those who would still use violence—burning, looting, bombing for peace—are as misguided as those who pull triggers on little snub-nosed guns. You don't have to shoot a man to be politically violent. You don't have to shoot a man to take from the people their right to choose who shall lead them and the direction they want to go.

#### HIGHER EDUCATION BILL CENTRALIZES MORE POWER IN WASHINGTON, FAVORS BUSING

### HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is my policy to publish a weekly news report to keep my constituents advised of my activities in their behalf.

The following is the text of my report of June 12, 1972:

#### HIGHER EDUCATION BILL CENTRALIZES MORE POWER IN WASHINGTON, FAVORS BUSING

The higher education bill that passed the House and went to the President last week is another step to centralize more power in Washington than ever before over this nation's educational system. Additionally, this bill provides federal support for busing in specific instances.

Because I am opposed to further concentration of power in Washington and because I am opposed to busing in order to achieve a racial balance, I did not support the bill.

I believe the country has the obligation of providing an opportunity for our young people to further their education but not by creating more bureaucracy in Washington. We already have approximately 158 different educational programs being administered by 29 different agencies of the federal government. This bill would create a National Institute of Education, a new centralized educational planning center and give it a billion dollars. The one thing we do not need, in my opinion, is more bureaucracy.

Two good anti-busing amendments that were in the original House version of the bill were dropped in the compromise final bill. The end result is that this bill allows federal funds to be used for busing. I also see pro-

visions in this bill that could provide grounds for endless court interference in the drawing and redrawing of school boundaries.

All in all, the bill is not, in my judgment, in the best interests of students, schools, higher education or the taxpayers of this country. I regret that the committee did not come up with a better bill, and I regret that Congress passed it; at least it did so without my support.

#### A CITY OF TWO TALES

### HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

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

It was the best of "Ideas," it was the worst of "Ideas"...

Indianapolis Star editorial, October 15, 1955:

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

Indianapolis Star editorial, May 28, 1972:

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

The editorials follow:

#### CHALLENGING FEDERAL COLOSSUS

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

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

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

Now the governor of Utah has decided to break another law to test its legality. J. Bracken Lee has announced that he will not pay his income taxes. He claims that the Federal government has no constitutional right to use his tax money to support people living in foreign countries, or their govern-

ments. If Mr. Lee loses, he will have to pay his taxes with 6 percent interest. If he wins, the American taxpayer can expect lower taxes, fewer deficits and less government spending.

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

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

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

#### LIBERAL DEATH-WISH

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

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

"Very well. That is a game that more than one can play. I'll quit paying my taxes to protest welfare chiseling, bureaucrats, grants to revolutionary and crackpot intellectuals, abuse of antipoverty programs, half-baked decisions by left-leaning members of the Federal judiciary, funds for phony commissions that reach foregone conclusions, supporting the double crossers in the United Nations and inflated salaries for ultra-liberal lawmakers who kowtow every time a Communist commissar sneezes."

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

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

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

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

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

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

What would become of Mrs. Hart? She is a member of the bourgeoisie. Communists liquidate the bourgeoisie. Does she think they would make an exception in her case? She seems to think so. They are willing to stake lives—usually other people's—on this delu-



sion whose falsity is written in the blood of millions.

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

#### MINORITY LEADER FORD EFFECTIVELY DEFENDS SALT AGREEMENT

### HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as controversy grows around the recent SALT agreement and confusing contradictory statements are heard from both sides, it is important to listen to those who present a clear and balanced view of the implications of this historic first step designed to limit the proliferation of strategic weapons. Therefore, I would like to call to the attention of the entire House an excellent speech on the implications of SALT delivered by the distinguished minority leader (GERALD R. FORD) before the VFW State convention in Grand Rapids, Mich. In his presentation, Congressman Ford argues effectively against both those who warn that the treaty grants the Soviet Union a guarantee of nuclear superiority and those who urge that it be coupled with drastic cuts in our military defense budget.

Mr. FORD asserts that in securing a limitation on the quantities of nuclear weapons the President has achieved a true balance of strategic power with the Soviet Union: the Soviets' "greater number of rocket launchers and more powerful warheads" are effectively counterbalanced by our "greater number of warheads" and our "more accurate and advanced technology." He points out that since the two nations are also about the same in terms of nuclear tonnage, we not only did not "give anything away" but also accomplished two very important goals by means of the agreement: we averted a senseless "stockpiling of nuclear weapons launchers by both the United States and the Soviet Union," and "we slowed the Soviet momentum in the nuclear arms race," thus perhaps avoiding a "future nuclear holocaust touched off by a Soviet first strike."

However, the distinguished minority leader is careful to note that agreements such as the SALT treaty are accomplished only from a position of strength and that it would be folly to heed the advice of those like Senator McGOVERN who advocate deep cuts in our defense budget. In order to facilitate further progress toward arms limitation and world peace, Mr. FORD urges that even though we have placed a "checkrein on the number of U.S. and Soviet rocket launchers," we must nonetheless be prepared to continue to improve the quality of our strategic weapons. I would certainly hope that we can soon achieve a companion agreement limiting qualitative improvements in strategic arms, but

if the SALT agreement has any lesson it is that the Soviets will not likely be amenable to such a further limitation unless they are firmly convinced that we are prepared to continue these qualitative and technological improvements in its absence. Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleague from Michigan delivered an able, realistic defense of the President's historic achievement in Moscow and would commend the speech to all of my colleagues.

The speech follows:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R. FORD

The SALT agreements entered into by the United States and the Soviet Union have, in effect, already become a part of history.

The SALT Treaty will in time become part of the heritage of our past. "The heritage" that, in the words carved on the National Archives Building in Washington, "is the seed that brings forth the harvest of the future."

What of the seed—the SALT Treaty itself? Have we made unwise concessions to the Soviet Union? Have we placed our national defense in danger? Have we placed ourselves in a position of nuclear inferiority?

The terror remains, but the balance is frozen in terms of a standoff in strategic weaponry. It is true that the Soviets have more rocket launchers than we have and more powerful warheads. But we have greater numbers of warheads and we have the advantage in accuracy and in advanced technology. In terms of nuclear tonnage, the total is about the same.

Have we, then, achieved anything at all? Indeed, yes. We have slowed the Russians' headlong rush toward nuclear superiority, a superiority which could have tempted them into a nuclear first strike against the United States.

Further stockpiling of nuclear weapons launchers by both the United States and the Soviet Union simply did not make any sense. Both of us have the power to destroy the other many times over. That, in effect, is insanity multiplied.

So what it all comes down to is this. We did not give anything away, and we slowed the Soviet momentum in the nuclear arms race and perhaps thus avoided a future nuclear holocaust touched off by a Soviet first strike.

As for the effect of the limitation on the United States, we can still improve the quality of our nuclear weapons. The only limitation is on quantities—and that limitation makes sense.

What of the harvest which may be produced by the SALT Treaty?

My fervent hope is that it will lead to future agreements further reducing the level of nuclear terror in the world and perhaps even to at least partial disarmament—mutual disarmament—of the world's two great superpowers.

It is worth noting, it seems to me, that no columnist or commentator spoke in the aftermath of President Nixon's mission to Moscow of what might have been called "the spirit of Moscow."

This is good. This is healthy. This is realistic.

Instead of the heady euphoria generated by the meeting between President Johnson and Premier Kosygin at Glassboro—a meeting that produced nothing—we have an attitude of good common sense that followed the productive summit meeting in Moscow.

The Moscow meetings were highly productive, but we did not come away from them with our heads in the clouds. Our feet are on the ground, and we are looking straight ahead. We are hopeful about the "harvest of the future" but we are not wrapping those hopes in foolish dreams.

There are, of course, those in the Congress who now are calling for deep cuts in our defense budget. They are demanding sharp slashes in our defenses despite the fact that the SALT Treaty was possible only because we bargained from a position of strength.

What of the harvest of the future? As we wind down the war in Vietnam, I believe we are entering on an era which holds great promise for the future peace of the world. I am hopeful that we can truly have a generation of peace—that future generations can settle the world's differences in some other forum than a vale of blood and tears.

But let there be no mistake. We can have peace in this age of nuclear weaponry and so-called wars of liberation only if we remain strong.

The most cursory look at history tells us that the possibility of armed aggression can never be dismissed. Let us, therefore, be on guard against those who preach the foolish doctrine of unilateral disarmament.

Our President has journeyed to Moscow and to Peking on missions of peace. He has opened up a new era of negotiations. He has thawed the hostility and suspicion that breed incidents and confrontation.

In less than a week I, too, will be making a trip to Peking and I expect to talk with top Chinese officials while there. I will be seeking to continue the dialogue the President has started and to open wider the door to China.

But I am fully cognizant, as is the President, that we in America must keep up our strength if we are to enjoy peace even in an era of negotiations.

Let us not forget the lessons of history. We must maintain our strength—both military and spiritual. We must make sure we can come to realize the harvest of the future which our present diplomatic endeavors are making possible.

I say we can and should be No. 1 in quality, if not in quantity.

I am aware, as is every taxpayer, of the heavy financial burden that military preparedness imposes on this country. But does anyone really believe that we cannot afford an effective defense against potential threats to our national safety? Are there really very many Americans who believe that it is better to suffer defeat than to fight?

Take a close look at the lessons of history. World War I erupted despite the Hague peace treaties.

World War II was caused by a power-hungry madman, not by an armaments race. It might well have been prevented if England, France and the United States had been better prepared.

It was for these very reasons that at the end of World Wars I and II we vowed never to be caught unprepared again. Are we doomed to once again repeat the mistakes we made following those world conflicts?

Unfortunately the passage of time throws a cloak of ignorance over the bitter errors of postwar history.

Half of today's Americans were not alive when we fought World War II. They, and other Americans in their early teens, had no direct connection with that war or any direct knowledge of it.

If indeed we are interested in preserving the peace we cannot ever again allow any foreign power to achieve overwhelming military superiority vis-a-vis the United States.

This is not to argue against attempts to negotiate an East-West detent. We should do everything possible to achieve such conditions. As I have already indicated, I strongly support President Nixon's missions to Peking and Moscow and the terms of the SALT agreements.

But the fact remains that weakness invites attack, and it takes only one aggressor nation to plunge the entire world into war.

Now that we have placed a checkrein on the numbers of U.S. and Soviet rocket

launchers, there will be those in Congress who will oppose improvements in the quality of U.S. nuclear weapons and the President's plans to modernize our Navy. This, I say, is the height of folly.

There is no question that the Soviets will continue to work on qualitative improvements in their nuclear arsenal. And as for sea power, the Soviets have been and are continuing to move ahead with a naval and maritime program that is a technological marvel.

Soviet Russia is preparing a military establishment which by 1975 could be ahead of ours in many respects.

During the past 10 years the Russians have developed the world's fastest interceptor aircraft, the world's largest strategic missile, and the world's largest helicopter. They have also developed more than 50 new ships of all classes in addition to a new all-purpose land tank, new antitank weapons, artillery and aircraft. These new weapons did not evolve overnight. They were on the drawing boards in the 1950s.

With no visible letup in the Soviet research and development program, it is quite possible that the decade of the 1970s will see a steady flow of new Soviet weapons systems that have been blueprinted during the past decade.

This is why I strongly support the President's proposed \$83 billion defense budget for fiscal 1973.

With this budget, President Nixon has initiated a buildup clearly intended to prevent the Soviet Union from outclassing the United States militarily.

I support the proposed stepup in the Navy's Underwater Long Range Missile System (Trident), the missile submarine program aimed at replacing our aging Polaris fleet with boats whose new missiles will have the same range as the Minuteman ICBM.

I support Navy modernization and the proposal to build three prototype B-1 super-bombers for the Air Force.

And I support the proposed 17 per cent increase in defense research and development funding.

The emphasis in this fiscal 1973 defense budget rests on investment items such as research, development, modernization, ship construction, and creation of a strong technological base to offset the Soviet strides toward a more efficient and productive research and development effort. I endorse this course.

Will this defense effort constitute a distortion of priorities? Will we be spending a disproportionate share of the U.S. tax dollar on defense needs?

Defense outlays in fiscal 1973, if approved as proposed by the President, will be down to 30 per cent of all Federal outlays—the lowest level, proportionately, since 1950.

At the same time, human resources spending will be allocated 45 cents out of every Federal dollar.

Those who would attack the President's defense budget despite this priorities ratio should heed the words of Air Marshal Sir John Slessor, who said: "The most important social service a government can render is to keep its citizens alive and free."

Let us never forget, then, that strength remains the key to peace and national security.

Critics of military spending are fond of pointing out that President Eisenhower warned the American people against what he called "the military-industrial complex." But they never quote exactly what Ike said in that farewell address of his in 1961.

Ike said this: "Until the latest of our world conflicts, the United States had no armaments industry. American makers of plowshares could, with time and as required, make swords as well. But now we can no longer risk emergency improvisation of national defense; we have been compelled to create a permanent armaments industry of vast proportions. This

conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience. The total influence, economic, political, even spiritual, is felt in every city, every State house, every office of the Federal government. We recognize the imperative need for this development. Yet we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications. In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist. We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes."

Note that Ike called attention to the possibility of an abuse of power on the part of the military-industrial complex but he did not urge that this complex be dismembered or destroyed. Instead he said, "We recognize the imperative need for this development."

And in that same speech, Ike said: "Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction."

Ike knew, as does Richard Nixon, that we could never move from an era of confrontation to an era of negotiation except from a position of strength.

It is a matter of sober fact that one can negotiate only from strength.

Yet today we have our unilateral disarmers and the "rather be Red than dead" crowd.

This produces what I call pollution of the American spirit. It is one of the most dangerous forms of pollution in America—and one we cannot fight with dollars.

We must fight against this adulteration of the spirit which has made America strong.

We must revive the virtues of Americanism—courage and honor, as well as justice, truth, sincerity and hardihood. We must recognize that among the things that will destroy America is peace at any price.

And as we approach the celebration of our Independence Day, let us reawaken patriotism—love of country, courage with conviction, faith in freedom, and devotion to duty.

As the late Gen. Douglas MacArthur said: "Be not deceived by strange voices heard across the land, decrying this old and proven concept of patriotism. From the very beginning, it has been the main bulwark of our national strength and integrity. Be proud to be called a patriot, or nationalist, or what you will . . . if it means that you love your Country above all else—and will place your life, if need be, at the service of your Flag."

Thank you.

#### LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

#### HON. LOUISE DAY HICKS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today, June 20, marks a sad anniversary for all those who love freedom. Thirty-one years ago, during the week of June 14 to 20, the world observed the Soviet Union's campaign of aggression, terror, and mass deportation in Lithuania, and during that time the Soviets deported or killed over 30,000 innocent Lithuanian men, women, and children.

I think it is fitting, on this sad anniversary, that we, as Members of Congress, take time to reflect on the tragic fate of all the Baltic States—Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. This is all the

more fitting, for we shall soon be observing the 50th anniversary of the United States recognition of the Baltic States.

The modern history of these peoples is the story of all men's struggle for the inalienable rights of freedom and self-determination. The Communist regime did not come to power in the Baltic States by legal or democratic means. The Soviets invaded and occupied those States in 1940 and the Baltic peoples have been suffering in Russian captivity ever since.

It is one of the ironies and tragedies of contemporary history that these gallant and gifted people, totalling over one million in the United States, have been fated to have their beloved homeland suffer under alien dictatorship for so long.

On June 10 of this year, the Boston chapter of the Lithuanian American Community met in Boston and adopted the following resolution, which I am proud to insert into the RECORD:

#### RESOLUTION

We, American citizens of Lithuanian descent, on June 10, 1972, at the South Boston Lithuanian Citizens' Association auditorium, at 368 West Broadway, South Boston, Massachusetts, do hereby commemorate the 31st anniversary of Soviet aggression and the mass deportations of June 14–20, 1941 during which the Soviets deported or massacred 35,000 innocent Lithuanian men, women and children.

Therefore, we hereby have unanimously adopted the following Resolution:

Whereas, the Genocide Convention, which declares the destruction of nations, racial and religious groups to be an international crime, has been ratified by sixty-nine nations, including the Soviet Union, and

Whereas, the Soviet Union, through a program of deportations and resettlement of peoples, continues to pursue its policy to change the ethnic character of the population of Lithuania and the other Baltic States, thereby committing the offence of genocide, and

Whereas, the Soviet invaders are unable to suppress the aspirations of the Lithuanian people for freedom and the exercise of their human rights, as demonstrated by the heroic attempt of defection by Simas Kudirka, the attempted escape of Vytautas Simokaitis and his wife, the arrest of Liudvikas Simutis, two bishops, and three Lithuanian priests, Fathers J. Zdebskis, P. Bubnys and A. Seskevicius for teaching religion, and most recently the tragic self-immolation by Romas Talanta-Kalanta to arouse international opinion against continued Soviet oppression, and

Whereas, an extraordinary petition protesting religious oppression signed by 17,000 persons in Lithuania reached the United Nations a week before Easter,

Now, therefore be it resolved That we demand that the Soviet Government release all political prisoners, and withdraw its armed forces, administrative apparatus, and the imported Russian colonists from Lithuania, thus permitting the Lithuanian people to freely exercise their sovereign rights.

That we respectfully request President Nixon to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums on behalf of the restoration of sovereign rights to the Baltic peoples, which policy was recommended by the President of the United States, by the House Concurrent Resolution 416 of the 89th Congress.

That this Resolution be sent to the President of the United States, and copies thereof to the Secretary of State, the United States Ambassador to the United Nations, to the Senators and Congressmen from our Commonwealth, and to the press.



That resolution speaks of the urgency of the enforcement of House Concurrent Resolution 416, which was unanimously passed by the House and the Senate in the 89th Congress. I feel that it is important that we review that resolution, and I am proud to insert the text of the resolution in the RECORD:

H. CON. RES. 416

Whereas the subjection 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 co-operation; 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.

Passed the House of Representatives June 21, 1965.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS, Clerk.

That resolution was filed and passed 6 years ago, yet Soviet oppression continues in the Baltic States. Since June 1940 the Baltic States have lost more than one-fourth of their combined populations due to the ethnically genocidal deportation and resettlement programs of the Soviet Union. Those practices continue, with no end in sight. As recently as May of this year, in the city of Kaunas, Lithuania, several thousand youths battled police and Soviet soldiers after a young Roman Catholic, Romas Talanta, burned himself in a public park for political reasons. After his funeral rioting continued for several days in the city and spread through much of the rest of the country. Those events helped bring international attention to the tragic fate of the captive nations, but more needs to be done.

America's diplomatic representatives at the United Nations and elsewhere must be prepared to confront the Soviet Union with its acts of aggression against these nations. We must do all that we can to see that the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, which has

been signed by the Soviet Union, is made a reality in the Baltic States and other captive nations. The President must bring the issue of the liberation of the Baltic States before the United Nations, and demand that the Soviets withdraw from Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. Above all, we must review the meaning of House Concurrent Resolution 416 and renew our determination to see that it is enforced. All of these actions will have their effect, as world opinion and criticism are brought to bear against the Soviet leadership.

I hope that we never forget the lesson of the sad fate of the Baltic peoples, and may we always remember the ancient precept that so long as some men are enslaved, none of us is truly free.

#### LETTER FROM CONSTITUENT

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I insert the following letter from a constituent of mine concerning closing cost on real estate transactions.

The letter follows:

DUTTON, KAPPES & OVERMAN,  
Indianapolis, Ind., May 31, 1972.

HON. ANDREW JACOBS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I can appreciate the fact that Congress is anxious to put a stop to the real estate closing cost abuses by attorneys and others in the D.C., Maryland and New York areas which have recently been publicized by the Washington Post. The practice whereby a lawyer receives a split of the title insurance premium simply for referring title business to a commercial title insurance company is deplorable and should be proscribed by appropriate legislation. The Senate version of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1972 (S. 3248) does proscribe this practice and deserves the support of every Senator and Representative. The House bill has a similar anti-kickback provision. However, in an attempt to strengthen the House version, the Housing Subcommittee has added a number of other well-intentioned but little understood amendments. The result is that the House version of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1972 as reported by the Housing Subcommittee on May 11 contains provisions contrary to the public's interest. Title IX of that bill regulates closing costs on federally related mortgage transactions. The way Title XI is currently worded it will have the effect of depriving lower and middle income groups of the benefit of being represented by independent legal counsel at federally related real estate closings.

Section 907(a) states:

"No attorney who performs any legal services which are incident to or a part of any real estate settlement with respect to which any party to such settlement has obtained a federally related mortgage loan shall receive any commission in connection with the issuance of title insurance for any real property which is a part of such settlement."

This means that the family attorney must stop short of providing his client full legal service which includes issuance of title insurance, or he must do so without compensation. Section 912(a) states:

"Any title company and its agents qualified to issue title insurance are authorized to perform any and all title services in connection with the issuance of such insurance in any real estate settlement involving a federally related mortgage loan."

If Sections 907(a) and 912(a) become law they will have the effect of eliminating the family lawyer from these transactions. The reason for this is that the title insurance must be purchased from someone other than an attorney already representing a party to the transaction. Therefore, in order to have the family lawyer involved in the transaction, two fees must be paid—one to the title insurer and another to the attorney. Since the sections allow the title insurance company to provide all title services, most lower and middle income families will have to forgo the benefits of independent legal counsel and depend on a title insurance company which has no fiduciary responsibility with respect to them to provide closing services. Of course, the more affluent buyers and sellers as well as the financial institutions involved will be represented by their own lawyers even if they are forced to go elsewhere for their title insurance. However, it would be unwise for the Congress to place this burden on lower income families.

A middle or lower income home buyer needs complete title assurance, which is legal advice plus an insured title, as much as a more sophisticated real property buyer. The determination of the legal rights and explanation of those rights to a buyer are the greater services; the writing and issuing of the title insurance contract are the lesser. For the sake of economy and efficiency home buyers should be able to obtain all legal services from a lawyer. Prohibiting compensation in the form of commissions for drafting, writing, and issuing title insurance contracts is unreasonable and will result in denying middle and lower income families legal services in what could well be the most important transaction of their lives, the purchase of a home.

At a time when the federal government is spending large sums of money to assure legal services to the middle and lower income groups, it seems rather incongruous for Congress even to consider passing legislation which will eliminate the traditional neighborhood lawyer. It is the neighborhood lawyer, the family lawyer, who can best serve the legal needs of the local community, and any legislation should encourage the participation of the traditional neighborhood lawyer in the real estate transactions rather than the elimination of them.

It should also be noted that the House proposals would give the commercial title insurance companies a monopoly on issuing title insurance and furnishing legal services associated with federally related real estate closings. If Congress wants to keep closing costs down, the last thing they should do is to grant a few large corporations a monopoly by making it impractical for individual lawyers to compete by offering complete title service.

It is respectfully requested that you support the protection of home buyers by opposing legislation which discriminates against lawyers and which would deny the middle and lower income families legal services in real estate transactions. You can do this by opposing the Housing Subcommittee's amendments and encouraging the House Banking and Currency Committee members to adopt the Senate anti-kickback provisions as set forth in S. 3248. In terms of the bill currently before the Banking and Currency Committee that would mean substitution of the anti-kickback provisions in S. 3248 for Title IX of that bill.

Sincerely,

DUTTON, KAPPES & OVERMAN,  
PHILIP S. KAPPES.

SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY—  
TOWN OF WESTWOOD

## HON. LOUISE DAY HICKS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as the Congresswoman from the district, it was recently my great pleasure to participate in the celebration of the 75th anniversary of the town of Westwood, Mass.

The town of Westwood reflects the diversity and vitality of the district which I have the honor to represent in Congress, and its story in the story of America. On this important anniversary, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues the following history of Westwood, which was prepared by the chairman of the 75th anniversary committee and the selectmen of Westwood, with the special assistance of a former Westwood resident, Mrs. Marjorie Fenerty.

## The history follows:

## HISTORY OF THE TOWN OF WESTWOOD

Westwood, Massachusetts, incorporated April 2, 1897, was the last of fifteen towns to be carved from the 1636 Dedham Plantation. Settlements in this section of Dedham began in the late 1600's, once the danger from the Indians had more or less subsided.

A sawmill on Purgatory Brook which produced clapboards for "closing in of their houses" for protection in severe winter, became the center of one cluster of homes in the early 1700's. Other early farms in this area were located on Rock Meadow Brook to the west and Pond Plain Brook to the south.

After several years of petitioning by the residents of the land "beyond ye Rocks Westward," the Clapboard Trees Parish was established by order of the General Court January 10, 1736. There were fifty-two names on the first assessment roll. In time this section became known as the West, or Third Parish of Dedham. Ten years before the start of the Revolutionary War, West Dedham had forty-two houses and three hundred thirteen inhabitants.

Deacon Ellis's Tavern and Store was a stopping place for farmers on their way to and from market, a meeting place for the Sons of Liberty, the West Dedham Militia and other formal and informal groups. Important notices were posted here; the Liberty Club met here; the hall upstairs was the scene of many an educational and social gathering and the West Indies Goods Store evolved into a General Store. In 1824 the first post office was established here.

The first meeting house was nothing but a shell when erected in 1731 and parishioners were permitted to build their own pews. There were many stormy sessions over the location of this house of worship, which resulted in two small buildings, the other of which became the meeting house for the South, or Second Parish of Dedham. Later disputes erupted over the location of the "burying ground" and "hears house" constructed in 1752. Geography also played an important part in building the new meeting house in 1809.

West Dedham citizens participated in the Dedham Company of the Suffolk Regiment of Militia in earliest days and in Captain Moseley's Volunteers during King Philip's War. Although there seems to have been little suffering from the Indians, the first murder of King Philip's War is said to have taken place in the Dedham woods and

Sachem Pumham was captured here in 1676. Dedham's "great gun" was procured for protection in these days and years later was "swung" after the alarm of April 19, 1775.

In pre-Revolutionary days the west parish had its Liberty Pole and Sons of Liberty which met at Abner Ellis's Tavern. Its men joined with others in Dedham in abhorring violence by a mob of the so-called Boston Massacre, but finally relented and voted indemnity for those suffering from this skirmish, only "on the ground of generosity" and out of gratitude for the repeal of the stamp tax. They refused to drink "foreign tea", banned all imported funeral gloves or other mourning garb and worked with others for the establishment of charter rights and privileges.

West Dedham formed three bands of minute men which answered the alarm of April 19, 1775, mustering in Dedham Center with other companies and marching to Lexington and Concord. All able-bodied men of the parish took part in one way or another during the long war and graves of thirty-seven veterans are found in the Westwood cemetery.

There were forty-three men with West Dedham connections who served in the "War of the Rebellion," twenty-six of them now buried in the West Dedham cemetery.

Eleven memorial squares in Westwood are dedicated to those who gave their lives in World Wars I and II.

As in other New England villages, West Dedham was full of small industries during the first half of the nineteenth century. Every stream had its mills of various types. Before long Mill Street was a thriving industrial complex with saw mills, cabinet shops, iron foundries and even a small tool mill powered by a windmill. Bradford Baker, who manufactured cradles, beds and coffins, advertised that he "had his customers all the way."

The first really major housing boom took place in the mid-1800's. In the 1840's many Irish families, fleeing the potato famine, settled in the High Rock-Hartford Street area.

By 1845 the West Parish had 124 dwelling houses, 192 polls and an assessed valuation, real and personal, of \$388,462.

Dedham Center was becoming more and more industrial and the two sections of town grew apart in interests and needs.

"Mother Dedham", on the railroad, in the 1870's and 1880's joined the Metropolitan Parks District, talked about taking over the private water company serving the center, installed electric lights and was considering putting in sewers. West Dedham residents felt no need for these innovations and realized that they would be taxed for these improvements although it would be many years before they might benefit from them.

The separation was brought about peacefully, with only a change of name from Nahatan (too much like Nahant) to Westwood, and on April 2, 1897, West Dedham, together with a southeastern section of the First Parish, was incorporated into the Town of Westwood.

The infant town had 1015 inhabitants and 140 farms on its eleven square miles. There were 120 children in the three village schools, three fire companies and 225 voters to take part in town affairs.

The first major change that took place was the building of street railways on both sides of town. Before this, transportation was limited to the stage and private carriages.

The days of the quiet self-sufficient farming village with homegrown entertainment as well as food came to an abrupt end in the 1930's. Westwood's low tax rate attracted families of modest means, seeking homes away from the city. An enterprising real estate promoter bought up farms and subdivided some of them into small lots with

correspondingly small and inexpensive houses.

The number of houses trebled between 1930 and 1950 and doubled again in the following seventeen years. The population increased at a greater rate, making necessary connection to a water system, construction of new schools and additions to old ones, installation of sewers and, of course, a spiraling tax rate.

Westwood of the 1970's is a town between 12,000 and 13,000, and has a developing, planned, industrial area (limited to light industry and warehouses) on the eastern portion near Route 1.

It is primarily a suburban town of well-kept commuter homes. There are seven churches, one junior high school, one senior high school and seven elementary school buildings.

In spite of the many changes and the rapid growth over the years, it retains much of the early New England charm in its old houses. It still has open town meeting form of government, is governed by a board of three selectmen and other elected boards, all of a non-partisan nature. Much of the newer building along High Street is in keeping with the Colonial style of architecture. Many of the older homes have been restored and, while modernized for convenience, the older features have been retained.

Through the cooperation of the town and the Westwood Historical Society, an organized celebration of the 75th Anniversary of its incorporation was planned for 1972. The high point of this event was a two hour long parade through the town, composed of some twenty brass bands, scores of floats representing many local groups, dozens of marching units and novelty entries, applauded by some 25,000 onlookers from surrounding towns. The Board of Selectmen from seven adjacent communities, with other local dignitaries, reviewed the parade, including Senator Leverett Saltonstall and Congresswoman Louise Day Hicks.

The 75th Anniversary Celebration of 1972 was heralded by raising the Anniversary Flag at the Town Hall and the erection of anniversary plaques at town boundaries. All the houses and structures built before 1850 were identified by date markers. Historical pictures and artifacts were displayed in the Public Library. An Anniversary Ball was organized by the Westwood Historical Society. Commemorative tiles were prepared and sold. All departments and grades of the school system conducted projects related to the anniversary and many of the town's private groups conducted their own anniversary activity. Westwood citizens were re-awakened to a vital awareness of their town's ancient heritage.

It may be of interest to note that in the Town's 75th year, a woman was elected to the position of Selectman.

## SALUTE TO EDUCATION

## HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join in the salute to education. The diverse institutions of American education are vital to our "free society" as initiators of progress and change. As the President's Commission on School Finance reported, "We cannot survive as a nation or as individuals without education." The value



and necessity of an education today is unquestionable, not only as an academic learning process, but also as a tool for social, emotional, cultural, and physical growth.

I pay tribute to the millions of teachers and school administrators who have so ably handled the ever increasing and demanding student enrollment. They realize, as we all should, the intrinsic worth of education not only to the student, but to the country. As the number of high school and college graduates increases, we can be assured of the steady progression of our Nation toward our long-held goals and ideals. Yet, perhaps more importantly, education is a universal concept, which may, hopefully, lead us to peace. I, therefore, join my colleagues today in saluting our educators, and their aspirations and accomplishments, in the field of education.

#### THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF AMERICAN OPTOMETRIC ASSOCIATION

**HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the start this week of a year-long observance marking the 75th anniversary year of the American Optometric Association, an organization whose members have made exceptional contributions to the health and general quality of life in America.

The American Optometric Association is right now holding its 75th annual congress in its headquarters city of St. Louis, Mo., and I believe it is fitting that we thank these health care practitioners for all they have done, and are doing, for their fellow Americans. Surely, we should wish them every success in their future efforts.

When a handful of dedicated men first recognized the need for a national professional organization to further the increase and application of scientific knowledge about the functions, anomalies, and correction of human vision, not even they could have predicted the tremendous advances their profession would make in its first three-quarters of a century.

Early records of the American Optometric Association show that the organization began with 183 charter members. Membership today is 17,020, a major percentage of the 18,400 optometrists actively engaged in full-time practice and some 2,000 more who are semiretired or in part-time practice. They are licensed in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

If those figures are not sufficiently dramatic, consider these:

Optometry is the third-largest independently prescribing health care profession;

Optometrists are located in nearly 6,300 different cities and towns of all sizes;

Optometrists provide over 70 percent of all vision care in the United States by servicing approximately 74 million patient visits per year.

Optometry has been aptly described as "America's first line of defense against blindness," because optometrists are most frequently the first to see a patient with a complaint about his visual performance. With the professional training and background today's optometrist has, he is able to detect the ocular signs of glaucoma and diabetes, two of the leading causes of blindness, and to promptly refer the patient for appropriate medical treatment of such conditions.

The optometrist of the 1970's provides a number of other highly specialized services for which he is specially educated. One of the most important is the visual rehabilitation of individuals with severe impairments which frequently render a person unable to work or to fully enjoy the many benefits of our advanced society. Intensive and broad-ranging work in this field has led to the development by optometrists of tremendously sophisticated lens and lens systems for the enhancement or restoration of severely impaired visual function.

All of us and all Americans owe a great debt of gratitude to America's optometrists, and it is my privilege to focus attention on them and their fine organization as the American Optometric Association begins its 75th anniversary year.

#### CONGRESSMAN McCLORY URGES TOOL AND DIEMAKERS TO SUPPORT METRIC BILL

**HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Congressman ROBERT McCLORY has been a principal proponent of legislation designed to effect a conversion of our hodgepodge system of weights and measures to the international metric system. The United States and Canada are the only major nations in the world which have not yet converted to the metric system or adopted a program for such conversion.

Mr. Speaker, following his report of legislation resulting in a 3-year study by the Bureau of Standards, Mr. McCLORY has now introduced a bill consistent with the recommendations contained in that study report calling for a comprehensive conversion to metric standards to be accomplished over a 10-year period.

Mr. Speaker, in addressing a recent meeting of the Tool and Die Institute, our colleague, Mr. McCLORY emphasized the urgency of his legislation and the apparent reluctance in some quarters to take action at this time.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that following Mr. McCLORY's appearance at the Tool and Die Institute, the officers of that organization including Josef F. Klingler, president; Clifford W. Berglund, vice president; and F. N. Meredith, training director, and others indi-

cated their active support of the legislation which Mr. McCLORY is sponsoring.

Mr. Speaker, I am attaching Mr. McCLORY's timely and persuasive remarks delivered to the Tool and Die Institute. I commend them to the attention of my colleagues.

The remarks follow:

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN ROBERT McCLORY

In addressing the Tool and Die Institute—including the graduates who are just now about to enter this exciting and vital discipline that enables our great industrial nation to function—I have a feeling that there may be no group that could be more influential in the success of a program to convert our existing system of weights and measures to the international metric system than you.

We must now recognize the fact that a tremendous momentum is behind the movement for a comprehensive conversion to the metric system. This may imply an eventual abandonment of the so-called English system, which we have followed with some modifications since our nation was founded. While I do not intend to reiterate the whole history of the movement which has now reached a decisive stage in our American life, I believe that some background information would be illuminating.

It is recorded that some 180 years ago, Thomas Jefferson, who was then Secretary of State under President George Washington, undertook to establish a uniform and stable system of weights and measures, including the decimal foot, in which all units of measure would be divisible by ten, in line with the decimal system of coinage which had been adopted for our monetary system.

In about 1790, the Paris Academy of Sciences established the "meter," which was considered to be a fractional part of the Earth's circumference. The meter became the basis of a system which was expanded to cover all weights and measures, and which was legalized in France in 1795. However, not until 1840 was the metric system finally made compulsory throughout the French nation. By 1900, some 35 countries in Europe and South America had adopted metric standards as their official system. By 1960, 78 countries had adopted the metric system.

At the request of President James Madison, in 1817, the U. S. Senate authorized a four-year study of our system of weights and measures. Secretary of State John Quincy Adams—soon to become President—undertook the study which he completed in 1821. Adams' report proposed alternative suggestions, among them:

- (1) To adopt, in all the essential parts, the new French system of weights and measures
- (2) To restore the old English system
- (3) To establish a combination of both
- (4) Do nothing, except to "fix" the existing standards

Adams is believed to have favored a plan whereby the President would immediately undertake negotiations with Britain, France, and Spain to establish uniform international measurements. However, nothing concrete developed from the Adams' study.

In 1889, our nation received official copies of the meter bars and kilogram weights from the International Bureau of Weights and Measures in France. Four years later, the Secretary of the Treasury issued an administrative order that these new metric standards should be the national standards for length and mass. Thus the United States became "officially" a metric nation back in 1893. The yard, the pound, and other customary units of measure were defined officially as fractions of the standard metric units.

In 1896, a bill providing that the government departments should use the metric system exclusively passed the House of Repre-

sentatives; however, it was later reconsidered and referred back to committee, where it "died." It is reported that during the election campaign that year, farmers and small tradesmen exerted tremendous pressure on the Members of Congress to prevent us from adopting the metric system as our sole units of measure.

Despite occasional weak spurts of interest, legislative programs to convert to the metric system have been relatively dormant until about 1965. Meanwhile, a great many other nations—including Japan, India, New Zealand, and now, Great Britain—adopted the metric system. Indeed, the United States and Canada are virtually the only nations which continue to resist a comprehensive conversion to metric measurements.

For many years, the automobile industry, which utilized the traditional standards, was able to block any Congressional action to study and recommend a conversion program. However, as the American car manufacturers have been increasing production of automobiles for the foreign markets (where metric measurements are essential), their opposition has gradually softened. Indeed, one of the most convincing studies in favor of industrial conversion was produced by the Ford Motor Company in about 1966.

Subsequent to the diminution of the automobile industry's opposition, there developed an active opposition among certain tool and die makers (which I have never been able to understand) and among several fastener manufacturers. Despite this opposition, a metric study commission was authorized by the Congress in 1968. Its 3-year study—carried out by the Bureau of Standards of the U.S. Department of Commerce—was completed in August, 1971. The report contains four basic recommendations:

- (1) A general conversion to the metric system.
- (2) The establishment of a basically voluntary program to accomplish this result.
- (3) The designation of a target date 10 years following the adoption of a conversion program.
- (4) The costs for such conversion should lie where they fall.

Although the final report from the National Bureau of Standards was published last August (1971), the Administration did not forward to the Congress any kind of legislation to implement the recommendations at that time. Yet, even a purely voluntary program which would involve the Federal Government in no more than bare administrative costs would seem to me to have been an essential follow-on to a coordinating agency or commission, and some machinery for facilitating a general conversion program throughout our industrial, commercial, educational, and even social framework should have been forthcoming. Just before the Christmas (1971) recess, I prepared a very simple bill (H.R. 12307), designed to support the metric study commission's recommendations, as follows:

- (1) A metric coordinating commission, composed of 9 members, would be appointed by the President, and would include representatives of (a) business, (b) labor, (c) education, (d) science, and (e) technology.
- (2) The coordinating commission would be charged with carrying out the metric study commission's recommendations for change-over to the international metric system.
- (3) Detailed plans and time tables for developing these plans through consultations with the various interests involved would be established.

(4) The commission would promote educational programs, primarily for the elementary and secondary schools but also for the public at large, designed to enable all Americans to think and work in metric terms.

(5) The commission would encourage appropriate American enterprise participation in international metric system activity.

(6) The target date for full conversion would be January 1, 1983—or about ten years hence.

(7) Beginning on January 1, 1983, the sole official weights and measures system in the United States would be the international system.

I should add that Senator Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island has introduced a metric conversion measure which is somewhat more detailed than my bill. It would provide for the payment of subsidies to companies which, in converting to the metric system, incur expenses that could not be absorbed in manufacture and sale of products. In March, 1972, I testified before the Senate Commerce Committee with regard to both of these measures.

It is my hope that the House Committee on Science and Astronautics also will schedule hearings within the next few weeks, and I further hope that the Congress will act at this session to implement the metric study commission's report.

The U.S. Department of Commerce did eventually submit a legislative measure just a day or two before the Senate Committee hearing. This measure is in the form of a joint resolution calling for the establishment of a 25-member committee which would not undertake to establish any program for conversion but would engage in further studies to be followed by a plan or program of conversion.

Most interested parties appear now to agree that the United States will follow in some way, and at some time, the recommendations of the metric study commission. In a recent issue of *Factory Magazine*, the lead article contains these words: "There is no doubt that the USA will go metric. The question is, 'when?'"

In the April, 1972, issue of the *Reader's Digest*, the lead article—entitled, "Here Comes the Meter!"—summarized the situation in these words:

Like it or not, the United States is finally joining the rest of the world on the metric system bandwagon. The only remaining question: Will the changeover result from costly drift—or efficient design?

I have been at a distinct loss to understand the delays on this legislation which have occurred at the Department of Commerce. No concrete explanation has been forthcoming. However, I am aware that there has been a strong undercurrent of opposition. In the surveys conducted by the metric study commission, over 80% of the some 4,000 medium and large size companies which were surveyed favored a changeover to the metric system. But 15% of the large manufacturers were opposed, and among the smaller companies, more than a third were in opposition.

The Department of Commerce, with its intimate contact with businesses and industries (including substantial personnel with experience in the private sector), must be sensitive to this lingering opposition. I don't want to suggest that the Department of Commerce has expressed active opposition. But its seeming inaction is all that is needed to destroy the momentum which would otherwise carry the metric conversion program to a relatively orderly and early fruition.

It is possible, too, that the Department of Defense, with its staggering annual budget of more than \$80 billion, is exerting some influence, since the study report shows that defense costs will be increased over a thirty year period by \$18 billion by reason of the conversion.

The International Fasteners Institute, with which I assume your organization has some very close relations, persist in its opposition. At the Senate hearings, the I.F.I. contended that it was not yet prepared to testify on this subject, arguing that more time and more study is required. Perhaps this opposition is persuasive with the De-

partment of Commerce. At any rate, the measure to implement the 3-year study report is still awaiting action in the Congress. The many mysterious and obviously powerful forces at work make the next step extremely uncertain—as well as critical.

As you are no doubt aware, we are experiencing a conversion to the metric system of weights and measures without any legislation and without any plan. How long the industrial changeover will take under such an unorganized, or shall I say, disorganized, setup is most problematical.

It can be said, without fear of contradiction, that a long, drawn-out, industry-by-industry unplanned conversion program would be by far the most costly. The maintenance of a dual system over a period of 30 or 40 years would complicate the problems of manufacturers, test the patience of tool and die makers, require the establishment and storage of huge inventories, and pose many other complex problems.

Some who are opposed to any conversion program are demanding new studies. Yet, I sense that many of those who make this demand are precisely the same persons who objected to the 3-year study on the basis that conversion to the metric system had already been studied and no new research was needed.

The fasteners industry is in a special category, where international agreements are virtually a necessity. At the present time, fasteners are designed and produced according to both inch and metric measurements. However, I believe that the total number of different fasteners is being reduced, and that there is a gradual uniformity occurring, with many of the standards being based on the metric system.

The fastener industry may not like to hear this, but its reluctance to participate more actively on the basis of standards which are quite universal—except in our country—is apparently enabling the metric-oriented nations to gain influence at the expense of our American companies.

I would not want to oversimplify the problems inherent in a conversion program. I am aware that there are reported to be more than 20,000 major engineering standards in the United States which would have to be converted to metric measurements. However, I would like to suggest that adoption by our nation of the metric system will, in my opinion, contribute substantially to ultimate advantages for every segment of our industrial community—insofar as foreign trade and international agreements are concerned.

The pharmaceutical industry has used the metric system almost since its origin. The photographic and optical industries have done likewise.

The space and aeronautics program is almost entirely metric.

Automobile manufacturers and others who produce for foreign markets have been working in metric terms for years.

Our troops returning from Vietnam deal readily in metric terms of meters, kilometers, liters, and milligrams. Our Olympic athletes have converted to metrics in most sports events.

We are encountering increasingly aggressive industrial competitors in Japan and Western Europe. American products manufactured according to metric measurements may, indeed, be one of the major means by which we meet this competition.

Resistance to change on our part can advance their cause and prejudice our competitive position. The British experience has demonstrated that in effecting conversion to metric standards many inefficient manufacturing practices may be discarded and labor-saving and money-saving innovations may result.

While tool and die makers have appeared in the past to raise the danger signal and shudder in fear of a program that would re-



suit in discarding their honored and traditional adherence to the millilinch tolerance, it would seem to me that you could experience the greatest boom in tool and die making history by retooling American industry according to metric measurements. By providing tools and dies to American industry during the next ten years, through the precise use of centimeters and millimeters, you would not merely increase your own production, but also enable the productivity of American industry to increase as a whole, and domestic and foreign markets to expand.

Is it not possible that this evening we have an opportunity to work together in behalf of the broad objectives of a better America—a nation that is in step with the rest of the world? Together, we can establish a mechanism through which our nation could move promptly and in orderly fashion toward a universal system, a system that might contribute to improved understanding between our nation and other nations, and in all of our human relationships.

We have come a long way in history since Thomas Jefferson spoke of the new French system of weights and measures. In preparing for conversion to the metric system, we can use the best minds and advice which the nation has to offer. This means including your minds, your advice, and your energy in this task.

#### CONGRESSWOMAN GREEN FROM OREGON

#### HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is most appropriate and fitting that the distinguished public service of my good friend and colleague from Oregon, EDITH GREEN, has been recognized and honored by so many organizations and institutions throughout the Nation. In the month of June of 1972 alone, Mrs. GREEN has received the following significant awards in recognition of outstanding career: Doctor of humane letters from Warner Pacific College in Oregon, doctor of public administration from Northeastern University in Boston, the Abram L. Sachar Award from the National Women's Committee at Brandeis University, and from Oregon State University she received the Distinguished Service Award, which is the highest accolade the school gives.

On Monday, June 12, 1972, the Christian Science Monitor printed a feature article on our distinguished colleague, EDITH GREEN, which appropriately recognizes her many fine qualities. The article follows:

CONGRESSWOMAN GREEN—SCHOOL-TREND WATCHER

(By Marion Bell Wilhelm)

WASHINGTON.—When Edith Starrett, the bright-eyed daughter of two dedicated teachers, yearned to become an electrical engineer, she was advised not to try for a "man's career."

Her second choice was law. Again, she was counseled out of a profession that would relegate a young woman to a "back office."

So Edith Starrett grew up to become a teacher, as was advisable for a woman looking for regular employment in the 1930's. Today she is one of the most powerful spokesmen for American education in the U.S. Congress.

After 18 years on the House Education and Labor Committee, Rep. Edith Starrett Green (D) of Oregon says philosophically: "As it turned out, the career that was chosen for me has been invaluable to my work in Congress, and I suppose it even makes me a little impatient with those of my colleagues who have never taught school."

