

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PHILIP PHILBIN

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to learn of the death of our former colleague and friend from Massachusetts, Philip Philbin. Phil had many virtues, among which were numbered kindness, competency and, above all, integrity.

I would like to make the observation that during all the years I knew Phil not once did I hear him make a remark criticizing another person. This rare trait has and will always come to mind when I think of Phil, for it is indeed rare to know a man of such great benevolence.

During his 26 years in the Congress Phil never turned a constituent or a fellow colleague away who came to him for help. Even while he helped others he went about his own work quietly and expertly and diligently.

On Saturday I, with many of my colleagues, traveled to Clinton to pay my last respects to this man I had known so well and had liked so much. I would like to share with you the words of the pastor of Our Lady of the Rosary Church in Clinton—a tribute delivered from a fellow Clintonian on behalf of all of us who had the privilege of knowing Phil Philbin.

At the time when Congressman Philbin retired from public life we who were his colleagues and friends gave him testimony of our love and affection.

Today we are again gathered together, this time to mark his passing on to eternal life. This is another expression for a beloved friend.

As a Congressman, Philip Philbin worked with you as a colleague or served you as Representative; as a fellow Clintonian he was a life-long friend to his town and its people; and as a faithful Christian he shared the same hope and ideals we are expressing today.

Congressman Philbin was a politician here in his district—that is a title of respect—none of this cynicism is attached to it which is found in some other places. Here we have his example of 28 years of integrity and honesty in public service. The newspapers have recorded the accomplishment of those years of service but this morning we have another sort of testimony—the presence of so many of his former colleagues. This confirms our high opinion of the job he did in Washington. Perhaps an even greater tribute is the presence of the so many people he served—those for whom he managed to make the impersonal procedure of the Government personal and for whom he removed the roadblocks of bureaucracy.

Phil Philbin was also our fellow Clintonian. Years of service in Washington never separated him from his home town. He always found the time to keep up contact with its people. He had a keen sense of family ties and local tradition. You could not meet him without being reminded of some family member he knew of or inquired for.

A fine example of his capacity for friendship was his association with the late Senator David I. Walsh. His loyalty outlasted death, for each year since Senator Walsh's

death, Phil Philbin arranged for memorial ceremonies, and so kept alive the memory of another great Clintonian.

Lastly, Phil Philbin was a faithful Christian—which is not a separate title but the sum of all his roles in life.

It is our sincere hope that today, together with his namesake, the Apostle Philip, his wish has been fulfilled. To this we add our love and affection for a friend we will greatly miss, but never forget.

SALT—NEXT STEP IN
DISARMAMENT

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Thomas S. Power, "Design for Survival," said:

It is, therefore, up to the American people to decide which road to survival they want to choose. The choice is by no means easy. The active proponents of one-world government have a very saleable product to sell—peace without an arms race—and they are both vocal and convincing. . . . Unfortunately, however, our approach—survival through military supremacy—ostensibly entails far greater sacrifices and risks, and therefore has less appeal to those who seek a quick and easy way out. Still, it is the only approach which will permit national survival. This is the approach we have followed to this day, and it has proved successful. . . . The two approaches permit of no compromise because they point in exactly opposite directions. Therefore, in making their choice, our citizens must select one or the other, realizing that once they have chosen the road to disarmament and one-world government, there can be no turning back.

The principal features of the SALT arms limitation agreements made in Moscow between the United States and Soviet Russia, and soon to be presented to both Houses of Congress, are summarized as follows by a select group of Senators including BARRY GOLDWATER and JAMES BUCKLEY:

The Moscow agreements freeze the United States at a 4-to-1 disadvantage comparing our overall missile payload to that of the Soviet Union;

The Soviet Union has three missiles for every two of ours, theirs are substantially larger, and the agreements guarantee that this gap will remain and probably widen;

Soviet missiles carry payloads several times larger than those of U.S. missiles, an advantage which the agreements not only protect, but allow to be enhanced;

The agreements forbid the United States to increase the number of its nuclear submarines while authorizing the Soviets to continue building them until they equal and then surpass the United States.