As the chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Education, Mrs. Green keeps her eye on trends and changes throughout the 50 states and the District of Columbia. She has sponsored major legislation to help rescue the nation's schools from the gathering storms of "a social hurricane."

#### DECLINE OF CONFIDENCE

All over the United States, she notes, school tax levies and bond issues are being defeated. Property taxes are high and uneven. Too often, she says, those making school policy are untrained in educational and professional skills.

"People seem to be losing confidence in the public schools," she observed in a recent interview. "I fear the day may be coming when we just won't have an educated citizenry. Already, we can see some evidence of this in some of our big cities."

Representative Green's goal is to see the federal government eventually take over 35 percent of all educational costs from kindergarten through college. This would help equalize education for all Americans, she believes, while maintaining the quality of their best schools. She calls the coming changes in the financing of education "revolutionary."

However, the trend toward national financing contains some pitfalls, she cautions.

In a number of states, she points out, suits have been brought by citizens questioning the equality of education in school districts with widely divergent tax revenues. If the local property tax is abandoned for some kind of statewide tax, parents in states such as Mississippi or Alabama might also bring suits claiming inequality with states such as Connecticut. National equalization, though beneficial in some ways, could be disastrous, in Mrs. Green's opinion, "if we settle for mediocrity."

#### LEGISLATION INTRODUCED

"I introduced a bill last year in which I proposed that the federal government by the year 1976 would contribute 25 percent of the total cost of education in the average district," she says, "and this session I am introducing a bill that would provide one-third of the cost. At present, we are contributing 7 or 8 percent."

"But I am not persuaded that money alone is going to buy quality. Here in the District of Columbia, for example, our schools are decaying before our eyes. And yet they have the highest per capita expenditure for education of any city of similar size in the nation."

Nor does Mrs. Green think that busing is the way to achieve the best education. She says: "I think a careful reading of the evidence shows that a child's education and his ability to be educated depend more upon the environment in which he lives than on the six hours a day in which he is transported to a school outside his neighborhood. I think that the task is much greater than we have assumed. We're going to have to change homes, and we're going to have to change neighborhoods."

#### TOO BIG A BURDEN

Any attempt to place the major responsibility for social reform on the schools alone is doomed to failure, she asserts.

"It may be that a youngster who is attending a very poor school and is bused has an opportunity for a higher quality of education," she adds, "but I think that, overall, the reverse is accomplished. I had lunch with some school-board members in Los Angeles, for example, a year and a half ago.

This last year they had to cut out \$50 million in programs and services for children in the Los Angeles schools because they didn't have enough money.

"Then a state court came along and said, 'You're going to have to desegregate.' The superintendent's office told me last November that for the first year their estimate on the cost of buying buses and hiring bus drivers will be \$42 million."

#### SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS AGAINST COMMUNIST CHINA

#### HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, in the aftermath of any extra-legal change in the government of any country, one matter of great concern to those having financial relationships with the prior governmental structure is that of the liabilities carried over to the successor government. In the international relations of the United States, this problem has been dealt with by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

Subsequent to many of the governmental transitions which occurred in east Europe following World War II, this Commission made certain determinations as to the validity of alleged claims against the successor governments, these determinations then being the subject of negotiations with the successor government. Ultimately, whether through the use of impounded assets of the subject government held in and by the United States or with funds provided by the Government, some form of settlement of the claims has been accomplished.

As I noted, this process has been generally completed at this point—but with one outstanding exception. The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission has certified losses totalling \$196,471,059.33 resulting from the Communist takeover of the mainland of China in 1949. These claims are still outstanding.

On September 28 of last year I sponsored House Concurrent Resolution 411 which urges the settlement of these claims as a condition to any further restoration of relations between the United States and the People's Republic of China.

Earlier this year I and five of my colleagues in letters addressed to the President and the Secretary of State went out of our way to make known our concern and that of many in this country for the prompt settlement of these claims. Responses have now been received and I am taking this opportunity to include this correspondence in the RECORD. As is obvious, these responses do not reflect a similar degree of concern or commitment to this goal. I would therefore question the interests the Government is serving in its pursuit of reconciliation with the PRC—are they the interests merely of the present administration in its efforts to find a place in history or are they the larger interests of the people the Government is committed to serve. I sincerely hope it is the latter and

not the former—although I have my doubts.

The responses follow:

APRIL 25, 1972.

THE PRESIDENT,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission has now certified losses totalling \$196,471,059.33 resulting from the Communist takeover of Mainland China in 1949. In September of last year, the attached House Concurrent Resolution was introduced regarding the discussion of these claims in any appropriate negotiations with the Mainland government.

It is our strong feeling that this matter is deserving of high priority in any such discussions and that the resolution of these claims ought rightly to be a condition precedent to any furtherance of the improving relations between the United States and the Peoples Republic of China.

Yours sincerely,

RICHARD T. HANNA,  
FRANK E. DENHOLM,  
GEORGE E. DANIELSON,  
EDWARD J. DERWINSKI,  
ROBERT L. LEGGETT,  
GEORGE W. COLLINS,  
Members of Congress.

[Identical letter sent to Secretary of State Rogers.]

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, D.C., May 1, 1972.

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HANNA: I would like to acknowledge and thank you for your April 25 letter to the President, in which you were joined by five of your colleagues, urging that resolution of the certified claims of nationals of the United States be given high priority in discussions with the People's Republic of China.

You may be assured your letter will be brought to the President's attention and also shared with the appropriate members of the staff.

With cordial regards,  
Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. TIMMONS,  
Assistant to the President.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, D.C., May 31, 1972.

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HANNA: Thank you for your letter of April 25, regarding the settlement of claims of United States nationals against the People's Republic of China which were adjudicated by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States under the Chinese Claims Act.

We share your strong feeling that the settlement of these claims is a matter of high priority. We are aware of House Concurrent Resolution 411, introduced last September, and have taken into account the views it expresses.

As you may know, the United States and the People's Republic of China, in a Joint Communiqué of February 28, 1972, issued at the close of the President's visit, "expressed the hope that the gains received during this visit would open up new prospects for relations between the two countries." While we do not consider, as your letter suggests, that it would be advantageous to make the settlement of the above claims a condition precedent to any furtherance of the improvement of relations, we believe that this atmosphere of improving relations is a beneficial one for discussion of the question of the settlement of these claims. We consider such a settlement to be particularly important for the facilitation of the development of trade, to-

ward which the Communiqué specifically looks.

I appreciate very much your interest in this matter and can assure you that we intend to give it the important attention it deserves in our discussions with the People's Republic of China.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID M. ABSHIRE,  
Assistant Secretary for Congressional  
Relations.

## HOOSIERS GIVE MORE AND GET LESS

### HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, taxes continue to plague our Nation with inequities. Moreover, the Federal bureaucracy is a beneficiary of much of the funds provided by our taxes. It is especially alarming to Hoosiers to learn that they pay more for every dollar of service from the Federal Government than any other state. The Tax Foundation reports that my constituents in the Second District of Indiana, along with the rest of Indiana, pay \$1.63 for every \$1 that we get in return. Is this equitable?

I have been provided with an article written by a friend of mine, Ben Cole, that appeared in the Indianapolis Star recently which I think explains the situation. I wish to insert that article here: STATES THAT SCOFF AT INDIANA ARE SNEERING ON OUR MONEY

(By Ben Cole)

WASHINGTON.—Hoosiers are the prize chumps among all the nation's taxpayers, according to figures published by Representative Bill Scherle (R-Iowa) during an appropriations debate last week.

Scherle's table, prepared by the Tax Foundation, reveals that Indiana pays \$695 million taxes every year to support Federal grant programs. And she gets back \$431 million—a shrinkage of \$264 million. That means every \$1 Hoosiers get in Federal grants costs them \$1.63.

Moreover, nobody else in the United States pays so much for a Federal buck as Indiana. Even Ohio, which comes next among the chumps, only pays \$1.55 for a dollar's worth of Federal assistance.

There are 21 states that pay a premium for Federal grants. Hoosiers used to chant a bitter little lament about how "all our taxes go to Texas." But even Texans, nowadays, have to pay \$1.05 for every \$1 they get back from the banks of the Potomac.

The victim states after Indiana and Ohio are Connecticut, \$1.55; Illinois, \$1.54; New Jersey, \$1.53; Delaware, \$1.53; Florida, \$1.49; Maryland, \$1.38; Wisconsin, \$1.38; Michigan, \$1.29; Pennsylvania, \$1.22; Nebraska, \$1.19; Iowa, \$1.17; Nevada, \$1.14; Massachusetts, \$1.12; Kansas, \$1.08; New Hampshire, \$1.06; Missouri, \$1.04; Virginia, \$1.04; Texas, \$1.03; and Washington State, \$1.02.

New York, where seldom is heard anything better than sneers about Indiana, reaps \$1 back for every 98 cents paid in. The District of Columbia, wherein you can hear some of the most patronizing comments about Hoosiers is the champion taker of all, reaping a return of \$1 for every 23 cents paid.

It is interesting that among the states receiving the most goodies from Uncle Robin Hood are those who hold themselves out as

being so much more culturally refined and politically sophisticated than Indiana.

But thanks to Scherle's providing the figures, it is now evident that these enlightened states are able to afford their liberalism because, they live on Indiana's money.

## PRIVATE PENSION PLAN SECURITY

### HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, one of the questions which should be faced by this Congress is definite action to unify and guarantee the security of private pension plans in the United States. Investigation into the status of these plans reveals some shocking facts. Today 30 million workers are under some form of retirement income hope as a result of 34,000 private pension plans. The majority of workers forfeit pension rights because of changing jobs or being discharged before vesting takes place, business failure, or business termination by merger, and so forth.

Private pension funds constitute the largest sum of unregulated capital in the United States. For an idea of the growth of the private pension funds it is interesting to note that in 1940 there were \$2.4 billion in private pension plans. In 1970 there were \$128.6 billion in these plans. It is estimated that there will be a quarter of a trillion dollars in these plans in 1980. This represents an increase of over 100 times in a 40-year period. Employees covered have increased from 4.1 million in 1940 to an estimated 42 million in 1980.

Present inadequate Federal law now requires only that administrators report annually the structure of the fund and its operations. The Federal Government can investigate suspected abuses. There are a few criminal penalties involving kickbacks, embezzlement, bribery, and false statements. More important there is no audit of these funds required by Federal law. There is no full funding or insurance requirement and there is absolutely no remedy for workers whose funds have been squandered either criminally or negligently.

Ninety-two percent of persons covered by plans which require 11 or more years of service before vesting never qualify for any benefits. Of 11.6 million workers covered in a recent study the average monthly retirement paid was \$99.

The first industrial pension plan was established by the American Express Co. in 1875. It provided for annual payments of \$500 per year for employees at the age of 60 with 20 years of service to the company.

A number of factors have led to the phenomenal growth of private pension plans this century. First the greater industrialization occurring in the early parts of the century moved many, many people away from farms. The great depression was an added impetus to the move toward retirement payments. With the advent of social security people became more conscious of the need for re-



tirement income and with the fact that social security was meant to be a supplement and not in itself full retirement. Private plans were given additional impetus by the World War II wage freeze which did not freeze fringe benefits. In 1949 the U.S. Supreme Court left standing, thereby approving, a lower court decision that private pension plans were properly the subject of collective bargaining.

We have gone through a large number of collapses of private pension plans. A noteworthy example was the Studebaker Corp. which had a very liberal plan vesting retirement benefits fully at the age of 40 after 10 years of service; 4,500 workers under the age of 60 who were fully vested at the time of the collapse of the Studebaker Corp. received only 15 percent of their entitlement.

As a general proposition, both labor and management favor private pension plans with professional management and favor encouragement by tax incentives.

Big issues, however, remain to be coped with. It is my considered judgment that Federal standards should be adopted by statute. There should be Federal standards for vesting, meaning that an employee is given irrevocable rights at least to a portion of the benefits dependent upon his length of service. In addition, Federal law should regulate the administration of trust funds on a much more comprehensive basis. A company should be prohibited from investing pension funds in its own stock. It should not be permitted to make loans to the company from pension funds for working capital. Fiduciary standards should generally be set up for the trustees of pension plans. Trustee fees should be strictly regulated to prohibit windfalls and to prohibit investments by trustees for personal gains.

The U.S. Department of Labor advises that 500 private pension plans cease to exist each year.

Either full funding should be required under strict regulations or some form of federally insured program patterned after the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation should be adopted in lieu of full funding.

The question of portability should be addressed—that is, the worker who changes jobs. This is an enormous problem and the cost may also be enormous.

Today I have introduced a comprehensive bill on this subject. I am not married to the provisions of this bill and have introduced it to voice my support for the proposition that some Federal legislation should be adopted in this area. We must see that there is reasonable protection offered to the worker from the collapse of funds which happens all too frequently at the present time.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—  
HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 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?

# AN EXCELLENT BUT DISTURBING REVIEW OF THE WORKER SAFETY AND HEALTH LAW

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the great expectations which millions of working people had for the first national safety and health law are, in the words of a keen observer, "being shattered by mismanagement, a callous view of human life and policies favoring industries the act was designed to regulate."

A recent article in the magazine Viewpoint, published by the AFL-CIO Industrial Union Department, tells what has happened to the golden promises of the new law after 1 year.

Congress has received an annual report in recent days, as required by this law, but only a handful of copies have been distributed. Until more copies are available, I suggest that my colleagues read the disturbing words of Sheldon Samuels, the occupational health, safety, and environmental expert on the staff of the Industrial Union Department.

I include this article with my remarks, along with section 26 of Public Law 91-596, the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, which contains the explicit requirements of the annual report to Congress.

The article follows:

[From Public Law 91-596, Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970]

## ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 26. Within one hundred and twenty days following the convening of each regular session of each Congress, the Secretary and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall each prepare and submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress a report upon the subject matter of this Act, the progress toward achievement of the purpose of this Act, the needs and requirements in the field of occupational safety and health, and any other relevant information. Such reports shall include information regarding occupational safety and health standards, and criteria for such standards, developed during the preceding year; evaluation of standards and criteria previously developed under this Act, defining areas of emphasis for new criteria and standards; an evaluation of the degree of observance of applicable occupational safety and health standards, and a summary of inspection and enforcement activity undertaken; analysis and evaluation of research activities for which results have been obtained under governmental and nongovernmental sponsorship; an analysis of major occupational diseases; evaluation of available control and measurement technology for hazards for which standards or criteria have been developed during the preceding year; description of cooperative efforts undertaken between Government agencies and other interested parties in the implementation of this Act during the pre-

ceding year; a progress report on the development of an adequate supply of trained manpower in the field of occupational safety and health, including estimates of future needs and the efforts being made by Government and others to meet those needs; listing of all toxic substances in industrial usage for which labeling requirements, criteria, or standards have not yet been established; and such recommendations for additional legislation as are deemed necessary to protect the safety and health of the worker and improve the administration of this Act.

## TURNING IT OFF—THE ADMINISTRATION'S APPROACH TO JOB SAFETY

(By Sheldon W. Samuels)

Two years after one of organized labor's toughest battles in the halls of Congress, in the closing days of 1970, the President signed the Occupational Safety and Health Act. Although the administration and labor were often at odds on key issues during this struggle, indeed the bill was fought with tooth and nail by the administration, the bill was signed amidst amity and euphoria. Labor looked forward to what then seemed like the beginning of a period of close collaboration with government in the most worthwhile of endeavors; protecting the environment of the workplace.

To a large extent, the expectations created by the passage of the Act are being met. The very fact of the nation's first serious job safety program is forcing at least a few employers to clean up their shops. The effect of a tough law and a few inspectors with an armory of even a few inadequate rules is having some good results.

But to a larger extent, these expectations are being shattered by mismanagement, a conscious disregard for workers' rights, a callous view of human life and policies favoring the industries the Act was designed to regulate.

Between the signing and the effective date of the Act, April 28, 1971, two agencies, the Bureau of Labor Standards in the Labor Department and the Bureau of Occupational Health in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, were converted respectively into the Occupational Safety and Health Administration and the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. A new agency was formed: the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission. All three agencies were mandated by the Act.

Organizational activity was, and remains, intense. The lights burned late in OSHA headquarters in downtown Washington and in the offices of NIOSH in suburban Rockville. New people were being hired and many of the old-timers, who for decades fought a lonely battle within the bureaucracy for recognition of the scandalous slaughter in the workplace, were stimulated by a new sense of mission and opportunity.

Feverish planning meetings were held between labor and government. At a specially called meeting of the AFL-CIO Standing Committee on Safety and Occupational Health, Secretary of Labor James Hodgson spoke of the commitment of his agency as if it were embarking on a crusade.

But all of this activity was not on behalf of the worker.

THEN ON APRIL 28 . . .

The first hint that something was wrong came when April 28 arrived and what was to be NIOSH lay in disarray, without a director, lacking in full administrative services, and generally with no serious effort being made to make it a functional organization. Its offices in six of HEW's regional offices were not even manned.

The role of OSHA is to see that American industry, by police action if necessary, applies available science and technology to the solution of job safety and health problems.

NIOSH is supposed to supply that knowledge, without which there will be no solution, through research and training. To fill its role NIOSH must become a vigorous partner of OSHA. But the administration has other plans.

The administration has proposed another major reorganization of the government, a cheap way to win political brownie points without really doing anything. NIOSH, if the Congress approves the plan, would become a part of what is now the Commerce Department. HEW is not about to channel scarce resources into an agency the White House says it is going to lose. The consequence is conscious underfunding, less than their share of administrative services, eliminated and truncated programs and a reduction in projected personnel levels.

Despite this treatment, NIOSH is building a reputation for outstanding performance. From the top down the agency is staffed by career civil servants and commissioned officers of the Public Health Service. There are no political appointees in the agency. This explains the quality of its work and pervasive high morale.

OSHA, too, has civil servants. When the agency opened its doors, many of them were in high positions. But by playing musical chairs, utilizing openings created by attrition and transfers while closing new top positions to civil servants, the Department of Labor has succeeded in filling key positions in OSHA with political appointments from the ranks of industries it is charged to police. The department itself is one of Washington's most politicized agencies. Morale is shaky and agency effectiveness has been hampered.

Not surprising for an agency in a department whose top ranks come almost entirely from big business, OSHA is also one of the most mismanaged agencies in the federal government. The myth that large corporate structures have administrative know-how applicable to government is destroyed by an examination of OSHA operations. Communication from headquarters to area offices through the regional offices is poor. The result is an uneven and inconsistent enforcement program, unacceptable employee training programs and little real input from the field force on agency policy. But the most important failure relates to the agency's inability to mount an effective industrial hygiene effort.

Early last summer a noise complaint was transmitted to OSHA's Chicago regional office by a lodge of the International Association of Machinists in St. Joseph, Michigan. Months went by without an investigation. Finally, after an industrial hygienist was borrowed from NIOSH at the demand of the union, a noise inspection was made in January and a citation was issued in February.

Why the delays? Among other reasons, OSHA inspectors generally receive little instruction in the health field. Those few with training do not have enough equipment. For example, a contract for 400 commercially-available sound meters was issued last June to the Columbia Research Laboratory of Woodlyn, Pa., (six months after the signing of the Act). As this is being written, in violation of the deadlines in the contract, the meters have not been delivered. There has never been serious consideration of obtaining the meters elsewhere.

Noise is only one health hazard being ignored by OSHA. The Labor Department has been warned by the IUD and the AFL-CIO that most complaints would be in the health area. In fact 60% of the complaints received in 1971 were on health issues.

Yet in adopting interim standards—as required by the Act—OSHA left out threshold limit values established by the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists for about 60 toxic substances. Asked in September, 1971, when some of the missing standards would be published, essentially a printing job, the reply was "later

this year." Since then the reply always has been that they would be "published in a few weeks." Actually the full list has been scheduled for publication in June, 1972.

Among the missing are standards for a group of nine compounds so lethal that no exposure for any period of time is considered safe. They all cause cancer.

The manufacture or use of one, betanaphthylamine, was outlawed in Pennsylvania only to reappear in plants of the Sylvania Corporation in Georgia and South Carolina. Questioned on this by the Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, the Labor Department's reaction was that "there are only a few workers involved." Their second response was that "there have not been any complaints!" (The plant is unorganized or there would have been complaints!) Even without a standard, and without formal complaints, the Labor Department can "take action under the general duty clause of the Act. As this is being written a report of a NIOSH investigation of these plants sits on someone's desk in OSHA. Hopefully this will result in enforcement of the Act.

But even the publication of a standard does not insure meaningful enforcement.

Amidst reams of press releases, specially convened meetings for industry and labor, and urgent pronouncements, OSHA finally developed a primitive operation called the Target Health Hazard Program. With fewer industrial hygienists than are employed by several states, early in February of this year they proposed a concerted attack on five toxic substances, including asbestos.

Action on the asbestos hazard was initiated by the IUD last November. The Secretary of Labor was forced to issue an "emergency standard" to replace a limitation that even industry found inadequate. Despite its weakness, especially in doing nothing to prevent asbestos-related diseases from afflicting the relatives of workers, the new standard should be enforced.

But enforcement has been virtually nonexistent. The IUD even gave the Labor Department a list of 27 plants compiled by HEW in 1969. These plants already had been surveyed and many could be expected to be in violation of the emergency standard. It took pressure from NIOSH and union complaints to produce any inspections. In one plant, neither a citation nor a clean bill of health has been issued four months after the investigation was initiated.

In this case, the Johns-Manville plant in Manville, N.J., state and federal government face the largest recorded epidemic of occupational cancer.

One civil servant in the Labor Department put his finger on one reason for the lack of response to the asbestos problem: "Industry has too much to say around here."

The investigation of a Mobil Oil Co. refinery in Paulsboro, N.J., is a case in point. A complaint by the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers on October 11, 1971, was acted upon quickly by OSHA's New York regional office. By October 15 teams of OSHA safety and health inspectors mounted a major survey of the plant conducted over several weeks.

#### INDUSTRY HAS INFLUENCE

The seriousness of the conditions in Paulsboro is indicated by the fact that so far the company has been cited for 93 violations (260) items. But not all hazards in the plant have been cited. One reason is company influence on OSHA decisions.

About half-way through the investigation, in response to company complaints, the department withdrew its prior approval for an international union staff specialist to aid the inspectors as a third party during the "walk-around." The company was still unsatisfied. To discourage future inspections and complaints, the company decided to dock the pay of the workers involved in the walk-around. OCAW, with support from the IUD, filed a brief in protest with the secretary of labor

on the basis that both the Occupational Safety and Health Act and the Wage and Hour Act were being violated. The Department upheld the employer.

In acting in this way on this issue, the Labor Department had to revise prior policies and decisions. The effect of this policy will be to discourage workers—especially the unorganized—from exercising their walk-around right, a key mandate of the Act.

But this right is being attacked in other ways. Denial during labor disputes is one.

Recently, during a strike led by the Steelworkers for union recognition at the Seminole Asphalt Company in St. Marks, Florida, an "imminent danger" complaint was filed with the OSHA area office. The area director responded and was on the scene the next day.

Labor Department policy, even in the case of imminent danger, prohibited the striking workers or their representatives from participating in the "walk-around" to aid the inspection. The inspectors did not find the hazard and left the scene. The next day a tank of asphalt blew up. The hazardous condition had not been corrected. Luckily no one was hurt. But there is no question that serious injury or death could have been the result.

A complaint about cotton dust brought by the Textile Workers against Wellman Industries of Johnsonville, S.C., illustrates how attempts are being made to ignore any request for inspection during a labor dispute. After months of union protest, OSHA admitted the validity of this complaint only to delay action further with a plea that an industrial hygienist was not available.

Even greater failures of policy loom in the area of state-federal relations under the Act. Rather than face its difficulties, the Labor Department likes to wave the flag with loud shouts of "states rights" whenever their promotion of state programs is questioned.

When the labor movement challenged the downgrading of workers' rights—such as the walk-around—to mere procedures which could be substituted by the states for other procedures, their response was geared to create the image of fervent defenders of the states against the unions. The facts are that what labor is questioning is the perpetuation of weak state programs which do not guarantee rights established by the Act for all workers. Not only do many state program directors agree with the labor position, but they go further to say that without a strong and clear stand on this issue by the federal government their legislatures will not mandate these rights in the states.

#### OSHA IS UNLOADING

In reality OSHA is attempting to shake off the unpleasant and politically vulnerable policeman's role in occupational health and safety. In their haste to unload this responsibility on the states they are offering as bait millions in federal funds for phony "planning" projects. When the states don't bite fast enough, some state officials report that OSHA deals with state legislators and state agencies behind the backs of the governors and the agencies they designate as having the primary job safety responsibility.

At the same time, state officials charge, OSHA is demanding that the amount of red tape in their programs match that which is being required of OSHA's own field force. One state estimate is that OSHA inspectors are being required to spend three days a week in their offices filling out forms.

There is no question that most of the information being requested of the states, and of OSHA's field staff, is important. What is wrong is that there is no real state-federal information exchange system. The OSHA data processing systems are so primitive and incompatible with those of the states that they make interchange of information unnecessarily time consuming if not impossible. Further, there is no way in which information from other federal government sources—including NIOSH—can be automatically fed



into a system for use by state and federal compliance officers. Many county law enforcement agencies are more sophisticated in this regard than the mighty United States Department of Labor.

But law enforcement is not a serious objective of the administration's job safety program. The plain fact is that the Occupational Safety and Health Act was in trouble as it approached its first birthday on April 28, 1972.

The administration has failed to ask for sufficient money to make the operation of OSHA and NIOSH meaningful. The creation of a set of rules to govern state action is shot through with employer bias, which if permitted to continue will inevitably destroy the spirit and letter of the law. The process of establishing health and safety standards moves along at elephantine pace. The factory and workshop inspection process drags and drags and drags.

In short, the administration, which together with the National Association of Manufacturers and the Chamber of Commerce desperately resisted the passage of the Occupational Safety and Health Act initially, now with almost equal tenacity seeks to abort the effective implementation of the Act.

HELLO, REMEMBER ME?

**HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly called attention to the Members for the need to acknowledge our respect and appreciation for our flag, traditions of our country, and the pride that we all should have in this great land of ours. The Calumet Index of Chicago in a front page editorial on Wednesday, June 14, emphasized feelings we should have on that particular day which was Flag Day.

Flag Day was celebrated very appropriately by an inspiring program here in the House. I believe this editorial in the Index very properly expressed the feelings of the publication's readers:

HELLO, REMEMBER ME?

Some people call me Old Glory, others call me The Star-Spangled Banner, but whatever they call me, I am your flag, the Flag of the United States of America. Something has been bothering me, so I thought I might talk it over with you—because it is about you and me.

I remember some time ago people lined up on both sides of the street to watch the parade and naturally I was leading every parade, proudly waving in the breeze. When your daddy saw me coming, he immediately removed his hat and placed it against his left shoulder so that his hand was directly over his heart . . . remember??

And you, I remember you. Standing there straight as a soldier. You didn't have a hat, but you were giving the right salute. Remember little sister? Not to be outdone, she was saluting the same as you with her right hand over her heart. Remember??

What happened? I am still the same old Flag. Oh, I have a few more stars since you were a boy. A lot more blood has been shed since those parades of long ago. But now I don't feel as proud as I used to. When I come down your street you just stand there with your hands in your pockets and I may get a small glance and then you look away. Then I see the children running around and shouting . . . they don't seem to know who I am.

I saw one man take his hat off, then look around. He didn't see anybody else with theirs off so he quickly put his back on.

Is it a sin to be patriotic?? Have you forgotten what I stand for and where I've been? Anzio, Guadalcanal, Korea and now Vietnam. Take a look at the memorial honor rolls sometime to see those who never came back because they died to keep this Republic free, One Nation Under God. When you salute me, you are actually saluting them.

Well, it won't be long now until I'll be coming down your street again. So, when you see me, stand straight, place your right hand over your heart—and I'll salute you by waving back—and I'll know you remember!!

VERNER W. CLAPP

**HON. EMANUEL CELLER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, in the Coolidge Auditorium of the Library of Congress this afternoon, tributes will be paid to the late Verner W. Clapp by his librarian peers in a public memorial ceremony. It is perhaps fitting for Members of the House to note the event, for Mr. Clapp was a dedicated employee of the Library of Congress from 1922 to 1956. As a Member of Congress these past 50 years, I am easily reminded of the tremendous growth and progress that has occurred, and is occurring, in our Library across the street. A listing of many of the high points in Mr. Clapp's career with the Library serve to remind one not only of this remarkable individual's dedication but also of the enormous and invaluable work being done in the Library of Congress and other libraries around the world. There has been a growing trend toward serving all the public with ever-increasing knowledge in ever-increasing forms. The services offered for the first time to Members of Congress less than 50 years ago by the Library of Congress are today in the process of being offered by many public libraries throughout the country to their broad constituencies.

When Mr. Clapp left the Library of Congress in 1956, it was not to retire but to assist the world's librarians to anticipate the knowledge explosion and to show them the direction in which some of their answers lay. As first president of the Council on Library Resources, established in 1956 with the support of Ford Foundation funds "to aid in the solution of library problems," Mr. Clapp approved over 400 council grants aimed at carrying out this mission. As a full-time consultant to the Council on Library Resources since his stepping down from the presidency in 1967, he has continued to be a major force in the field of librarianship. The New York Public Library, as well as other New York institutions, have also benefited from Mr. Clapp's guidance and the council's funding.

Presently the council, and its Ford Foundation benefactor, are generously assisting the New York Public Library in its financial crisis.

Verner Clapp "literally died with his boots on," one close associate in the li-

brary field commented on learning of his death. Dr. Fred C. Cole, Mr. Clapp's successor as president of the Council of Library Resources, observed that "to the last he pressed himself continuously to increase his own knowledge in order to serve his profession and his fellow man." Such tributes, and those that will be made to Verner Clapp at the Library of Congress this afternoon, should remind us of the tremendous task that lies in front of us in this vital field.

THE 750TH ANNIVERSARY OF  
HUNGARY'S "GOLDEN BULL"

**HON. STEWART B. MCKINNEY**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has just completed a series of meetings with Communist leaders in Peking and Moscow. These meetings could well mark the beginning of a new understanding between the United States and the Communist nations of the world. In light of these developments, I feel that the 750th anniversary of the Golden Bull, the Hungarian counterpart of the English Magna Carta, is of particular significance.

This significance stems from the fact that the Golden Bull was a forerunner in man's endeavor to strike a balance between economic and political forces which otherwise might stifle his right to self-determination. In this sense, the principles of the Golden Bull are similar to those of all freedom-loving peoples of the world.

The Golden Bull insured a citizen's right to resist injustice regardless of whether it was perpetrated by the King or feudal barons. This grant of rights to the masses of lesser Hungarian nobility—a substantial percentage of the nation—distinctly limited the King's power. Under the Golden Bull, the lesser nobles were authorized to use resistance, either collectively or individually, to any abrogation of their rights. This right of resistance also made it easier for the middle classes to stand up against the local petty monarchs.

Specifically, the Golden Bull exempted the clergy and the lesser nobility from taxation, permitted them to dispose of their property in any manner they preferred, protected them from such capricious exercises of regal power as arbitrary confiscation of property and imprisonment, and allowed them to refuse to perform military service in foreign countries. The nobles also were guaranteed the right to an annual assembly through which they could petition for a redress of their grievances.

Mr. Speaker, we who live in the United States too often take for granted the immeasurable personal liberties we enjoy. We tend to forget that the freedom we once struggled for is still only a dream to the people of Hungary. We also tend to forget our relative position in world history. Therefore, this anniversary of

the Golden Bull should be a time for rededication and reexamination.

Primarily, we should reexamine our history as a free nation relative to other nations, Hungary in particular. As early as 1222, Hungary established the principles of the Golden Bull; our Constitution was signed in 1787 and we live by it today. Hungary has also found itself lost in two world wars and has been ruled by two successive totalitarian dictatorships; the United States has never lost a world war, or experienced a dictatorship. Therefore, we as a nation should rededicate ourselves to the Hungarian people. To fail in this rededication would be both a tragedy for the United States and a blow to the freedom-loving people of Hungary.

### SALUTE TO EDUCATION

#### HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to say a few words in tribute to our Nation's education system.

It is a well-known fact that I have been a staunch supporter and initiator of countless pieces of legislation concerning education. I have supported all legislation which aimed to increase Federal funds for education in addition to being the principal sponsor of the Library Services Act and the Vocational Student Loan Act.

Such actions, I feel, are blatant evidences that I am a long-time admirer of our education system. I believe that this is an area which is most worthy of all of my efforts in addition to the efforts of my colleagues in the Congress. I have devoted my time to the improvement of education because I have a deep-felt faith that it is a system which is anxious for change and renovation when needed. Because of our education system's alacrity for self-improvement, our Nation is bestowed with its most precious product—the educated and enlightened citizens of this great country.

Though my contributions to education have warranted much of my time and energy, the outputs of such efforts have exceeded my inputs which is a fact that pleases me tremendously. Results of my contributions to education are that I know I have aided this great Nation in attaining the best education system in the world; the level of our achievements in all respects is evidence of this. Also, I have received honors from organizations such as the united business schools, the Association of Private Schools Administrators, and the Jeannette Teachers Association, to name a few. These tributes to my legislative efforts are encouraging in that they express my constituents' appreciation, which is one of the highest manifestations of support that a Congressman can have.

In closing, I would like to urge my colleagues to continue their efforts and support in behalf of education in America.

I know that I will continue in my relentless endeavors to aid the great education system of the United States.

### NUCLEAR POLLUTION

#### HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully call to the attention of the Members of the House an article in the current issue of Harper's Bazaar concerning the matter of nuclear pollution and its threat to the population of this Nation.

The Harper's Bazaar article, written by Natalie Gittelsohn, expresses great alarm over the effectiveness of safety measures now in force by the AEC.

I make no brief in behalf of the article, save that I believe it should be read:

#### THE SHAME OF ROCKY FLATS

RE NUCLEAR POLLUTION DOES THE AEC TELL THE WHOLE TRUTH AND NOTHING BUT TO THE U.S.A.?

(By Natalie Gittelsohn)

"What is Rocky Flats doing out there?" one of the wives whispered, as if the question had never been asked before. "That brown mist over the mountains..." another mused. "Is it really just pollution or...?" "Or is it plutonium dust?" a more strongly reality-moored participant in the discussion finished for her. "Is the wind blowing plutonium dust into our backyards?"

The conversion you have just read was not exhumed from some 1950's science fiction called Incredible Stories. Those were the words of some very real American housewives who have very good reason to feel very worried. They live, with their families, in the scenic state of Colorado—locality, Arvada—about five miles downwind from the famous (or more accurately, infamous) Rocky Flats Plutonium Plant, operated since 1953 by the Dow Chemical Company. In the spring of '69, Rocky Flats was the site of the most disastrous fire of America's nuclear age. Plutonium stored in a cabinet mysteriously ignited, spreading flames far and wide. Plutonium's primary use? Reactor fuel in nuclear weapons.

Inhaling only tiny quantities of this most virulent radiological poison damages living tissue, leads to cancer of the bone and lung and may cause death, scientists agree.

But by August, 1969, neither Dow Chemical nor the Atomic Energy Commission (which has control over every aspect of nuclear energy) had failed to make even the routine tests for traces of plutonium spread in the soil around Rocky Flats according to Roger Rapoport, author of *The Great American Bomb Machine*. So early that fall, exasperated by official inaction, Dr. Edward Martell, nuclear chemist with the National Center for Atmospheric Research, set out to conduct his own soil tests. Dr. Martell soon discovered that lethal plutonium particles had indeed escaped from Rocky Flats and had been carried by the wind all the way to Denver. Some of the worst contamination that he found lay in the suburbs of Broomfield, Westminster—and Arvada. As reported by Mr. Rapoport, "The contamination of Denver ranged from ten to 200 times higher than plutonium fallout deposited by all atomic bomb testing." It was also 100 times higher, said Rapoport, than the amount Dow Chemical spokesmen would acknowledge.

The housewives of Arvada were gathered together on an afternoon in the early spring of 1972. It was three long years after the fire

on Rocky Flats—and still they were worrying and wondering. Still, they felt, nobody was leveling with them about the dangers of plutonium poisoning or the biological weapons stocked around Denver.

"Just recently, I heard that they did take the nerve gas out of the Rocky Mountain Arsenal. But I wonder what's left there? What's really stored in our area right now?"

"I tried to find out whether a list of hazardous materials stored in our state was available to the general public," another wife acknowledged. "The first office I tapped referred me to about, oh, seven or eight others. Finally I found a district director who told me that all of the information about what's stored in the Rocky Mountain arsenal is highly classified for security reasons. So the only thing we can do is guess."

More sighs. More guessing. More speculation.

"I don't think they've even taken the nerve gas out yet. They're still waiting for the okay to demilitarize those 21,000 nerve gas bombs..."

"All those weapons, supposedly for our security, are stored so close to us that we'll probably become victims of them in the end. One small canister of nerve gas can destroy this entire area. Why did they feel they needed 20,000 canisters?"

"A million-dollar contract, no doubt. Back to the old dollar again." The women considered that idea, soberly. It was out of grudging respect for the old dollar that most of them were living five miles away from the plutonium plant. "My husband works out there," an uncertain voice piped up. "This is a highly federally impacted area. Arvada's where the jobs are."

Other voices rose in quick support. "If my name is banded about, my husband's employer, who thinks quite differently than we do, is going to say, 'Sorry, but we don't need you anymore.'"

The crucial paycheck issue comes up, naturally, wherever nuclear installations are big business. In fact, it is fear of reprisal—economic and governmental—which causes reluctance among many employees to discuss the issues at all.

In her recent study, *Atomic Doubletalk*, subtitled "a review of matters withheld from the public by the AEC," Gene Schrader, former staff member of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, examines our nuclear history. She touches all bases, starting with the first atomic explosion in Los Alamos in 1945. (Two months after that blast, a *Times* reporter revealed that radiometers showed scraps of crater glass "were actually still dangerous.") "New experiments continue and unlikely accidents happen," Mrs. Schrader warns. "But the AEC has no patience with those who question its safety policies."

The Commission's inordinate power may explain, if not excuse, its failure to cultivate patience with its critics. "Never before in the peacetime history of the United States has Congress established an administrative agency with such sweeping authority and entrusted with such portentous responsibilities," said the men who wrote the Atomic Energy Act in 1946. Roger Rapoport characterizes it bluntly as "one of the nation's major legislative disasters. The legislators merely totalitarianized nuclear power," he remarks.

As this issue of *Bazaar* goes to press, the Supreme Court has just reconfirmed that totalitarianization of power. In a 7-to-2 decision (Justices Douglas and Stewart dissenting), the Court upheld the principle that the AEC alone has the authority to regulate the discharge of radioactive debris from nuclear power plants. Minnesota met defeat asserting its right to set more rigid limits on the radioactive discharges of a plant near Minneapolis. Yet, more than a dozen other states sided with Minnesota in this dispute.

Paul Jacobs, who last year conducted yet



another inquiry into the power and responsibilities of the AEC for *Atlantic* magazine, also deplores the Commission's imperious attitude. "The agency is uncomfortable presenting anything less than the most jovial view of nuclear energy," he says, then asks, "Is it possible that nuclear energy as a cure for the power crisis may be worse than the disease itself?"

Many of our most distinguished scientists answer that question in the affirmative, including Dr. Linus Pauling, twice winner of the Nobel Prize; Dr. John Gofman, research bio-physicist and director of the Committee for Nuclear Responsibility; and Dr. Arthur Tamplin, group leader of the bio-medical division of the AEC's own Lawrence Radiation Laboratory.

Dr. Tamplin: "The evidence concerning the hazard of plutonium to man suggests that if you can measure it in the air, it's probably already too hazardous . . . Radioactive wastes propose a disposal problem unique in human history. You have to protect them from getting into the atmosphere for a thousand, and in the case of plutonium, for hundreds of thousands of years . . . The Russians could set up a monitoring system and find out what is coming out of Rocky Flats. But the citizens of the United States don't know because nobody has set up the monitoring station to tell them."

Dr. Pauling: "According to my calculations, one 20-megaton bomb tested in the atmosphere is responsible for 500,000 grossly defective children and 500,000 people caused to have cancer. That's a million casualties for one 20-megaton bomb . . ."

Dr. Gofman: "In order to make the nuclear power industry safe, we will have to do 99.9% perfect work every step of the way, including the guardianship of the radioactive waste . . . That is, if there's not one accident . . . Unless we can do 99.9% perfection, the radiation all of us will get will start rising toward those numbers that would give us, for instance, 32,000 more cancers every year. . . . But I don't want to scare anyone to death, I want to scare them to life."

All those who will allow themselves to be scared to life by Dr. Gofman should get it clear in their heads that Rocky Flats is not an isolated pinhole of poison on the otherwise bland map of America. As of January, 1970, there were nearly 125 cities and towns in the United States where nuclear weapons were being manufactured, tested, deployed and stockpiled. Among them: New York, Chicago, Cleveland, Dallas, Las Vegas, Los Angeles and Miami, as well as Wichita, Kansas; Albuquerque, New Mexico; Aiken, South Carolina and Limestone, Maine. In mega-city or micro-village, how many of us are still "safe enough?" How many of us will still be safe enough in 1973?

Said Dr. Gofman, regarding the AEC request that the Commission issue "Interim" operating licenses to nuclear power plants which failed to submit the final environmental impact statement required by the National Environmental Policy Act: "The AEC has failed to solve the problems of safety against major accidents at nuclear power plants. . . . The AEC has failed to solve the problems of radioactive waste disposal. . . . What is needed is a moratorium on the construction of nuclear power plants until safety problems have been solved and increased funding (made available) for the development of alternate, safe and fully adequate sources of power . . ." Harold Grey and Paul Ehrlich, among other eminent scientists, agree.

The nation is impaled on a tragic dilemma. In the last twenty years, we have built more than 40,000 nuclear bombs, more than enough to kill everyone in the world three times over. And we live in an economy based on production-for-use.

We have spent over \$30 billion in the development and construction of nuclear weapons. This program carries with it the

increasing risk of death, cancer, radiation poisoning, and literally inconceivable genetic damage.

More than 90 billion gallons of nuclear waste are already buried in the states of Washington, Idaho, South Carolina and Tennessee. In its own report, finally released to the public, the Atomic Energy Commission conceded, "None of the existing AEC disposal installations is in a satisfactory geologic location."

Recently Bess Myerson, New York City's Commissioner of Consumer Affairs, was narrator of a bold and probing radio show, *In the Name of Defense*. "Our scientists are more worried about nuclear dangers than our mothers," Miss Myerson said. "Because they have more information. . . . We, the American people, have a right to know of the dangers to our health from radioactivity. . . . We call on the Atomic Energy Commission to stop the testing of nuclear weapons. In the name of defense, we are poisoning our land, our air, our water and our children. There is no safe level of radioactivity. We who have given life must be dedicated to preserving it." If you would like to dedicate yourself to that goal, please write to Bess Myerson at Another Mother for Peace, Beverly Hills, California. This nonpartisan organization, dedicated to nonviolence and the elimination of war, has given the national issue of nuclear pollution top priority on its activities agenda for the coming year.

#### WASHINGTON REPORT TO INDIANA'S NINTH DISTRICT CONSTITUENTS ON THE MOSCOW ACCORDS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the complete text of my recent Washington report on the Moscow Accords.

#### WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman LEE HAMILTON)

Editor's Note.—This is the first of two Washington Reports on the President's Summit Conference.

The Moscow Accords, which crowned a period of extraordinary diplomacy at the Summit, are probably the most important agreements since World War II. In brief, the agreements are as follows:

1. *Nuclear Arms*.—The United States and Russia will limit their defensive missile systems to two relatively modest ABM sites apiece. They also agree to a five-year freeze of their offensive missile arsenals at the present levels.

2. *Environment*.—A joint commission will study problems of air, water and soil pollution, and measures to control man's impact on the environment.

3. *Incidents at Sea*.—Rules have been agreed upon for insuring the safety of naval vessels and planes operating in close proximity, and for avoiding collisions.

4. *Medicine*.—A joint commission will coordinate research on heart disease, cancer and public health generally.

5. *Space*.—A joint docking of manned spacecraft and flight of the linked craft will be carried out in 1975. There will also be co-operation in space meteorology, space medicine, remote sensing of earth resources, and exploration of the moon and planets.

6. *Technology*.—A joint commission will

recommend exchanges and combined research in science and technology.

7. *Trade*.—A joint commission will resolve an entire range of trade problems including most-favored-nation treatment, credits, trade promotion and the study of joint resources development projects.

These specific agreements were concluded with a declaration of principles intended to make a new, more stable and constructive era of Russian-American relations. These principles include peaceful coexistence, restraint by both powers, a readiness to exchange views at the highest levels, and a disavowal of any intent to create spheres of influence.

These agreements are good news. They represent a distinctive breakthrough in the relationships between the two super-powers.

No one can be certain, of course, how important these agreements really are. It all depends on their implementation, but each of these agreements represents a giant and promising step in Soviet-American relations.

The basic concept of the Moscow Accords has been to create so many mutual interests through joint committees, common projects and negotiations that constituencies for co-operation will be developed in each nation and so that neither nation will allow other conflicts of interests to disrupt the great power cooperation.

Several of these agreements, like the ventures in environment and medicine, represent an upgrading of earlier agreements, and several were delayed in announcement to assure a successful Summit.

Even though there was significant progress at the Summit, there are disappointments. No major progress was made on trade. The formation of the joint commission to devise comprehensive trade agreements represents an admission that the United States and the Soviet Union have been unable to reconcile their differences on trade.

Nevertheless, the trade agreement represents a step forward, and the commission will seek to negotiate overall trade agreements, including reciprocal most-favored-nation treatment, arrangements under which credits will be provided to finance sales by each nation to the other, provisions for the establishment of business offices in each country by concerns of the other country, and mechanisms for arbitration of commercial disputes arising from trade. The two countries were unable to resolve the Soviet Union's World War II Lend-Lease debt to the U.S., last publicly valued by the U.S. at \$800 million and by the Soviets at \$300 million.

Also, perhaps the major disappointment is that apparently nothing was done to resolve the political conflicts between the United States and the Soviet Union in Vietnam and the Middle East, or to establish the rules of procedure in such conflicts, like consultation and arms supply limits.