On the House Floor recently some fiscal conservatives were trying to cut appropriations to the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. I raised the question: For what purpose are we supporting a Disarmament Agency in

any form? The fact is that since 1962 we have been engaged in formal disarmament negotiations in Geneva, conducted by this Agency, always with the stated purpose of "the total elimination of all armed forces and armaments except those needed to maintain internal order within states and to furnish the United Nations with peace forces." It is significant to note that Paul Nitze, Assistant Secretary of the Navy in 1962 under a Democratic administration when these negotiations began, reappears 10 years later under a Republican administration as a leading big-name negotiator of the SALT agreements. Reducing American forces to a level of permanent inferiority to the Soviets is a long step toward the kind of disarmament sought since 1962, most likely to be followed, once accomplished, by a push to limit U.S. arms to the point that they are inferior to those of the United Nations as well.

Such disarmament is buying national suicide on the installment plan. Last year Gen. Curtis LeMay, former Air Force Chief of Staff and founder of the Strategic Air Command, warned that if present trends in arms limitation continue, this country can look forward within 18 months to some type of ultimatum from our principal arms rivals. Even the disarmament-prone New York Times pointed out in an editorial June 5:

That [Soviet] edge includes 40 per cent more intercontinental ballistic missiles (1408 to 1000) and missile-launching submarines (62 to 44), one-third more submarine-launched ballistic missiles (950 to 710) and a threefold Soviet advantage in megatonnage of total missile payload. Much of this appears in writing in the five-year agreement freezing strategic offensive missiles.

Defense Secretary Melvin Laird admitted a year ago that "we have been in a period of almost moratorium since 1967 on new strategic weapons deployment" while noting in the May 4, 1972, issue of Commander's Digest that we are "in a period of vigorous Soviet military expansion at sea, on the land, in the air and in space."

Shortly before the SALT agreements were finalized in Moscow, the Senate Judiciary Committee released an updated study pointing out that of 25 agreements signed at previous summit meetings, 24 had been violated. So we dare not even fall back on the forlorn hope expressed in a recent State Department briefing for congressional wives, admitting that the SALT agreements establish a missile gap favoring the Soviet Union, but nevertheless justifying them on the grounds that without the agreements the gap would expand. If we abide by the agreements, we can be sure that the gap will expand as soon as the Soviets decide that the time has come to break it.

Let the State Department be advised never to talk to women, especially when one of those women is my wife. Let the American people be advised that we must pay heed to General Power's warning and fight for America's national survival. SALT must be returned to its proper place—the dinner table.

KEMP END-THE-WAR RESOLUTION

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, to follow is the full text of House Concurrent Resolution 634 which I have introduced. It is my fervent hope that this resolution will make it possible for this Chamber to endorse a goal of peace in Vietnam with a unanimity to which it is seldom accustomed.

The resolution follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 634

Whereas the continuing war in Southeast Asia is of great concern to the people of the United States;

Whereas the current military invasion of South Vietnam by the forces of North Vietnam has contributed to the escalation of the war;

Whereas a lasting peace in that region can be achieved only through agreement between the Great Powers, the Democratic Republic of (North) Vietnam, the Republic of (South) Vietnam, and the indigenous people of the latter two countries; and

Whereas the United States Congress cannot by a legislative Act impose an agreement upon the parties so as to end the war, guarantee the release of the prisoners of war, settle political issues, guarantee the peace, alleviate human suffering in the region, guarantee self-determination of the people of Vietnam, and reunite the American people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the policy of the United States for the promotion of peace in Southeast Asia should be to immediately resume and continue negotiations to achieve the following objectives and agreements:

1. An immediate cease-fire by all forces;
2. Complete and total withdrawal by the Democratic Republic of (North) Vietnam of all men and equipment from the Republic of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos;

3. Concurrent withdrawal of all remaining military forces of the United States, the People's Republic of China, and of the Soviet Union, and all other foreign military forces, from Vietnam;

4. A cessation of the shipment of arms and war materials to the Democratic Republic of (North) Vietnam and to the Republic of (South) Vietnam;

5. Free elections, supervised by the United Nations:

- (a) to determine whether the two countries should be reunited under a common government;

- (b) to determine the form of government for the reunited country if a reunited country is preferred by the people of both countries;

- (c) to determine the form of government for each country if separate and sovereign countries are preferred by the people of each country;

6. Supervision and enforcement of the peace in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia by the United Nations; and

7. Economic aid to the countries of Southeast Asia by the United States and other members of the United Nations: Be it further

Resolved—

A. That in order to facilitate negotiations toward the objectives and agreements enumerated above, it is the sense of Congress that immediately after the achievement of a cease-fire, all prisoners of war then held by the Democratic Republic of (North) Viet-

nam, the Republic of (South) Vietnam, and by insurgent forces, be released, under the supervision of the International Red Cross for voluntary repatriation, and that all parties to negotiations prepare and exchange lists of the missing and unrecovered dead so that the International Red Cross may make a full accounting for all missing persons.