By far, the most important agreement reached in Moscow is the one relating to nuclear arms. The importance of the agreement is that it marks a reduction in strategic arms rivalry and a mutual acceptance of nuclear parity. Perhaps more important than any specific provision in the agreement is the change in attitudes reflected in the agreement with both powers wanting to reduce the risks of nuclear war and to relax international tensions.

The central purpose of the nuclear arms agreement is to achieve, not disarmament, but a more stable "balance of terror" at the existing level of armaments, and to make certain that the two superpowers understand their dependence upon mutual restraint.

The agreement is made possible because both countries believe that they are now strategically equal, that they have enough weapons to deter nuclear attack, that they need to stop adding more weapons before

they can reach agreements to reduce the number of weapons, that they need to conserve resources for better purposes, and that they must collaborate where it is possible, to avoid conflicts in other areas where collaboration is not possible.

Through a strange paradox in the arithmetic of strategic weapons, the treaties, by limiting defensive systems, bring offensive systems under control. Mutual deterrence against attack has depended upon each side being confident of its ability to destroy the other after absorbing a first strike. With each side confident of its deterrent, because of the limited defensive system of the other side, there is no need to fear a first strike, and there should be no reason to deploy new offensive systems.

The President has given his assurance that the national security is not endangered by this agreement, and that the U.S. will continue to have sufficient forces to deter potential enemies. He points out that verification can be achieved by space satellite reconnaissance, and without on-site inspection.

Although the Soviet Union will have 2,300 launchers to 1,700 for the U.S., the ongoing U.S. MIRV program will ensure a substantial margin of deliverable warheads. There is no chance the Soviets can reverse that advantage in the next decade. Without the agreement, the Soviet Union would increase its lead of missile launching submarines because the U.S. has no current building program for these weapons. The U.S. achieved a major goal in setting a limit on the giant SS-9 ICBMs. In addition, the U.S. has a larger, more modern bomber force than the Soviets.

In short, the U.S. is better off with the agreement than without it. The momentum of the Soviet buildup has been stopped and the U.S. has been spared the great expense of a new building program which offered no assurance of greater security.

This first strategic arms limitation treaty should be viewed as a major step forward, but only a beginning. The nuclear agreement does not stop the arms race. It does not limit the quality of the weapons. It does not stop the two superpowers from upgrading their offensive nuclear missiles, adding more warheads, or more destructive warheads, or from improving their missile defense systems.

So the United States should press ahead towards further limitations, and perhaps even some reduction in arms. Instant success should not be expected. It took seven years of effort, and thirty months of intense negotiations, to achieve this limited result. Hopefully, agreement will soon be reached to begin the next round of the Strategic Arms Limitations Talks in the fall. This round should seek permanent offensive weapons agreement, dealing with medium range missiles, long range missiles, long range strategic bombers and forward based weapons systems.

Overall, I think the American people have good reason to be pleased with the developments in Moscow. Beyond the specific agreements, which are very important, the personnel contacts between the two nations and the positive steps taken suggest even greater progress in the future. Enormous problems still exist between the two countries, as the total lack of progress between the two countries on Vietnam and the Middle East show, and the unresolved tensions are deep-seated and many. Strong political forces will operate in both countries to keep tensions high and to accelerate military competition.

But it is encouraging that the atmosphere of international relations has improved. The agreements present a real opportunity for a more realistic, less ideological approach to the competition between the U.S. and the Soviet Union, and to start a process of stabilizing the military balance at moderate levels.

## CANCER RESEARCH AT CLEVELAND CLINIC

### HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, last year, the Congress expressed its deep interest in the efforts to find a cure for cancer through its approval of the Cancer Conquest Act. Nothing short of a full scale research effort is now required, and I am pleased to report to my colleagues on the excellent cancer research work being done at the Cleveland Clinic, work which is supported by legislation we in the Congress have enacted.

Under the guidance of Drs. Roenigk, Deodhar, St. Jacques, and Burdick, a new technique, in which metastatic melanoma is treated with vaccinia virus, is being tried, and thus far the results have been very encouraging. I am proud of the work done by these dedicated and extremely competent men, and I believe that there could be no wiser use of Federal health moneys than to support work of the type in which they are engaged.

I would now like to call to the attention of my colleagues a more detailed report on their work, which is as follows:

#### IMMUNOTHERAPY OF MALIGNANT MELANOMA WITH VACCINIA VIRUS

Henry H. Roenigk, Jr., M.D., Department of Dermatology, Cleveland Clinic.

Sharad Deodhar, M.D., Department of Pathology, Cleveland Clinic.

\*Robert St. Jacques, M.D., Department of Dermatology, Cleveland Clinic.

Kenneth Burdick, M.D., Syntex Research, Stanford Industrial Park, Palo Alto, California.

The field of tumor immunology has progressed very rapidly in the past decade in both animal and human tumor systems. In human cancer, this evidence has come largely from the demonstration of tumor specific antigens and from in vitro studies demonstrating both cellular and humoral immunity with cytotoxic effect on tumor cells.

Morton and co-workers demonstrated humoral antibodies to melanoma cells in patients with melanoma using indirect immunofluorescent technique. They found the highest titers of antimelanoma antibodies in patients with localized metastasis of melanoma.

In 1960, Burdick and Hawk reported a prolonged remission of metastatic melanoma after repeated injections of vaccinia virus into cutaneous metastatic nodules of melanoma. They were unable to demonstrate cytotoxic activity of the patients serum after therapy, at that time.

In the past ten years, at the Cleveland Clinic, twenty patients with metastatic melanoma have been treated by this technique and significant regression has occurred in eight patients who had stage II (regional metastasis) of their melanoma (Tables 1 and 2).

I have personally seen many of the early patients treated by Dr. Burdick and was impressed by the results. Three years ago, a 42-year-old lawyer was seen with the second recurrence of an amelanotic melanoma of the groin about the size of an orange. Reexcision resulted in a third recurrence in the

\* Fellow, Department of Dermatology, Cleveland Clinic.

suture line one month after surgery. Vaccinia virus therapy was used and a complete remission was obtained.

With newer culture techniques, immunofluorescent tests and colony inhibition tests as described by Hellstrom, we are now able to measure cellular and humoral antibodies to melanoma cells and possible cytotoxic effects of vaccinia virus immunotherapy. Four patients have been studied extensively by immunologic techniques. In addition to producing clinical remission of metastatic melanoma, we have preliminary evidence to suggest that we may have stimulated cellular immunity against the metastatic melanoma.

#### METHODS AND MATERIALS

##### (1) Routine Studies:

All patients had a complete history, physical examination, routine hematological and biochemical tests (SMA-12), x-rays of the chest, abdomen, liver scan, brain scan, bone survey, quantitative immunoglobulins, melanin determinations on urine.

Delayed hypersensitivity skin tests to different agents (PPD, monilial extract, varidase, mumps vaccine) were performed. Sensitization to DNCB was performed in addition to PHA induced blast transformation study on peripheral lymphocytes as a measure of overall cellular immunity.

##### (2) Special Immunological Studies:

Detection of serum antibodies to melanoma cells by immunofluorescent techniques using acetone-fixed melanoma imprints and microcytotoxic techniques for detection of cell mediated immunity in vitro involving cell inhibition were performed.

These colony inhibition techniques were done with and without the patient's serum to detect possible enhancing antibodies. The tissue culture used was melanoma tumor cells grown on a special tissue culture medium (Waymouth) fortified with fetal calf serum. Appropriate controls include reactions against the patients own skin fibroblasts, or other tumor cells such as breast cancer cells, and normal lymphocytes against melanoma cells. In the test for humoral antibodies, human serum complement will be used. The ratio of lymphocytes to target cells is that recommended by Hellstrom. The possible presence of serum blocking antibodies was tested by these cytotoxic techniques. Studies were also performed to detect HL-A antigens on the melanoma cells, skin fibroblasts and lymphocytes.

##### (3) Vaccinia Virus Therapy:

Patients with stage II disease with regional metastasis (skin and lymph nodes) were considered ideal candidates for vaccinia virus therapy. Early in the study, some patients with stage III disease were treated. Before therapy, the largest tumor nodules were surgically removed. Regional lymph nodes were not removed. The vaccinia virus (Lilly, from the lymph of calves inoculated with the virus) in one glass tube is diluted with up to 0.5 ml. of saline and injected directly into the tumor nodules. Depending on the severity of local and systemic reaction to the virus, subsequent injections of up to five tubes of vaccinia virus diluted with 0.5 ml. of saline are injected at two week intervals. A modified, accelerated type of vaccinia reaction with redness, swelling and induration of the nodules will be observed in about four days. It may be accompanied by fever, chills and nausea.

#### RESULTS

During the ten year period from 1960-1970, 476 cases of malignant melanoma were seen at the Cleveland Clinic. Twenty patients with metastatic melanoma were treated during this ten year period with vaccinia virus therapy (Table 2). The clinicopathologic stage of these cases shows a much more prolonged survival in the stage II treated patients. Their survival after vaccinia virus therapy was 32.2 months average compared to only 4.6 months in the stage III.



IN COMMEMORATION OF THE 60TH  
ANNIVERSARY OF THE SAINT  
ALOYSIUS CLUB OF PASSAIC, N.J.

## HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues here in the Congress to join with me in heartiest congratulations and best wishes to the St. Aloysius Club of Passaic, N.J., in celebration of their 60th anniversary as a social-athletic organization.

Sixty years ago, a young curate of St. Joseph's Church, the late Right Reverend Monsignor Lawrence Szorc, met with 12 young men of his parish marking the birth of the St. Aloysius Club. The club's first decade spanned the tumultuous years when the world erupted into World War I. It was during these first 10 years, however, that the St. Aloysius Club began its actual participation in the sports arena with many championship baseball teams among their membership. Some of their Passaic semiprofessional baseball greats immediately preceding World War I who keynoted the many successes of the club in the sphere of sports in the years to come were: Fischer, Marut, Grant, Lajeskie, Stazewski, Jesionowski, Roche, Siemienski, Ruskin, and Rutkowski. President Wilson's call to arms, heralding the beginning of World War I, recruited 38 members of the club. Of those who served with the American Expeditionary Forces, two did not return: Albert Danko and Frank Ruskin were killed in action.

The postwar reorganization of the St. Aloysius Club was effected under the guidance of the late Right Reverend Julius A. Manteuffel. The club's prime athletic endeavors turned to basketball with players Grant, Patlen, Jermalowitz, Klevitt, Roche, and Grabiec earning the club an outstanding reputation second to none on the basketball courts.

Through the outstanding efforts of Ted Fialkowski, Aldon Patlen, Ted Klemans, John Grabiec, and Henry Janowski, the club expanded its activities during the 1920's to include club socials, public social events, basketball, baseball, and track.

In the 1930's while Americans were recovering from the crash of 1929, the St. Aloysius Club, riding on the momentum it had acquired in the 1920's, fortified the niche they had carved out for themselves on the basketball court with new achievements on the baseball diamond. Spirited play in the Gersie League by the Reno brothers, Nowak, Gogal, Zarkowski, Staniec, Cajzer, and Sudol thrilled thousands of local followers of the national pastime.

It was during the 1930's that the club's membership focused increased attention on municipal affairs.

During the decade of the 1940's and before World War II had ended, 167 men from "St. Al's" had served in our Nation's uniform—five of them giving their lives in battle. During the postwar years, the 1946-47 season, the St. Aloysius Club

fostered a professional basketball team managed by Stan "Chick" Gradzki which won the Tricounty League Championship with such stars as Ted Janeczek, Bobby Wanzer, Mike Hamner, Bob Pope, Whitey Macknowski, and Lefty Halkard. The St. Al's seniors, with Gene Garlewicz, the Burek brothers, Ed Gradzki, Stan Wozny, Mitchell Bargiel, John Wagner, and Bill Mastrolia, took championship honors in their division winning 26 out of 28 games including a club record winning streak of 22. A fourth basketball team composed of boys of preclub age took championship honors in their division. In table tennis, the St. Al's led by Walter Biela, with Ted Soja, Walt Grembowitz, and Stan Spolnik, won all honors in the Passaic-Clifton-Garfield area. In softball, the St. Al's won the city championship with such players as Al Potosnak, Bob Neilley, Jerry Furst, Henry Kowal, Fred Kuren, Al Wasilewski, Bill Wakszmudzki, and Wally Liptak.

In the 1950's the St. Aloysius Club continued their championship efforts. Twenty-three of their members served in the Korean conflict and, with God's blessing, all of them returned. They captured the softball championship in 1952 and another in 1956. Their basketball team held the spotlight in 1958.

The St. Aloysius Club with their diligence and dedication to the principles of sportsmanship and fair play in our American system and way of life has indeed been an inspiration to all of their members and has truly enriched our community, State, and Nation. The success of their efforts and the guidance they provided in their recreation athletic-social activities to the people of our district are reflected in the personal achievements of their membership. Over the years these men in their personal career pursuits have achieved prominence in all walks of life and we are especially proud of their professional expertise and outstanding contributions to the spiritual, moral, legal, political, civic, educational, industrial, and environmental integrity of our community.

Special commendation and best wishes are extended to the 1972 officers and committeemen of the St. Aloysius Club as follows:

Officers: John L. Salek, president; Louis Wolkenstorfer, vice president; Joseph Korczynski, financial secretary; Fred J. Kuren, treasurer; and John Bacha, secretary.

Committeemen: Walter Biela, Robert Bliss, Zygmunt Dorski, Steve Drozdowski, Albert Galik, chairman, Stanley Gradzki, chairman, Andrew Igloidy, chairman, Ed Janeczek, William Kachur, Fred Kobylarz, Ted Kozak, Walt Makowski, Al Pawlowski, John Piroch, Michael Sopoliga, Stanley Spolnik, chairman, Joseph Wakszmudzki, Stanley R. Wozny, Stanley Zalewski, and Fabian Zolcinski.

We do indeed salute these officers, the parish priests throughout the club's existence, and all of the members of the St. Aloysius Club and extend our appreciation as they commemorate their 60th anniversary year in service to our people.

## ATTACKING DRUG ADDICTION IN OUR PRISONS

### HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the high number of offenders who enter correctional institutions today with a history of narcotics addiction or drug dependency constitutes a serious problem in American society, both inside and beyond our corrections system. Although hard statistics concerning previous drug usage by offenders are scarce, there is evidence that in some of our jails and prisons up to one-half of the offender population have brought a drug abuse problem with them.

In August of 1969, the District of Columbia's Department of Corrections conducted a study which demonstrated that 45 percent of all men coming to the city jail were heroin addicts. In the State of Maryland, the corrections commissioner recently estimated that as many as 50 percent of newly committed Maryland prison inmates are drug users. Four years ago the figure was placed at 30 percent and, according to the commissioner, the percentage could climb as high as 80 percent in only a few years.

The problem is also severe in our Federal prisons. In hearings before the Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries of the Senate Judiciary Committee in March of 1971, the Federal Bureau of Prisons Director, Mr. Norman Carlson, testified that roughly 20 percent of all offenders confined in Federal institutions have significant problems of narcotics addiction, a number which has been increasing rather substantially over the past several years. This figure does not include the undoubtedly higher number of offenders who are merely drug abusers.

The large number of addicts populating our correctional institutions today is frightening, particularly considering the current crime crisis. It is generally recognized that addicts released from correctional institutions are a high-risk group. According to a recent study conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, 69 percent of a sample group of Federal offenders arrested in 1965 on a narcotics charge were rearrested by 1969. Our correctional institutions are failing to rehabilitate drug addicted offenders, for most simply resume their habit upon leaving prison and promptly return to a life of crime in order to support it. What is particularly disturbing, however, is the increasing evidence that more and more of our addicts are turning to violent crimes such as assault and armed robbery to obtain their drug money instead of committing nonviolent offense such as shoplifting, which they traditionally have been known to do.

It is clear that unless our penal system can improve its performance in handling this special class of offender—the narcotic addict—we can expect to make little headway in reducing recid-

vism and its accompanying high-crime rate.

In this article, I would like to describe the present role of our Federal and State correctional facilities in fighting drug addiction and detail my proposals to improve the situation.

A specialized treatment program for narcotics addiction was established in the Federal correctional system with the passage of the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966 (NARA). Prior to this time, only a small percentage of the total Federal prisoner addict population was selected for commitment to the two U.S. Public Health Service hospitals at Lexington, Ky., and Fort Worth, Tex. Most were simply committed to one of 27 Federal correctional facilities and received no special treatment for their drug problem. Following passage of this legislation, drug treatment programs were established in 1968 in three institutions: the Federal Correctional Institutions at Danbury, Conn., and Terminal Island, Calif., and the Federal Reformatory for Women at Alderson, W. Va. Since that time, an additional unit has opened at Milan, Mich., and the capacity of the Danbury unit has been doubled.

The Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act directs itself, however, to only a limited number of offenders. Excluded from treatment are persons convicted of crimes of violence, drug dealers—unless dealing for their own personal use because of a habit—those who have been convicted of a felony on two or more prior occasions or against whom there is pending a prior charge of a felony, and those who have been committed under the act three or more times already.

Because only a very small percentage of addicted offenders have qualified for treatment under NARA, there remains a large number of offenders in our correctional institutions with equally serious drug addiction or dependency problems who are not receiving treatment of any kind.

In light of this deficiency, the Federal Bureau of Prisons recently has developed programs in five other institutions, which are modeled after the NARA program, to accommodate these offenders. The non-NARA facilities are located at the Federal institutions at Lewisburg, Pa.; Terre Haute, Ind.; Lompoc, Calif.; El Reno, Okla.; and Petersburg, Va. In addition, a non-NARA program has been established at Fort Worth.

The capacity of both the NARA and non-NARA programs, however, is only 1,050 persons, barely one-quarter of the Federal offender population estimated to be addicted to heroin alone.

The treatment program, itself, has two phases—institutional treatment and aftercare services.

Although each NARA treatment unit has developed its own specific treatment methods, institutional treatment throughout the entire program is focused on redirecting the patient's behavior through a group therapy approach. The offender's personal life and attitudes, after all, were initially responsible for his addiction and participation in criminal activity. Emphasis is also placed on

vocational training and developing offenders' basic academic skills. It is hoped the patient leaving the program will thus be better equipped to reenter society, having overcome his need for a narcotics habit.

The after-care treatment phase is key. Treating an offender while he is incarcerated can only prepare him, in part, to function in the community. Followup in the community is crucial to the success of the program, for it is here the offender undergoes the real test. Will he or will he not be able to withstand the pressures of community living without reverting to drug use? In addition to basic counseling and maintenance services, the scope of after-care services includes self-help groups led by ex-addicts, vocational guidance, education, training, and job placement. After-care services help the offender through the critical period immediately following his release from the institution, and can determine the success or the failure of the entire program.

Has the NARA program proved successful? According to Bureau of Prisons officials, the program is still in the experimental stages and citing conclusive statistics regarding its success would be premature. Nonetheless, preliminary results have been encouraging and there is room for optimism.

Plans for the future include establishing one drug unit in each of the Federal Bureau of Prisons' 28 institutions, although obtaining adequate resources and attracting competent staff remain significant stumbling blocks.

Although it has its drawbacks, at least the Federal Bureau of Prisons has an established program to treat drug addicts. This cannot be said of our State and local prisons and correctional facilities. One-half of this country's jails, for example, have no medical facilities whatsoever, much less treatment programs for drug offenders. And most State prisons have established few, if any, drug-treatment facilities for their inmates, regardless of the fact that the State prison population is 10 times that of the Federal system.

In order to make any significant headway in treating the drug addicted offender, we must make sure that our correctional facilities on the State level have the resources and the incentive to establish adequate treatment facilities to accommodate the growing numbers of drug addicts and drug-dependent offenders in their institutions.

To help meet this crisis, I have introduced in the 92d Congress legislation designed to encourage the establishment by States of narcotics treatment programs of offenders.

Presently, the major Federal program which provides financial aid to States and localities for the purpose of strengthening their crime prevention and control activities is the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) program established under title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. A 1970 amendment to this act provides for a special program of grants for the improvement of correctional institutions and facilities and cor-

rectional programs. As of now, however, there is no provision specifically providing for the establishment of drug treatment programs in State and local correctional facilities. My bill would provide that States desiring funding from the LEAA for correctional institutions and facilities make provision in their funding application for the establishment and development of such narcotic treatment and rehabilitation programs. It also would direct the Attorney General to prescribe standards for the administration of these programs.

Two courses of action hold promise in combating the growing and alarming number of drug-addicted and drug-dependent offenders. First, we need to establish drug treatment facilities and programs in our State and local correctional facilities as rapidly as possible—best accomplished, in my opinion, by using the already existing LEAA program. And, second, we need to correct some of the problems existing in our Federal Bureau of Prisons program. Principally, we need to extend treatment to a greater number of drug-addicted and drug-dependent Federal prisoners.

Our ability to come to grips with the growing rate of recidivism and the concomitant increase in crime we have all been experiencing hinges, in large part, on our ability to come to grips with the drug-addicted offender.

#### THE GOLDEN BULL OF HUNGARY

#### HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, 750 years ago, the Hungarian nation planted its seed in the garden of democracy, personal freedom and constitutional liberties—the Bulla Aurea was written to stress and to guarantee the basic rights of man.

When one turns his thoughts to the men and women living in the year 1222, when one begins to picture the feudal social structure and the extremely narrow life style embodied in the tiny East European village, the significance of this Hungarian Magna Carta becomes increasingly recognized and respected. For the Golden Bull attacked feudalism at its deepest roots; it provided for the degradation of any lord who abused his office—promising safeguards to all nobles against arbitrary arrest; it sought to maintain a balance between the political and economic forces within Hungary; it authorized all persons to put up resistance, individually or collectively, against the violation of their human rights.

It is truly an irony of world history that this nation which was one of the very first to speak for freedom and social justice has had its growth in this vital area stunted and its seed of democracy prevented from germination. As I join my many friends of Hungarian ancestry in honoring the 750th anniversary of the Bulla Aurea, let us continue to rec-



ognize the great contribution this nation has given to the rights of freedom and fairness for us all. Let us join, today, this brave people in reaffirming our commitment to the rebirth of these rights in their own native land.

#### A SALUTE TO EDUCATION

### HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this opportunity to join in the National Education Association salute to education. Lincoln said of education that "I view it as the most important subject which we, as a people, can be engaged in." No one can quarrel with this statement, least of all a person who has devoted all of his adult life to education, as I have.

We in Alaska are privileged to have many fine and dedicated educators. These men and women have demonstrated their professional abilities both in the classroom and by working to improve the educational system as a whole. A small representative group of Alaskan educators symbolize the profound influence educators can have on education in Alaska and throughout the United States. Let me say, initially, that for each individual I mention, there are dozens more who equally deserve recognition. Lack of space here cannot diminish the vital and all-encompassing role they play in their community and State.

Mrs. Doris Ray has been teaching in the Fairbanks area for 15 years and she is currently heading the social studies department at Lathrop High School there. She was just appointed to the National Education Association Council on Instruction and Professional Development. In addition, Alaska is honored to have Mrs. Ray as one of the 12 educators in the Nation selected to serve on the National Teacher Task Force, sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education. She will meet with the task force once a month here in Washington in an effort to upgrade American education.

Working with Mrs. Ray in Alaska are Bill Potter, of Juneau, president of the Alaska Education Association; Bob Lintott of Anchorage, president-elect of the Alaska Education Association; Sanna Green of Anchorage, former president of the State association and currently serving as Alaska's PACE chairman; Hank Harrison, Alaska teacher of the year this year and NEA director for the entire State; and Bob Van Houte, the executive secretary of the Alaska Education Association.

I cannot overstate the importance of education in our society. The efforts of these and many other educators in our 49th State cannot be commended sufficiently to the degree they affect the future of our civilization. The dedication educators bring to their profession can seldom be matched. As we continue to improve and expand our education system, we will need to call again and again

on these fine people and their fellow professionals. With their efforts our schools and education will continue to progress to meet the unbelievable needs of the future.

Alaska has long been called the last frontier. We have pioneered so many innovative and creative education programs and educational legislation in the last 15 years, it can truly be said that with the professional dedication of 4,000 educators in Alaska we are and will remain "the first frontier." In "the great land" there is no question we will occupy that position for many years to come.

#### XEROX HEAD'S PLAN IS RECOPIED

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the State of New York primary for delegates to the national conventions being held today will bring to an end the hectic primary campaign battles.

The struggle for the Democratic Party nomination has been arduous and newsworthy. It is hard to tell the overall public reaction to the presidential primary. Certainly many citizens were entertained, others were confused by the rhetoric of the various Democratic presidential hopefuls.

One observer, who was certainly entertained and certainly not confused by it all, was Bill Anderson, national correspondent of the Chicago Tribune. He is one of the most respected political analyst among the working reporters. He has managed to survive the Democratic battles from New Hampshire, across the country and back to New York and still retain his objectivity.

He has also retained his sense of humor which is evident in his column of Friday, June 16, which I insert in the RECORD at this point:

#### XEROX HEAD'S PLAN IS RECOPIED

(By Bill Anderson)

WASHINGTON, June 15.—Max Palevsky of Los Angeles is board chairman of the Xerox Corp. That's the company making the machines which reproduce copies of almost everything but people.

Not since President Thomas Jefferson of Monticello, Va., invented a letter copying device has there been anything like Xerox. People use the machines to duplicate dirty jokes to mail to friends. Radicals steal copies of the Pentagon's papers and duplicate them for distribution to the New York Times and the Washington Post.

Some copy boys at The Chicago Tribune once used the machine there to print secretly an underground newspaper which was the forerunner of the Chicago Journalism Review. They wrote uncomplimentary things about editors and reporters, in that order. There are so many Xerox copies in industry today that proliferation of papers has started a whole series of machines—paper shredders. The paper shredders are sort of the antiballistic missiles of both government and industry.

But that's beside the point. The point is that Palevsky has made a pot of money out of the whole thing. A lot more than Jefferson, who died a poor man. In fact, Mr. Palev-

sky has so much money he has become what the politicians call a "fat cat" donor. In this particular election year, he has become to Sen. George McGovern what millionaire Clement Stone already is to Richard Nixon. A lot.

Mr. Palevsky has been heavily financing Sen. McGovern since McGovern started running for President, and that has been a long time. He did so even in the dark days of the McGovern campaign, when the senator's staff was sharing the cost of rental cars with reporters tramping around the country. [Now the McGovern press rooms have free booze.]

The man from Xerox has been so helpful in the cash department he has won accreditation to give his senator advice, and this includes advice about money. Also our money. McGovern, as some readers may remember, got into trouble during the California debates with Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey about money. Also our money. This was because of the McGovern welfare plan to give every man, woman, and child in the United States \$1,000 every year.

For some reason, the figures of the cost of this program got into the Mickey Mouse realm. This has confused a lot of people. Most everybody in the U.S. would like to have an extra dollar, and would be delighted with \$1,000. But at least one or two persons, including Humphrey, wondered how much it would cost. Usually when the federal government makes donations, it costs about \$1.40 to give away 1. Even Mr. Palevsky admitted that "these [McGovern] figures don't add up." He indicated he might even computerize all of the political statements about the new \$1,000 program because "we want to bring it into focus." That's a tall order, if I may so, even if it comes from Xerox to a computer.

Strictly to save the computers all the extra work, I would like to suggest that Sen. McGovern abandon the \$1,000 plan. I have a far better one anyway. It would be far simpler and less costly for everybody in the country just to automatically give all the money they have and make to the federal government. This would eliminate all withholding tax paperwork for industry and the requirement of individuals to fill out tax forms. Think of the advantages. It would remove the temptation to list an extra child as a tax deduction.

My plan would wipe out millionaires, including Eugene L. Wyman, the Los Angeles backer of Sen. Humphrey. McGovern has already said something should be done about Wyman because he is the wrong kind of millionaire.

Furthermore, my plan calls for giving everybody more money than McGovern's plan. After careful research, I have discovered there is enough money in circulation to give each person in the United States \$16,972.34 a year. Of course we would still need a defense establishment, but I propose to give President McGovern two shotguns and a 1.5 inch cannon for the White House yacht. This would cost \$972.34 a year, leaving \$16,000 for everybody else. I defy Xerox to duplicate this.

#### GREAT NECK SENIOR CITIZENS CENTER OF NEW YORK CELEBRATE 15TH ANNIVERSARY

### HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the Great Neck Senior Citizens Center of New York is celebrating this year its 15th year of service to the community.

I recently had the privilege of sharing

the center's 15th anniversary reception and it was a most noteworthy occasion. Our senior citizens are often overlooked, if not forgotten, by the society at large, and this gathering served, Mr. Speaker, to remind me of the important contributions senior citizens make to this Nation.

Three of Great Neck's finest citizens, Mr. Jesse Markel, Mr. Fred Williams, and Mr. Joseph Grasso, helped to make possible the 15th anniversary reception at the center, and I wish here in the pages of the RECORD to note their very own special contribution. Indeed, the reception would not have been complete without the presence of Mr. Markel, known to many as "Mr. Great Neck."

I think it important that we note here all of those who played a part in making the anniversary reception a success. They are Ida Goldstick, Janice Hawley, Dr. Martin Hurvitz, Marjorie Kern, Herbert Kern, Jeanette Kramer, Frances G. Markel, Herbert Maurer, Frank Neubert, Alma Simons, Thomas J. Carroll, Henry Reed, and Fred A. Williams.

I take pride in the fact, Mr. Speaker, that we in Great Neck have such a center, and I would wish for every community in America the very same for their senior citizens.

#### SALUTE TO EDUCATION

### HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, since their birth in the 18th century, American educational institutions have always been at the center of the Nation's progressive forces in bestowing their benefits on America's children. Education has sought to perpetuate the best in American character: social responsibility, community consciousness, and the honest and continual reevaluation of society. As the Nation's bicentennial approaches, a salute to American education is more than appropriate. Not contented with intellectual concerns alone, American educators have always devoted themselves to the development of the whole child.

Given such an admirable history, we can be sure that American educational institutions today will rise with competence to the challenges of insufficient funding, internal strife, and incomplete fulfillment of the Nation's promise of equal education for all its children. And we look with pride and hope to American educators for the leadership needed in the hard struggle for equal employment opportunity.

Education is the key to progress for tomorrow's America. Every schoolchild deserves the kind of training that will allow him to realize fully his special potential, whether he is black or white, rich or poor. I am confident that the Nation's educators can and will surpass their commendable record in the next few years as we continue to fight toward fulfillment of the Nation's promises to its children.

### A GOVERNMENT OF MEN, NOT LAWS: THE WIRETAPPING CASE

### HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, the historic decision of the Supreme Court yesterday in United States against U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, the wiretapping case, should cause all of us to reflect on the attitude of the current administration with respect to the Constitution and laws of the United States.

In that 8-0 decision, the Court held unconstitutional under the fourth amendment the announced and repeatedly exercised policy of the Nixon administration to wiretap citizens without any search warrant or other judicial authorization.

For many months I have spoken out against this policy. It is a policy of harassment, of dissent, of repression, and of unlawfulness—as demonstrated by yesterday's clear decision. On November 30, 1971, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page 43583, an article I wrote on this subject which was published in the Boston Globe. In that article I stated:

"No [prior] Attorney General in the history of the country has claimed that the President is above the Fourth Amendment to the Bill of Rights which states categorically that all of us are protected from 'unreasonable searches and seizures' by the government. The Constitution requires the President to 'Preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.' The President is not carrying out this duty unless he states that the Fourth Amendment applies to the President of the United States just as it does to the rest of us."

As Mr. Justice Powell stated in the Court's decision yesterday:

History abundantly documents the tendency of government . . . to view with suspicion those who most fervently dispute its policies.

Mr. Speaker, the following statement of the Supreme Court in this case is so important that it should be carved in stone throughout the land:

The price of unlawful public dissent must not be a dread of subjection to an unchecked surveillance power.

The Court further stated:

The fourth amendment does not contemplate the executive officers of government as neutral and disinterested magistrates.

Therefore, when this or any other administration wants to pry into the lives of private citizens, it must, like other would-be snoopers, seek judicial authorization.

Of course, I am gratified that the power of the executive in this case has been appropriately limited, that this policy of unauthorized wiretapping has been declared unlawful. However, I take small comfort from this decision, Mr. Speaker, in view of the many other unlawful acts of the administration which have not yet been checked.

The list of unlawful acts perpetrated by this administration is so long, and

reaches into so many areas of our national life, that it is in fact a pervasive pattern. This is the administration which:

First, continues to prosecute and, indeed, escalate, a war, the termination of which is a matter of national policy embodied in law;

Second, impounds billions of dollars in funds voted by Congress;

Third, in violation of the first amendment restrained the publication of the Pentagon papers until ordered by the Supreme Court not to do so;

Fourth, promulgated comprehensive tax laws—the asset depreciation range system—without any congressional authorization;

Fifth, withheld from public view unclassified material regarding the SST and Cannikin nuclear explosion in contravention of the Freedom of Information Act;

Sixth, unlawfully announced an expansion of the jurisdiction of the Subversive Activities Control Board—Executive Order 11605—without congressional approval;

Seventh, refused to prosecute those responsible for the Kent State killings;

Eighth, ordered arrested more than 10,000 demonstrators and bystanders in Washington one day last year, virtually all of the arrests being declared unlawful by the courts;

Ninth, has regularly converted Federal grand juries into tools of domestic surveillance;

Tenth, has summarily arrested, detained, and harassed innocent aliens under Immigration and Naturalization Service policies;

Eleventh, in 1969 suspended the operation of Justice Department Civil Rights Act guidelines in order to permit certain school districts to remain segregated;

Twelfth, attempted to delay the effect of court-ordered integration plans in at least six major cities;

Thirteenth, reversed its milk price parity policy immediately after receiving a large political contribution from proponents of the reversal;

Fourteenth, settled under highly questionable circumstances the ITT anti-trust case and sent representatives to Congress to lie about their involvement with the settlement; and

Fifteenth, nominated for the position of Attorney General of the United States an individual who was offered a bribe and did not report the offer until he learned a week later that the FBI had it under investigation.

The list of unlawful acts and policies of this administration is long and sordid and a discredit to the desire of most Americans for honesty—basic honesty—and fairness in government.

Fairness includes respect for the right of all individuals to privacy and I rejoice that we have a system wherein the courts will ultimately protect the people's privacy even if the executive branch will not.

In his concurring opinion in the wiretapping case, Mr. Justice Douglas refers to the "recurring desire of reigning officials to intimidate their critics—" He



quotes the 1971 statement of Senator Kennedy, who stated that the unauthorized wiretaps of this administration:

Accounted for an average of 78 to 209 days of listening per device, as compared with a 13-day per device average for those devices installed under court order—[There is a] frightening possibility.

#### Warned Senator Kennedy:

That the conversations of untold thousands of citizens of this country are being monitored on secret devices which no judge has authorized and which may remain in operation for months and perhaps years at a time.

We should all be thankful that this policy has been ordered terminated. Now we must turn our attention to other unlawful practices in the executive branch of a government supposed to be of laws, not men.

The Supreme Court has rejected on grounds of unconstitutionality assertions of power by the executive on only a few occasions in the entire history of the United States. Two of those decisions—the recent "Pentagon Papers" case and this wiretapping case—have already been precipitated by unlawful policies of the current administration. I expect we will hear more along these lines from our Highest Court before the year is out.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this point editorials from today's New York Times and Washington Post with respect to the Supreme Court's wiretapping decision.

#### The editorials follow:

[From the New York Times, June 20, 1972]

##### THE RESTRAINT OF LAW

The Supreme Court has delivered a sharp rebuke to those ideologues of the executive branch who consider the President's "inherent powers" superior to the Constitution. In an 8-to-0 decision the Court has rejected the assertion that the Government has the right without court orders, to tap the wires of "dangerous" radical groups. Justice Lewis P. Powell Jr., who wrote the opinion, said: "The price of lawful public dissent must not be a dread of subjection to an unchecked surveillance power."

Former Attorney General Mitchell's position that the Republic would be in danger if the Justice Department could not tap wires without court orders has now, fortunately been completely demolished by this unanimous vote of the "Nixon court," in which only Justice William H. Rehnquist, who was an advocate of the Government's case while he was in the Justice Department did not join. The Government claimed that in order to get the court's permission to tap wires, it would have to submit too much concrete evidence. But this fear of disclosure—even to the courts—goes to the heart of the matter: The Constitution means to protect all citizens against vague fishing expeditions by the executive.

It was Mr. Mitchell's view that civil liberties would be safe so long as it was he who had to give personal approval in each instance of electronic surveillance. Fortunately, the Court was not persuaded by a system of constitutional safeguards dependent on the Attorney General's, or even the President's infallibility or, as Mr. Mitchell put it, on the "self-discipline of the executive branch." Moreover, there has been growing evidence that there is far more domestic spying than has been authorized by the Attorney General.

The Supreme Court understood the historic lesson that a blank check of official

powers is the prelude to their abuse. "Vigorous citizen dissent and discussion of Government action in private conversation," Justice Powell warned, must not be deterred by fear that unauthorized Government monitors are listening. Those who argued the Government's case admitted that they were asking for an "awesome power" but pledged to use it with "discretion."

The Supreme Court, ignoring the usual division between "liberal" and "conservative," has now reminded the Government that it is just because its powers are so awesome that their exercise cannot be left to the discretion of men without precise restraint of law, under the Constitution.

[From the Washington Post, June 20, 1972]

##### THE COURT AND ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCES

The decision by the Supreme Court yesterday that the Federal Government cannot constitutionally use electronic surveillance devices in domestic security cases unless it gets judicial permission to do so is a landmark in the long struggle to maintain individual freedom in this country. The effect of it—if the Executive Branch complies with it, and we trust that will happen—should be to reduce substantially the near-paranoiac fears among some citizens that their conversations are being tapped or bugged by the government. Beyond this, the decision is a sharp slap at the Nixon Administration which had badly attempted to justify as a legitimate exercise in presidential power a practice that had begun years ago and grown steadily more dangerous.

This decision, as far as we can tell, will have no substantial impact on the Executive Branch's legitimate efforts to gain information about those who would engage in acts of political espionage or terrorism. It simply requires the Department of Justice to handle its investigations into those areas as it already handles its investigations into other kinds of crime. What it does rule out is the procedure ardently advocated by this administration under which the Attorney General alone determined when wiretapping and eavesdropping equipment was to be used in domestic security cases. In the future, a judge is to make that determination under traditional standards of the Fourth Amendment. This rule, it should be noted, has not yet been extended to cover investigations into subversive activities by other governments.

It should be said that the procedure defended by the Nixon Administration in this case did not originate with it; what this administration did was give it a much more explicit rationale. For at least 25 years, the Department of Justice through the FBI has carried out electronic surveillance in domestic security cases without court approval. Lying behind these efforts to protect the domestic peace, at least in the beginning, were fears of Communist subversion and espionage. More lately, the fears have expanded to include other kinds of domestic unrest and the phrase "domestic security" seems to have grown in meaning to encompass many kinds of strong dissent against the status quo. The Court seems to have recognized this. In a powerful opinion by Justice Powell, it said:

History abundantly documents the tendency of government—however benevolent and benign its motives—to view with suspicion those who most fervently dispute its policies. Fourth Amendment protections become the more necessary when the targets of official surveillance may be those suspected of unorthodoxy in their political beliefs. The danger to political dissent is acute where the government attempts to act under so vague a concept as the power to protect "domestic security."

Underlying the Court's decision was an explicit rejection of the key argument which

the Nixon Administration had used in claiming the right to broad surveillance power. That claim was that the President could not fully discharge his constitutional duty to protect domestic security unless his agents were free to engage in whatever wiretapping and eavesdropping the Attorney General might authorize. To this, Justice Powell replied, "We recognize, as we have before, the constitutional basis of the President's domestic security role, but we think it must be exercised in a manner compatible with the Fourth Amendment."

The Justice turned aside each of the arguments the government had made to support that assertion—that this kind of surveillance was primarily intelligence gathering, not law enforcement, that domestic security matters are too complex for courts to evaluate, and that secrecy would be compromised by requiring warrants in advance. The last two points were brushed aside and to the other, Justice Powell noted that security surveillances are particularly sensitive because, among other things, of "the temptation to utilize such surveillances to oversee political dissent."

Perhaps the most important effect of this decision will come outside of government. The idea that the government is always listening has become widespread in some areas of our society and has something to do, we think, with some of the bitterness loose in the land. Adherence to the spirit of this decision, or whatever minor modifications Congress might be able to make in it, by the Executive Branch would remove one of the grievances which is helping to increase the alienation of some citizens from their government.

#### GEORGIA STATE CHAMPIONS

#### HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, on June 3 of this year the West Point, Ga., High School baseball team won the Georgia Class B State Championship. The 13 fine young men who compose the team worked long and hard all season to win the first State championship for West Point since 1964. After being down one game, they came back to win the next two for the State crown. Mr. Speaker, in a day and age when some young men are deserting and demeaning our Nation's traditional values, it is certainly refreshing to find that there are many who still find fulfillment and pride in working together and winning at such an "All-American" activity as baseball. The 13 young men of the West Point team, their coach, and the West Point Quarterback Club—which has provided such outstanding support for the school's entire athletic program—are all deserving of our commendation.

Therefore, I would like to bring to the attention of our colleagues the names of the West Point High School State baseball champions:

Jimmy Williams, Coach.

Team members: Ronald Daniel, Jim Keith, Art Jones, Scott Crook, Joe Cooper, Eddie Singleton, Johnny O'Brien, Dickie McCarthy, Mike O'Brien, Randy Daniel, Andy Shirley, Kenneth Hoats, and Mike Crook.

Keith Powell, Manager.

Kelly Powell, Bat Boy.

As the Member who is privileged to represent West Point in Congress, it is with great pride that I will present to the school, in commendation of this excellent team, a flag which is being flown over the Capitol today.

#### AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL PRIVACY ACT

**HON. EDWARD I. KOCH**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a revised version of H.R. 854, my Federal Privacy Act. I might note that this bill will be the subject of hearings by the House Government Operations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information chaired by our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. MOORHEAD) on Thursday and several days next week.

H.R. 854 as amended responds to the problem that individuals face today in not knowing what Government agencies maintain files on them—and most important whether these files contain erroneous and unfairly damaging material. The number of records the Government maintains on individuals is growing with the retention and retrieval of information facilitated by computers which are becoming increasingly sophisticated. Even so, the Congress has yet to develop a policy governing the collection, evaluation, dissemination and use of this material.

The Federal Privacy Act would help the individual to protect his own interests against abuse by Government collecting practices and would necessarily reveal patterns of Government operations which are detrimental to individual liberties. The bill requires that any Government agency maintaining records on a person do the following:

First, notify the person that such a record exists;

Second, notify the person of all transfers of such information;

Third, disclose information from such records only with the consent of the person or when legally required;

Fourth, maintain a record of all persons inspecting such records;

Fifth, permit the person to inspect his records, make copies of them, and supplement them; and

Sixth, remove erroneous or misleading information from a person's file, and notify all agencies and persons to whom the erroneous material has previously been transferred of its removal.

Exception to the disclosure rule would be made in the case of records that are required by executive order to be withheld in the interest of national security and for purposes of criminal prosecution. The President would be required to notify the Congress on an agency-by-agency basis each year of the number of files withheld for these reasons.

H.R. 854, as amended, also creates a Federal Privacy Board to supervise the administration of the provisions of the

bill. In particular, it would permit an appeal by an individual seeking the removal of erroneous or misleading information contained in his file. The Board also would hear complaints that an agency had not complied with other requirements of the bill.

The Federal Privacy Board would be composed of seven members appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. If the Board found that one or more requirements of the Federal Privacy Act had not been met, it could issue a final order directing the agency to comply. The order would be binding on the individual and the agency. Appeals from the Board's decision could be made to the Federal district court.

The bill I am introducing today clarifies my original intent that these disclosure provisions should apply to files held on organizations and corporations, as well as individuals. Thus the word "person" has been substituted for "individual" where applicable.

The revised bill also adds a penalty, a fine of \$1,000, for willful violation by an employee of a Government agency of a provision of the bill.

While H.R. 854 originally left to the individual agencies the responsibility to establish rules for the procedures with respect to how persons will be notified of records maintained on them and how the records will be made available, today's bill transfers that authority to the Federal Privacy Board.

Finally, this bill adds the requirement that an agency divulge information maintained on persons to individuals within the agency only if they have a "need to know."

Mr. Speaker, because of these and other technical changes in the bill, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the full text of the revised bill as I have introduced it today. Printed under the number, H.R. 15613, it follows:

#### H.R. 15613

A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that persons be apprised of records concerning them which are maintained by Government agencies

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding immediately after section 552 thereof the following new section:

#### "§ 552a. Individual records

"(a) Each agency that maintains records, including computer records, concerning any person which may be retrieved by reference to, or are indexed under such person's name, or some other similar identifying number or symbol, and which contain any information obtained from any source other than such person shall, with respect to such records—

"(1) notify such person by mail at his last known address that the agency maintains or has augmented a record concerning said person;

"(2) refrain from disclosing the record or any information contained therein to any other agency or to any person not employed by the agency maintaining such record, except—

(A) with permission of the person concerned or, in the event such person, if an individual, cannot be located or communicated with after reasonable effort, with per-

mission from members of the individual's immediate family or guardian, or, only in the event that such individual, members of the individual's immediate family and guardian cannot be located or communicated with after reasonable effort, upon good cause for such disclosure, or

(B) that if disclosure of such record is required under section 552 of this chapter or by any other provision of law, the person concerned shall be notified by mail at his last known address of any such required disclosure;

"(3) refrain from disclosing the record or any information contained therein to individuals within that agency other than those individuals who need to examine such record or information for the execution of their jobs;

"(4) maintain an accurate record of the names and addresses of all persons to whom any information contained in such records is divulged and the purposes for which such divulgence was made;

"(5) permit any person to inspect his own record and have copies thereof made at his expense, which in no event shall be greater than the cost to the agency of making such copies.

"(6) permit any person to supplement the information contained in his record by the addition of any document of writing of reasonable length containing information such person deems pertinent to his record, and

"(7) remove erroneous information of any kind, and notify all agencies and persons to whom the erroneous material has been previously transferred of its removal.

"(b) This section shall not apply to records that are—

"(1) specifically required by Executive order to be kept secret in the interest of the national security;

"(2) investigatory files compiled for law enforcement purposes, except to the extent that such records have been maintained for a longer period than reasonably necessary to commence prosecution or other action or to the extent available by law to a party other than an agency; and

"(3) interagency or intraagency memoranda or letters which would not be available by law to a party other than an agency possessing such memoranda or letters in litigation with such agency.

"(c) The President shall report to Congress before January 30 of each year on an agency-by-agency basis the number of records and the number of investigatory files which were exempted from the application of this section by reason of clauses (1) and (2) of subsection (d) during the immediately preceding calendar year.

"(d) This section shall not be held or considered to permit the disclosure of the identity of any person who has furnished information contained in any record subject to this section.

"(e) Any employee of the United States who under color of agency authority knowingly and willfully violates a provision of this section, or permits such a violation, shall be fined \$1,000."

(b) The table of sections of subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting:

#### "552a. Individual records."

Immediately below:

"552. Public information; agency rules; opinions, orders, records, and proceedings."

Sec. 2. (a) There is established a Board to be known as the Federal Privacy Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board").

(b) The Board shall establish published rules stating the time, place, fees to the extent authorized, and procedure to be followed with respect to making records promptly available to a person, and other-



wise to implement the provisions of Sec. 552a of Title 5 of the U.S. Code.

(c) The Board shall promptly consider complaints from any person that one or more of the requirements of section 552a(a) of title 5, United States Code, have not been met, with respect to the records specified in such section, by the responsible agency. The Board upon finding that one or more of the requirements have not been met, shall issue a final order directing the agency to comply with such requirement or requirements, and this order shall be binding on the parties to such a dispute.

(d) The Board shall consist of seven members, each serving for a term of two years, four of whom shall constitute a quorum. The Members of the Board shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. No more than four of the members appointed shall be of the same political party, and shall be from the public at large and not officers or employees of the United States. Any vacancy in the Board shall be filled in the same manner the original appointment was made.

(e) Members of the Board shall be entitled to receive \$100 each day during which time they are engaged in the performance of the business of the Board, including travel-time.

(f) The Chairman of the Board shall be elected by the Board every year, and the Board shall meet not less frequently than bi-monthly.

(g) The Board shall appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as are necessary to the carrying out of its duties.

(h) The Board shall hold hearings in order to make findings upon each complaint, unless it determines that the complaint is frivolous. The Board may examine such evidence as it deems useful, and shall establish such rules and procedures as it determines are most apt to the purposes of this section, including rules insuring the exhaustion of administrative remedies in the appropriate agency.

SEC. 3. Sec. 1 of this Act shall become effective on the ninetieth day following the date of enactment of this Act, and Sec. 2 shall become effective upon the day of enactment of this Act.

#### TAX REFORM

### HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the issue of tax reform has been a major one in the current presidential election campaign. It should be, for the American taxpayer is shelling out more and more of his hard earned money to meet local, State, and Federal dollar demands.

A recent editorial in the Irwin, Pa., Standard-Observer pointed out this year the American household will average \$4,530 in governmental taxes for 1972. The amount is \$200 over last year's average and another "record" high.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting the editorial into the RECORD for the consideration of my colleagues, particularly since it involves the Federal budget. According to the article, 71 percent of the Federal budget is "uncontrollable" or spending already committed by this and previous Congresses. It is long past time to reform our taxing programs and our spending.

#### NEW TAX HIGH

Bedraggled American taxpayers are having another record thrust upon them.

Each household will average \$4,530 in state, local and federal taxes for fiscal 1972, according to the Tax Foundation. That's up \$200 from 1971 and is, once again, an all-time high.

This year's hike is due to boosts in social security taxes and state and local taxes, which will more than devour some relief we all will enjoy in our federal income tax load, the Tax Foundation said.

In the past 10 years estimated total taxes have increased 77.5 per cent per household. Total current tax payments at all levels (federal, state, and local), amount to \$295 billion—6.5 per cent above fiscal 1971.

The spending side of the picture is even more startling. The foundation predicts total spending to rise by 12 per cent from \$363 billion in 1971 to \$405 billion in 1972. This means, of course, deficits at all levels of government and, probably, higher taxes in the future to help pay the interest on money governments must borrow to pay their bills.

This accelerating tax burden is very nearly out-of-hand. It is estimated that 71 per cent of the federal budget is "uncontrollable"—that it involves spending already committed by previous Congresses. If Congress won't call a halt, others will have to by refusing to send the "big spenders" back for another spending spree.

#### IN COMMEMORATION OF THE GOLDEN BULL OF HUNGARY

### HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 750 anniversary of the Golden Bull, the Hungarian Magna Carta. It is indeed fitting that we pause to commemorate this Hungarian cornerstone of man's continuous struggle for freedom and justice. The Golden Bull, issued in 1222 gave constitutional protection to a far greater part of the population than other similar letters of rights elsewhere in medieval Europe. Under the terms of the Golden Bull, Hungary's freemen were guaranteed personal freedom and other basic rights and privileges and narrowed the gap which separated the existing social classes. Furthermore, the document protected the lower classes from exploitation and stipulated that if the king violated the provisions of the document then the barons and nobles had the right to collectively or individually resist. This most important concept not only limited the monarch's power but enabled the middle class to defy the petty monarchs of the realm.

The Golden Bull of Hungary represents some of the noblest human aspirations guaranteeing personal freedom and forbidding the oppression and exploitation of the poor. The Hungarian struggle for freedom and the spirit of resistance, first expressed in the Golden Bull has continued to be a cherished ideal of the Hungarian people and nation. Let us all hope and pray that the principles of the Golden Bull will in the future once again become a reality for Hungary and its people.

#### "BULLA AUREA"—THE HUNGARIAN MAGNA CARTA

### HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the courageous and freedom-loving Hungarian people on the occasion of the 750th anniversary of the Hungarian Magna Carta—the Golden Bull of Hungary.

The April 1972 issue of "The Fight for Freedom," the newsletter of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters' Federation, contained an excellent study of the history of the Bulla Aurea and I include this article in my remarks at this time:

#### THE GOLDEN BULL OF HUNGARY

The 750th anniversary of the Hungarian Magna Carta recalls the past of a thousand-year-old state. And reminds us that the nature of some social and political conflicts remains more or less the same through centuries.

This cornerstone of the Hungarian constitution, named the Bulla Aurea (Golden Bull), was issued in 1222, seven years after the Magna Carta of England was granted in June 1215. While in England this charter of liberties strengthened the barons against the King, in Hungary, it served all landowners, in today's terms the middle and the lower middle classes.

Since it was a peculiarity of Hungarian history that incomparably more people were nobles than in any other European country and that they often remained noble even when impoverished, the Golden Bull gave constitutional protection to a much larger part of the population than other similar letters of rights elsewhere in medieval Europe, including England, the "cradle of parliamentarism", or Switzerland, the "flower-garden of individual liberties".

The fact that in Hungary the human rights of that period were extended over the mass of the lesser nobility, authorizing them to put up armed resistance individually or collectively against violation of their rights, limited not only the King's power. It made it easier for the middle classes to defy also the magnates, the "petty monarchs" of the realm.

The national Diet began to emerge before the end of the 13th century and was a precursor of our modern Parliaments. It was an assembly of locally chosen delegates of all landowners and was destined to protect the lesser nobility (which then consisted of all who owned land) as well as the Church more against the aristocracy than against the King. This was one of the main reasons why feudalism could not become firmly established in Hungary.

The Golden Bull, the trailblazer of the national Diet, was such an important step towards modern democratic institutions that some of its stipulations are worth remembering even now, 750 years after the event.

It attacked the very roots of feudalism by decreeing that the title and estates of the lords-lieutenant of counties were not hereditary. It provided for the degradation of any lord-lieutenant who abused his office; and promised safeguards to all nobles—i.e., to a significant portion of the nation—against arbitrary arrest.

Soon after, in 1231, the Golden Bull was placed under the guardianship of the Archbishop of Esztergom, the Primate of Hungary. He was authorized to excommunicate the King for violation of the charter's articles.

This is why the Golden Bull, this 13th century bulwark of what today we call human rights, has been regarded as the foundation of Hungarian constitutional liberties.

If the Bull expressed them in legal terms, their political content became known as the Doctrine of the Holy Crown, the crown of the first Hungarian king, Saint Stephen, who was anointed in 1000 A.D. The constitutional Doctrine of the Holy Crown is based on the same principles as the Golden Bull: all political power, even royal prerogatives, were subject to, and derived from, the Crown that symbolized the union of, and independence between, King and nation; the Crown was considered the fountainhead of all rights, of the King's privileges as well as of the rights of all his subjects.

While according to the concept of that age the ruler's power was based on the Grace of God, in Hungary the effectiveness of royal power depended on the assent of the entire nobility. This tenet was defined by the great codifier of Hungary, Stephen Werboczy, who also played a memorable part in European history when he accompanied Charles V of the Holy Roman Empire to Worms where the famous confrontation with Luther took place.

The basic idea of these principles—those of the Holy Crown dating from 1000, and those of the Golden Bull of 1222—is the same: a constitutional limitation of power, a limitation that served to keep a balance between economic and political forces.

A doctrine that could help us to heal some of the problems of our modern societies.

Mr. Speaker, a very fine exhibition commemorating the Hungarian Golden Bull will be on view at the Library of Congress until June 30. I have visited this fine display and I heartily recommend it to anyone interested in the glorious history of the Hungarian people.

As we celebrate the anniversary of the Bulla Aurea—the introduction of rule by law to Hungary—let us renew our dedication to the goal of a free and independent Hungary and reaffirm to the valiant people of that country that they are not forgotten.

#### SALUTE TO EDUCATION

### HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join in today's "Salute to Education" observance by paying tribute to our Nation's schoolteachers.

Teachers constitute one of our Nation's most valuable resources. Their idealism is clearly reflected in the fact that they dedicate their lives to this noble profession despite the low level of compensation usually afforded to them.

My interest in economic justice for teachers was reflected in the amendment I sponsored to last year's Economic Stabilization Act which authorized the payment of retroactive wages to teachers and others who had been denied salary increases called for in contracts signed before the wage-price freeze.

Mr. Speaker, as teachers continue their vital task of preparing our youth to meet the challenges of this complex age, we in the Congress have an obligation to sup-

port programs which enhance and improve this Nation's educational system. We owe America's 2 million teachers a debt of gratitude for the outstanding contribution they are making to our country's future.

#### SPACE PROGRAM PRODUCES IMPORTANT CIVILIAN APPLICATION

### HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, recently the Oklahoma City Times published a most interesting and enlightening editorial about some remarkable, newly devised items which are now available for civilian application as a result of America's manned space program. This aspect of our space program is often overlooked and taken for granted by the general public. The editorial which follows serves a most useful purpose in reminding all of us that our space program is of great benefit to all mankind:

[From the Oklahoma City Times, Apr. 25, 1972]

#### MORE TRACKS ON THE MOON

When the crew of Apollo 16 left the moon, the camera on the Moon Rover vehicle being left behind tracked their space ship for a second or so, and then picked up the receding spot of flame marking its path for another few seconds. The camera's aim was not good, and the viewer in his easy chair on earth had trouble picking out the right dot of light. It was something like trying to watch the puck in a televised hockey game.

So there were a few complaints registered at various TV stations. That is a measure of how much we have come to take this amazing feat of exploring the moon for granted.

That camera was being controlled from Houston's Manned Space Flight Center, which happened to be roughly 240,000 miles away. It was not only being remotely controlled from that distance, it was sending perfect, clear pictures to tens of millions of television sets in dozens of countries around the world, in full color. It recorded the liftoff of the Orion vehicle and allowed a slow-motion playback a few minutes later (obviously taken with another camera or lens). There was nothing ho-hum about the performance of men or machines.

The Moon Rover had set a new speed record for moon travel—over nine miles per hour. A number of things were done for the first time on the moon by the crew of Apollo 16, prompting one newsman to marvel in passing that he was routinely saying that something had never been done on the moon before. "I hear my own voice saying that as if I were noting a new record for runs batted in," he said, "and it seems unreal."

All of the tracks on the moon to date are American. There are the huge footprints of the space-suited men themselves, the marks left by equipment dragged from one point to another, and the tracks left by the Moon Rovers. There is also a collection of abandoned scientific equipment, ordinary hardware, and landing modules.

These are the tangible evidences that man has set foot on the moon. But here on earth, there are still many who wonder whether it has been worth the cost. The Apollo flights cost three astronauts their lives, when their ship burned on the launch pad in Florida. They also have cost the nation billions of dollars.

Most of that money was spent in developing equipment that would take men there and return them safely to earth. Some of the new gear was designed to meet problems which were already assumed to exist. When they proved real, it had to be ready to deal with them quickly and effectively. Some of it was miniaturized from existing equipment. We knew how to make certain devices, but did not know how, or even whether, they could be made small and light enough to be carried on a long space journey, in a ship only 13 feet across.

Some of the most remarkable of the newly devised items made it possible for the monitoring crews on earth to keep track of the health and physical condition of each crew member during the flight. And from those ingenious, sturdy, and capable instruments came some of the most important civilian applications of space technology.

Space research technology has given us devices to measure blood oxygen in critically ill leukemic patients, notes Dr. J. R. Maxfield of Dallas. Among other "fallout" he lists are a new plastic for new arteries and for packaging food; new instruments now used in cataract surgery, infrared supersensitive detectors that permit early detection of some types of cancer; the computer used to enhance pictures televised back to earth from the moon and Mars which is now used also to analyze human chromosome pictures for further research into the mysteries of life itself, and even faster and painless dentists' drills.

Space research has also given us faster, more compact and more versatile computers. It has made possible the kitchen ware that the housewife takes from the freezer and places directly into the oven, and then places on the table when ready. It has given us the material from which the countertop range with the burners imbedded in a solid surface is made. The astronauts' helmets include sophisticated spun electrodes which have been adapted to detect hearing defects in small children. Even the live color television that will bring this year's Olympic Games to viewers around the world is a space age development.

In the final analysis, the value to each of us of all this space exploration is found in the spur to research and development it has provided. Since President Eisenhower responded to the first Russian Sputnik by ordering a full-scale space program (small by later standards), our gross national product has gone from around \$440 billion a year to more than \$1,000 billion.

#### HICKSVILLE, N.Y., REJECTS BUSING, SUPPORTS SCHOOL PRAYER, QUALITY EDUCATION

### HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, several issues which have been of prime concern to me since I came to Congress in 1971 have been forced busing, quality education, and prayer in schools. On June 13, the community of Hicksville, Nassau County, Long Island, N.Y., held a "straw vote" on these issues as a part of its school board elections. The questions were modeled after the questions put to the voters of the State of Florida in March, and the results are remarkably similar—thus bearing out the unanimity of opinion on these issues throughout the United States.



I am including the results of the Hicksville voting in the RECORD at this point:

## VOTING RESULTS

Do you favor an amendment to the U.S. Constitution that would prohibit forced busing and guarantee the right of each student to attend the appropriate school nearest his home?

	Percent
Yes (4,513) -----	78
No (1,249) -----	22

Do you favor providing an equal opportunity for quality education for all children, regardless of race, creed or color?

Yes (4,927) -----	87
No (724) -----	13

Do you favor an amendment to the U.S. Constitution to allow prayer in the schools?

Yes (4,307) -----	74
No (1,484) -----	26

# AN OUTSTANDING ITALIAN-AMERICAN—THE HONORABLE NICHOLAS MARTINI OF PASSAIC, N.J., AND THE BOYS' TOWNS OF ITALY

## HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, my Eighth Congressional District of New Jersey was recently honored and privileged to have as our visitors to the 27th annual Passaic area committee assembly members and friends of Boys' Towns of Italy. Through the excellent chairmanship of the Honorable Nicholas Martini assisted by Messrs. Sol Eigen and Jasper Morici—all of Passaic, N.J.—over 325 persons convened at an anniversary luncheon meeting on May 18, 1972, at the Robin Hood Inn in testimony to the genuine enthusiasm and strong support that we all have for the good work that is being carried out by the Boys' Towns of Italy. It is interesting to note that Messrs. Eigen and Morici have been associated as cochairmen of this project with Mr. Martini for over 20 years.

The eminently distinguished Monsignor Carroll-Abbing, founder and president of Boys' Towns of Italy was the honored guest and received a warm reception by all of those in attendance. Miss Dana Valery, who was born in South Africa of Italian parents and is a most talented songstress of stage, screen, and television in both the United States and Europe and sister of singing star Sergio Franchi, highlighted her featured presentation on the program with her comment that in all of her travels throughout the world as an entertainer, "the single most outstanding character of American people is their great generosity, ability, and desire to help the needy and unfortunate."

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request you and our colleagues here in the House to join with me in tribute and appreciation to Chairman Nicholas Martini whose personal unselfish efforts over the years

have contributed so much to the cultural enrichment of our community, State, and Nation by the quality of his leadership and steadfast communion among all men that epitomize the grandeur and strength of pride in one's heritage, and particularly his Italian-American ancestry. We do, indeed, salute his integrity and exemplary lifetime of dedicated service on behalf of all mankind.

Mr. Martini was born in Paterson, N.J., in 1904, attended local public schools and graduated cum laude from Rutgers State University Law School in 1926. He was admitted to the New Jersey Bar in 1926 as an attorney at law and as a counselor at law in 1929. He has been admitted to practice before the U.S. Supreme Court, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and other Federal authorities. He is also a member of the Passaic County New Jersey State Bar Association, the American Bar Association, and the American Trial Lawyers Association.

He was elected to the honorary scholastic society of Kings Beach in 1926 and has served as a member of the academy of political science of Columbia University. He was elected city commissioner of the city of Passaic in 1935 where he served 5 consecutive terms or a total of 20 years. In 1943 he was elected mayor of the city of Passaic for a 4-year term. He was elected in 1937 as a freeholder in our Passaic County and was reelected in 1940 to another term on the board of chosen freeholders of the county of Passaic, receiving consecutive reappointments until his retirement in 1961.

Mr. Martini was chosen as Passaic's outstanding citizen in 1951. In 1960 he was one of the founders, helped to organize and continues to be an active board member of the Passaic County Board of Technical Vocational Education. He headed many relief drives during World War II. He was especially cited by the President of the Republic of Italy and the Italian Government as national committeeman of American relief in Italy and for his outstanding efforts on behalf of Boys' Towns of Italy. In 1947 he was awarded the Star of Solidarity, the highest civilian award of the Italian Government.

He has been a member of this national committee since it was organized in 1943 and in 1945 it became Boys' Towns of Italy. He has been chairman of the Passaic area committee for the Boys' Towns of Italy for the past 28 years.

On May 14, 1970, Mr. Martini received the Golden Cross of Honor from the Italian National Foundation for Children. This was presented to him at the 25th anniversary dinner of the Passaic area committee of Boys' Towns of Italy by Monsignor Carroll-Abbing, Boys' Towns founder, in recognition of his extraordinary services to this organization.

Yes, we do indeed share the pride of his wife Theresa in Mr. Martini's outstanding achievements. I am pleased and privileged to be numbered amongst his many, many friends and to have him as a lifelong resident of my congressional district and ask my colleagues to join with me in national recognition and appreciation to all of his good works.

# HON. ROBERT PRICE'S ATTENDANCE RECORD OF COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on page 20732 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 13, 1972, Hon. ROBERT PRICE of Texas inserted a corrected copy of his special action report, a report which he mails to his constituency, which dealt with the attendance record of Members of the Texas delegation in the House of Representatives. In his original RECORD insertion which appeared in the RECORD for June 12, 1972 on page 20563. Mr. PRICE pointed with pride to his being the ranking Republican member of the Subcommittee on Space Science and Application. He also made mention of the fact of his other important subcommittee assignment, the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight of which I am chairman.

Everyone in this body knows, Mr. Speaker, that the committee system is the heart of the Congress and most of the work of a Member is carried on within the committee. Since Mr. PRICE has made an issue out of attendance to support his bill that a Member of Congress should be expelled if he does not answer to at least 70 percent of rollcalls in the House; I took it upon myself to check upon Mr. PRICE's attendance on the "very important" committees on which he serves in the House Science and Astronautics Committee. The report follows:

Through June 14, 1972, there was a total of 85 full committee and subcommittee meetings held. Mr. PRICE was in attendance at 36 such meetings; being absent for 49. A breakdown of his attendance is as follows:

## ATTENDANCE RECORD

FULL COMMITTEE (1ST SESSION, 92D CONGRESS)

January 26, 1971:	Panel Meeting,	Absent.
January 27, 1971:	Panel Meeting,	Absent.
January 28, 1971:	Panel Meeting,	Absent.
February 23, 1971:	Organizational Meeting,	Present.
February 25, 1971:	National Science Foundation,	Present.
March 2, 1971:	NASA Authorization,	Present.
March 3, 1971:	NASA Authorization,	Absent.
March 4, 1971:	NASA Authorization,	Present.
March 9, 1971:	NASA Authorization,	Present.
March 10, 1971:	NASA Authorization,	Present.
March 11, 1971:	NASA Authorization,	Present.
March 16, 1971:	NASA Authorization,	Absent.
March 30, 1971:	NASA Authorization,	Present.
April 1, 1971:	NASA Authorization,	Absent.
April 29, 1971:	NSF Authorization,	Present.
July 22, 1971:	Tech Asst bill,	Absent.
September 9, 1971:	Apollo 15 Report,	Present.
September 14, 1971:	Metric bill,	Absent.

October 21, 1971: Various Committee Items, Absent.

**FULL COMMITTEE (2ND SESSION, 92D CONGRESS)**

January 25, 1972: Panel Meeting, Absent.

January 25, 1972: Panel Meeting (PM), Absent.

January 26, 1972: Panel Meeting, Absent.

January 26, 1972: Panel Meeting (PM), Absent.

January 27, 1972: Panel Meeting, Absent.

February 8, 1972: Panel Meeting, Present.

February 9, 1972: NASA Authorization, Absent.

March 17, 1972: NASA Authorization, Absent.

March 22, 1972: Fire Safety, Present.

March 23, 1972: NASA Authorization, Present.

April 26, 1972: National Science Board, Present.

May 16, 1972: Apollo 16 Report, Absent.

**MANNED SPACE FLIGHT SUBCOMMITTEE (1ST SESSION, 92D CONGRESS)**

March 22, 1971: NASA Authorization, Absent.

March 24, 1971: NASA Authorization, Present.

April 2, 1971: NASA Authorization, Present.

April 3, 1971: NASA Authorization, Present.

April 5, 1971: NASA Authorization, Present.

July 23, 1971: KSC Land bill, Present.

**MANNED SPACE FLIGHT SUBCOMMITTEE (2D SESSION, 92D CONGRESS)**

February 10, 1972: NASA Authorization, Absent.

February 11, 1972: NASA Authorization, Absent.

February 17, 1972: NASA Authorization, Absent.

February 22, 1972: NASA Authorization, Present.

February 24, 1972: NASA Authorization, Present.

March 1, 1972: NASA Authorization, Absent.

March 2, 1972: NASA Authorization, Absent.

March 3, 1972: NASA Authorization, Absent.

March 8, 1972: NASA Authorization, Present.

March 8, 1972 (PM): NASA Authorization, Absent.

March 9, 1972: NASA Authorization, Present.

March 9, 1972 (PM): NASA Authorization, Present.

March 10, 1972: NASA Authorization, Absent.

March 10, 1972 (PM): NASA Authorization, Absent.

March 11, 1972: NASA Authorization, Absent.

March 14, 1972: NASA Authorization, Absent.

March 14, 1972 (PM): NASA Authorization, Absent.

March 16, 1972: NASA Authorization, Absent.

March 16, 1972 (PM): NASA Authorization, Absent.

May 31, 1972: U.S.-Soviet Program, Present.

**SPACE SCIENCE & APPLICATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE (92D CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION)**

March 18, 1971: NASA Authorization, Absent.

March 19, 1971: NASA Authorization, Absent.

March 19, 1971 (PM) NASA Authorization, Absent.

March 22, 1971: NASA Authorization, Absent.

March 25, 1971: NASA Authorization, Present.

**SPACE SCIENCE & APPLICATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE (92D CONGRESS, 2D SESSION)**

February 17, 1972: NASA Authorization, Absent.

February 22, 1972: NASA Authorization, Absent.

February 24, 1972: NASA Authorization, Absent.

February 29, 1972: NASA Authorization, Absent.

March 1, 1972: NASA Authorization, Absent.

March 2, 1972: NASA Authorization, Absent.

March 7, 1972: NASA Authorization, Absent.

March 8, 1972: NASA Authorization, Present.

March 9, 1972: NASA Authorization, Present.

March 14, 1972: NASA Authorization, Absent.

March 16, 1972: NASA Authorization, Absent.

March 16, 1972 (PM): NASA Authorization, Absent.

March 21, 1972: NASA Authorization, Absent.

May 2, 1972: Briefings, Present.

**SUB-COMMITTEE ON NASA OVERSIGHT**

(Member during 1st Session, 92nd Cong. only)

May 13, 1971: Organization Meeting, Present.

June 15, 1971: OAO & Mariner, Present.

June 16, 1971: OAO & Mariner, Present.

June 17, 1971: OAO & Mariner, Absent.

June 18, 1971: OAO & Mariner, Absent.

**SUB-COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION**

(Member during 2nd Session, 92nd Cong. only)

June 13, 1972: US-Soviet Relations, Absent.

June 14, 1972: US-Soviet Relations, Absent.

**RECAPITULATION**

Full Committee (1st & 2nd Sess. 92nd Cong. thru June 14, 1972)

Absent, 15.

Present, 16.

**Manned Space Flight Sub-Committee**

Absent, 15.

Present, 13.

**Space Science & Applications Sub-Committee**

Absent, 15.

Present, 4.

**NASA Over-Sight Sub-Committee**

(1st Sess. only)

Absent, 2.

Present, 3.

**International Cooperation Sub-Committee**

(2nd Sess. only)

Absent, 2.

Present, 0.

**BALTIC STATES**

**HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the history of the Baltic Nations has been one long tragic struggle against czarist and Soviet imperialist designs to secure outlets on the Baltic Sea. The middle of June marks the anniversary of two major events in the loss of independence by the

Baltic States and their absorption by the Soviet Union. Between June 14 and June 17, 1940, the Soviets presented the three nations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania with ultimatums and then invaded and occupied them. This was followed by incorporation of these nations as constituent republics in the Soviet Union.

Many years have passed since these tragic days. A whole generation has grown up which has never heard of the mass deportations of Baltic peoples into Russian slavery. Many do not even know that Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania ever existed on the face of the earth as independent and free nations.

Despite the captivity in which they live, despite the tragedies they have endured, the Baltic peoples throughout the world remain dedicated to the restoration of the independence of their respective fatherlands. It is my hope that someday the Baltic States will again be able to resume their rightful place in the community of nations, and that the desire for freedom which so many of their peoples cherish will be rewarded.

F. M. LINDSAY—A NEWSPAPERMAN AND CIVIC LEADER

**HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, F. M. Lindsay was a businessman and civic leader without peer in the central Illinois industrial city of Decatur.

Few other men in the last half century had as much impact on the life of that community.

His death on Sunday, June 11, at the age of 92, leaves a void that will be hard to fill.

At his death Mr. Lindsay was chairman emeritus of the Lindsay-Schaub Newspapers, publishers of the Decatur Herald and Review, the Campaign-Urbana Courier, and other daily newspapers in East St. Louis, Carbondale, and Edwardsville in Illinois as well as the Midland, Mich., Daily News and two newspapers in Florida.

Mr. Lindsay was born on November 9, 1879, the eleventh of 12 children of John and Edna Nicholson Lindsay, who were among the earlier families settling in Macon county. He began his newspaper career as a 7-year-old carrier boy for a local labor newspaper. He worked his way through the University of Illinois where he earned a bachelor of laws degree in 1904. He was admitted to the practice of law in Oklahoma but soon went into the newspaper business, first in Shawnee, Okla., and then in Decatur.

F. M. Lindsay gained control of the Decatur Herald in 1920 and became general manager of the Herald and Review when the two papers were consolidated in 1931. In 1947 he succeeded the late H. C. Schaub as president of Decatur Newspapers, Inc. The corporate name was changed to Lindsay-Schaub Newspapers in 1952.



I have known F. M. Lindsay in many different ways during the 22 years that I have represented the Decatur area in Congress. Even before I came to Congress I knew him, first as an opponent to my candidacy, one of my worst opponents I may say, in the Republican primary campaign of 1948 when I challenged incumbent Congressman Rollo McMillen and lost. Two years later, however, when I was first elected to the Congress, F. M. Lindsay was one of my best friends. You might ask how this change was possible. The reason was quite simple. Rollo McMillen, a Decatur attorney, was a life-long friend of F. M. Lindsay and Mr. Lindsay was a man who stood with his friends. In 1950, after Mr. McMillen decided to retire, Mr. Lindsay was quick to say that he had admired the way I conducted my 1948 campaign without making any personal attack on Congressman McMillen, who was a very honorable gentleman. This appealed to Mr. Lindsay and our relationship has been a friendly one through the years.

To say that F. M. Lindsay was one of our State's most successful newspaper publishers is the truth but not the whole truth. At the same time he was a dedicated worker for the good of the community in which he lived and a devoted family man.

After being honored for his service to the Community Chest in 1953, he said:

I have always felt that one should strive to do all that he can for his own family betterment; secondly, to do all that he can for his local community, in making it a healthy and most pleasing place to live.

Mr. Lindsay's first wife, the former Vivian Simpson, died in June, 1919. Their son, Merrill (F. M., Jr.), is president of Lindsay-Schaub Newspapers. In 1921, Mr. Lindsay married Marjorie Ruth McKay of Sarnia, Ontario, who survives with their three children, Donald M., of Champaign-Urbana, and Marjorie E. and Shirley J., both of Indiana Lakes Estates, Fla.

In extension of my remarks I include the following editorials from the Decatur Herald and the Champaign-Urbana Courier:

[From the Decatur Herald, June 13, 1972]  
INDEPENDENCE GUIDED F. M. LINDSAY

Although F. M. Lindsay, chairman emeritus, of the board of Lindsay-Schaub newspapers who died Sunday, traveled extensively, and had interests that knew no boundaries, his home was in Central Illinois.

His mother and father came to Macon County in the period of 1845 to 1851 and in 1879 Mr. Lindsay was born. He was active in high school athletics, and was a 1904 graduate of the University of Illinois. He continued an interest in the growth of the university and its athletic program.

The family attachment to the area also meant a newspaper attachment as his father operated the Decatur Labor Bulletin in the later part of the nineteenth century. After the death of Mr. Lindsay's father the Bulletin was consolidated with the Decatur Herald.

Following a brief association with the Decatur Review in the advertising department, Mr. Lindsay bought the Decatur Herald in 1912. The names of Lindsay and the Herald

were inseparable in those years prior to consolidation with the Decatur Review in 1931.

Mr. Lindsay developed a newspaper with a broad view of the local, state and national scenes. Because it was a morning paper, its delivery area covered large parts of Central Illinois just as it does today and many people outside Decatur became familiar with the paper.

Although Mr. Lindsay was a businessman he was vitally interested in the editorial content of the Decatur newspapers and particularly the editorial page. His interest in politics and life at all levels of society was reflected in the Herald and later in the Herald and Review through editors such as Warren Hardy and Edward Lindsay, his nephew.

In those early years, the Herald developed standards that have always been a part of Lindsay-Schaub newspapers. Mr. Lindsay carried his interest in public services beyond the newspapers to personal service in a variety of Decatur activities, and he served on nonpaying state boards under governors Horner, Green, Stevenson, Stratton and Kerner.

Through it all he was a fiercely independent man, and he wanted his editorial pages the same way. He wanted editorials to comment on events without fear and without obligation to any political party.

His respect for the nation's political heritage and democratic system and his desire for independence were described in these writings of his:

"Over the years we have stressed the two-party system and have encouraged those who think independently to show their strength at the polls by supporting the party that represents best the most constructive modern thinking that comes with the changing needs as society progresses. . .

"Our newspapers should never be content to depend upon the two parties to completely monopolize the thinking and decisions for the future. Such a policy and principle would ultimately lead us to a one-party domination. Our two parties should always be forced to give full consideration to the ideas of the independent voters group."

Those words ripen with age.

[From the Champaign-Urbana Courier, June 13, 1972]

F. M. LINDSAY, 1879-1972

Persons throughout the newspaper industry, and especially this organization, will remember F. M. Lindsay for his dedication to the business and his contribution to its growth in public service.

Mr. Lindsay died Saturday at the age of 92. He was chairman emeritus of the board of Lindsay-Schaub newspapers.

While he was the kind of man who easily could have become an institution in his own time, those who encountered him over the years remembered his warm, friendly manner and his deep concern for individuals. Often he expressed his feelings for mankind most eloquently.

It was this concern that led him to considerable activity in public affairs that ranged far beyond the newspaper business. His interest in local, state and national politics left its imprint on the newspapers in this organization, and throughout his years he remained intensely interested in affairs of all communities served by Lindsay-Schaub newspapers.

Of course, he was most active in his home town of Decatur, where he served in a variety of public service activities.

In addition he served on a number of governmental boards and agencies concerned with orderly growth of the community.

He dearly loved the University of Illinois, from which he was graduated in 1904. Through the years he was active in alumni affairs, and was a devout Illinois athletic fan. Although he never served the university in an official capacity, he followed its growth and counseled its leaders.

Mr. Lindsay was a busy man all his life, but he also found time to serve at the state level as well as the local, and he particularly enjoyed service on the State Housing Board. He was appointed and reappointed by governors Horner, Stevenson, Stratton, and Kerner.

As one of the founders of this newspaper organization, Mr. Lindsay felt deeply about the public service role of newspapers and their leadership responsibilities.

As guidance for those who would come after him in the organization a book was published some years ago containing statements made by Mr. Lindsay to owners and employees of the company. The last paragraph of that book is a sample of what he left for us:

"We are living in one of the great history-making periods of government—local, state, national and international. I have great faith in the ultimate success of those who believe in individual freedom. Human minds with freedom of expression will ultimately succeed in bringing about a sounder and a better world."

## EDUCATION IN AMERICA

### HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, the importance and value of education in America today cannot be overestimated. Although critics of the system demean teaching methods and students protest course selections, education remains the keystone to a successful life.

Statistics prove that more and more people are taking advantage of the classroom experience offered by a greater number of teachers. The number of high school graduates increased 2.4 percent this year alone.

Worthwhile education, of course, is not limited to schools. All of us should work hard at remaining "students" throughout our lives. My first employer, Bill Schleman, was a warm-hearted and knowledgeable old relator who taught me several invaluable lessons. One of his favorite proverbs has also become one of mine—"Do not make excuses—make good" and "always stay on good terms with your pocketbook."

An open mind and an inquisitive nature are the best tools a lifetime pupil can possess. In a country like the United States, our republic form of government encourages the common man to rise according to his abilities, a good education is the best foundation we can have.

I therefore want to salute education for the constantly increasing opportunities it offers the citizens of this great Nation.

## FURTHER GUN CONTROLS ARE NEEDED

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, what more need be said to convince this Congress and this Nation that the time for further, more effective gun control legislation is now? How many more Americans—public figures and private citizens, alike—need be shot before we take affirmative action to restrain the flow of firearms and regulate the purchase and sale of weapons?

In 1968, as we know, Congress was practically shamed into enacting the Gun Control Act of 1968 by the public outrage following the assassination of Senator Robert F. Kennedy. Now, Gov. George Wallace, of Alabama, is lying paralyzed in the Washington suburbs after an unsuccessful, but still despicable, attempt on his life, with the assassin using a store-bought handgun.

In my home city of Elizabeth, N.J., one young man was killed and five other innocent people injured recently by a gunman who had no apparent motive. But more importantly, neither this gunman, nor Governor Wallace's would-be assassin, nor anybody else seems to have any apparent difficulty in obtaining their choice of weapon, regardless of their previous record.

Further reasons for immediate action—carefully documented and supported by facts—are outlined in the following editorials from the Newark Evening News and the Daily Journal of Elizabeth, N.J.: [From the Newark Evening News, May 17, 1972]

### NOW, A FEDERAL GUN LAW

In the aftermath of the appalling attempt on the life of Gov. George C. Wallace, thoughts compulsively turn to what can be done to eradicate the cancer of violence.

The effort must be as forceful and as multi-faceted as the disease itself. Removing the incentive for one person to commit violence upon another will require continuous attention to removing gross social and economic inequities. To succeed entirely would necessitate the eradication of mental aberrations that grow out of real and supposed injustices. Complexity of such endeavor is sufficient to challenge every resource. Total success would seem to lie beyond attainment.

There is, however, a reachable goal which, while not eliminating all possibility of violence, could substantially limit the means of committing violent crime—both by limiting access to concealable weapons and by aiding apprehension and prosecution to a point of deterrence.

That is the imposition of federal controls on handguns.

In the shock waves of the assassination of Sen. Robert F. Kennedy, Congress was aroused to do something about the accessibility of guns in a nation where they could be bought as readily as a pair of mail-order nylon or slacks. Congress was aroused, but not very far nor fervently.

It outlawed the purchase of guns and pistols by mail order. It left it to the states to deal with over- (or under-) the-counter

sales. The same lobbyists that riddled tough federal legislation with softening amendments then went to work in state capitals.

To its credit, the New Jersey Legislature withstood such erosive pressure to the extent of enacting one of the most effective gun-control bills in the country. The nationwide void, however, is deplorable—and stands as an open invitation to pack a pistol, if not on the hip at least in a closet or drawer.

The basic expedient of control enacted in New Jersey—that of fingerprinting applicants and compiling individual records of mental instability, alcoholism or drug addiction—goes a long way toward keeping guns out of the hands of the irresponsible.

In turn, those who, by reason of registration, can be held accountable are inclined to carefully supervise the accessibility of the guns in their possession.

The Senate rejected federal registration of firearms in the wake of Sen. Kennedy's assassination. This was shortly before the National Commission on the Causes of Prevention of Violence—a study commission established after his brother's assassination in 1963—reported an alarming rise in the number of pistols and revolvers being produced or imported in the United States.

In the first six months of 1968, 1.2 million hand guns were made or brought into this country, as against 1.6 million in all of the preceding year. As such commissions usually do, this one went out of business after filing its report.

Not so the gun makers and importers. They're still thriving. In fact, business keeps getting better and better.

It should not have taken another attempt on the life of a political candidate to arouse Congress from the lethargy of evasion. But the crime having been committed on the person of Gov. Wallace, the compelling incentive exists once more.

Retreat behind "fancied self-defense" or "protection of home and health," or by way of distorting the "militia clause" in the constitutional right to bear arms can no longer be justified. Stringent controls on the possession of firearms, particularly handguns, can and must reduce their wanton use to the lowest limit that is humanly attainable.

[From the Elizabeth Daily Journal, May 19, 1972]

### GUN CONTROLS: SHOOTING OF GOVERNOR WALLACE DRAMATIZES THE NEED FOR TOUGHER FEDERAL LAWS

The fact that it took federal agents only 10 minutes to trace the purchase of the gun that seriously wounded Gov. George C. Wallace proves that the 1968 Federal Gun Control Act is worthwhile. Without this form of registration, it would have been difficult to pinpoint ownership of the weapon in the event that Gov. Wallace's suspected assailant had escaped.

The Wallace shooting gives fresh impetus to attempts to strengthen existing gun control laws that still allow millions of handguns to be imported into the country and to cross state lines without any trouble. Gov. Wallace is the 10th man seeking or holding the office of the President to be an assassin's target, and in nine of the ten cases the weapon used was a handgun.

Strengthening the law won't be easy. The assassination of Martin Luther King and Robert F. Kennedy in 1968 led to passage of the Gun Control Act, which prohibited the mail order or other interstate purchase of firearms and ammunition by persons who do not live in the dealer's state. But intensive lobbying by the National Rifle Association caused deletion of a provision requiring national registration of every firearm and licensing of every gun owner.

Experience has shown that the 1968 legis-

lation is easily circumvented. Cheaply imported parts for "Saturday Night Specials" still flood the market. The ban against interstate mail order sale of firearms has been sidestepped by the shipping of guns between licensed dealers in different states. A person need only place an order locally and wait for the weapon to arrive at the dealer for pick-up. It is estimated that eight out of 10 handguns in such cities as Boston and New York came from other areas.

There were an estimated 24 million handguns in private hands in 1968, according to the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence. An additional 2.5 million are being manufactured domestically or imported every year. One new handgun is sold in the United States every 13 seconds, and used handguns are being traded at the rate of two a minute.

Not all of these guns get in the hands of criminals, of course. The Commission on Violence estimated that about half of all American households have firearms. That helps to explain why most murders are committed in the home.

It is just as important to keep guns out of the home as out of the hands of criminals, political terrorists and psychopaths. Federal controls would by no means bring about instant disarmament, but they would gradually reduce the supply of weapons and make it more difficult for criminals and disturbed persons to secure firearms without some risk of discovery.

One of the ironies of the Wallace shooting is that he has been opposed to gun controls, and that the assassination attempt took place in a state which recently enacted a law banning concealed weapons and the transporting of handguns. The weapon used in the Wallace shooting, however, was bought in Milwaukee.

In the absence of effective laws in other states, guns can easily be brought into Maryland or New Jersey or Massachusetts, all of which have various control laws on the books. In Massachusetts, for example, a 10-year study by state police traced 87 percent of the guns used in crime in that state to out-of-state purchases.

Despite this evidence of daily murder, and the more sensational attacks on public figures, the gun lobbyists and the National Rifle Association are mobilized to the point where the 1968 Federal Gun Control Act might possibly be repealed and replaced with a federal law which the "American Rifleman" claims will be aimed at controlling criminals rather than harassing gun owners. Fourteen separate bills to repeal the law are pending in the House.

Meanwhile, a public terrorized by armed criminals and concerned over the future of democratic institutions must content itself with reading such scatter-brained slogans as "Register Communists, Not Guns," and "Guns Don't Kill People, People Do." Mull that over the next time someone waves a revolver at you and think how much easier it would be to avoid a knife, rope, brick, a pair of hands, a karate chop or even a bow and arrow.

### BETHESDA-CHEVY CHASE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure for me to have this opportunity to commend the Bethesda-Chevy Chase



Chamber of Commerce for being the first business organization in suburban Maryland to receive full accreditation from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

One glance at the fine record of achievement of this chamber and the reasons for their unique and honored status are easily recognized. Last year alone 19 new businesses were brought into the Bethesda area; new buildings or additions to old ones were completed providing over 1,000 new parking spaces; 1,317 newcomers were given information about Bethesda and its businessmen; and marketing surveys for local businessmen were conducted. But the chamber's efforts were not confined to these areas of service alone. The chamber actively and effectively represented the interest of its members before the Montgomery County Council, the State legislature, and their representatives in Congress.

It is a worthy tribute that the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Chamber of Commerce should be the first to receive accreditation. It is a great pleasure for me to serve the members of this outstanding organization.

#### SALUTE TO EDUCATION

#### HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, the education of our children is our best investment in the future of this country. Estimated expenditures for the past school year equal more than \$46 billion, but dollar

figures simply cannot measure the dedication of the entire educational establishment in encouraging our young people to reach their highest potential.

The education of America's youth must always be a matter of top priority. Elementary and secondary education encompasses far more than instruction in the basic skills or preparation for future careers. In challenging students to think on their own, in developing interaction skills and successful intergroup relationships, today's schools prepare our children for active roles in tomorrow's society—whether at work, at home, or in involvement in civic affairs.

With a pupil enrollment for last year of over 48 million, taught by more than 2 million teachers, our schools represent a vast commitment to the future progress of America.

#### ETHEL MARSDEN

#### HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I have recently been notified of the death of a most remarkable constituent, Mrs. Ethel Marsden. I would like to share a few thoughts on this admirable lady.

Mrs. Marsden was, in the words of a relative, "a model of self-reliance, in the Emersonian sense." She would never have thought of asking for public support, instead, working at a variety of jobs in order to raise her family. As her relative said:

It is sad that the courage and philosophy which mark the lives of men and women like Mrs. Marsden must pass unnoticed; while those who opt for the less honorable path achieve acclaim.

I think it is fitting that we pay tribute to this gallant lady, from whom we can all learn. Her integrity, courage, strength, and indomitable will reaffirm the real ideals of America.

#### YOUGHIOGHENY CLEANUP CAMPAIGN 1972

#### HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, last year and again this year, it was my pleasure to be a part of the kickoff of the annual Youghiogheny River and Lake Cleanup Campaign. I want to congratulate Mr. Burl B. McVicker, reservoir manager of the Corps of Engineers, and the other officials who helped organize this year's events.

This has been an annual event on the Youghiogheny since 1967, and its success can be measured by the year-round interest in keeping the river and lake as clean as possible. I would like to commend all those citizens who have worked so hard to make the campaign a success. Once more these citizens have set an example that others should continue to try to emulate, and I wish them success during the remainder of the cleanup campaign.

### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, June 21, 1972

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*I am doing a great work, so that I cannot come down.*—Nehemiah 6: 3.

O Thou who art the Author of life and the Giver of every good gift, whose presence and power underlie all our lives, unto Thee do we lift up our hearts in prayer.

We confess that we often forget the greatness of sincerity, the power of love, and the influence of goodness. Grant that we may clothe ourselves with such devotion to duty and such dedication to deity that in daily life we may set forth the greatness and the glory of moral character.

We pray for our country that leaders and people may turn to daily tasks without doubt or fear, relying upon the guidance and the support of Thy Spirit. May we in America not be dismayed for Thou art with us and wilt take care of us every day and all the way; through Jesus Christ our Lord in whose spirit we pray. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's pro-

ceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

- H.R. 1974. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gloria Vazquez Herrera;
- H.R. 2052. An act for the relief of Luz Maria Cruz Aleman Phillips;
- H.R. 2076. An act for the relief of Vladimir Rodriguez LaHera;
- H.R. 4050. An act for the relief of Maria Manuela Amaral;
- H.R. 6201. An act for the relief of Lesley Earle Bryan;
- H.R. 6907. An act for the relief of Matyas Hunyadi;
- H.R. 7641. An act for the relief of Chung Chi Lee; and
- H.R. 9552. An act to amend the cruise legislation of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3230) entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of

funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Assiniboine Tribes of Indians in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 279-A, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. METCALF, Mr. FANNIN, and Mr. BELLMON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 6957) entitled "An act to establish the Sawtooth National Recreation Area in the State of Idaho, to temporarily withdraw certain national forest land in the State of Idaho from the operation of the U.S. mining laws, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. MOSS, Mr. HANSEN, and Mr. JORDAN of Idaho to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3617. An act to strengthen and expand the Headstart program, with priority to the economically disadvantaged, to amend the