B. Immediately after the confirmation by formal agreement of the policies and procedures set forth in this resolution between the national parties named herein and any necessary additional parties and the completion of action taken to return all prisoners of war, as specified in paragraph A; the parties to this agreement shall announce a certain date for the complete and final withdrawal of all foreign military personnel from all Indochina, and the total withdrawal must take place on or before December 31, 1972.

INDIAN POINT NO. 2

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 19, 1972, the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board held a licensing hearing at Croton on Hudson concerning the licensing of a proposed atomic energy plant known as Indian Point No. 2.

Due to severe environmental effects caused by Indian Point No. 1 plant which is in operation, the present proposal to license a second nuclear energy plant in the same location has caused grave concern among residents of that area. At the June 19, 1972, hearing I made a limited appearance before the Board and issued the following statement. I include it in the RECORD so that my position in this matter will be known not only to the Board, but to my colleagues in the House:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE HAMILTON FISH, JR., BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

Mr. Chairman, I am Hamilton Fish, Jr., Member of Congress representing the 28th Congressional District of New York. My present District includes four counties which border the Hudson River and the entire area I represent has had a long continuing, historic interest in the Hudson for transportation, fishing and recreation. Further, I am now running for re-election in the new 25th Congressional District, which contains Dutchess, Putnam and Northern Westchester Counties, as well as parts of Ulster and Columbia Counties. All of these counties border on the Hudson River. Most significantly, the Indian Point plant is physically located in the new 25th.

Thus, it is for the purpose of protecting these traditional interests of my present and future constituents that I am making this limited appearance before you today. I am appearing to express my concern over the possible consequences of a nuclear accident at this plant, as well as the environmental and public health implications of the proposed routine emission of radioactive materials from this plant into the water and into the air.

THE GRAVE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE ASLE

Mr. Chairman, you and your colleagues have a grave responsibility, one that demands the best of scientific and technological competence on one hand and the rare ability to integrate into your deliberations, consideration of public welfare on the other. You have before you a record in which the utility

argues strongly about the need for this additional generating facility and warns of the potential power shortages that could occur should this project be delayed. It further asserts that the anticipated environmental effects are at least balanced in the scale of public values by the benefit of the electrical output of the plant. To counter the powerful voice of this utility, which is well amplified by the voices of its experts, there is only the feeble voice of the intervenors, who lack the resources to launch the exhaustive analysis of the assumptions, oversights, or even possible errors in the analyses of the utility and of the AEC itself. So the fundamental thought I would leave with you is that this Atomic Safety and Licensing Board should assert to the utmost its independence under AEC regulations, and that it probe deeply and incisively into the assertions of the utility. Further, that it treat with close attention the views of the intervenors, for in those views may be contained the kernels of some fundamental truths that bear directly upon the issue whether this plant should be licensed to operate, and, if so, under what special conditions.

ATTENTION TO NONRADIOLOGICAL FACTORS

Mr. Chairman, at this stage of the licensing process for the Indian Point 2 nuclear power plant, you have to deal with the non-nuclear environmental effects. You well know, the Calvert Cliffs decision with its judicial reading of the National Environmental Policy Act. You may know that in the Congress, I was an original co-sponsor of this legislation and have since been a vigorous supporter of it. Because of the interest of my constituents in the Hudson River, in preserving its quality and character, I particularly welcomed that part of this decision having to do with AEC's responsibility to consider the effects of nuclear power plants upon water quality. I would recall for the Board part of what Judge Skelley Wright wrote. He said, and I quote:

"NEPA mandates a case-by-case balancing judgement on the part of federal agencies. In each individual case, the particular economic and technical benefits of planned action must be assessed and then weighed against the environmental costs; alternatives must be considered which would affect the balance of values. . . . In some cases, the benefits and possible costs may lie anywhere on a broad spectrum. . . . The point of the individualized balancing analysis is to ensure that, with possible alternations, the optimally beneficial action is finally taken."

Going further, the Court made it abundantly clear that while the granting of a license by the AEC is contingent upon a water quality certification, the AEC is not precluded from demanding water pollution controls from its licensees which may be more strict than those demanded by the certifying agency. The Court clearly expects the Commission to balance the overall benefits and costs of a particular proposed project, and consider alterations (above and beyond the applicable water quality standards) which would further reduce environmental damage. Yours is the heavy responsibility of giving substance to this judicial reaffirmation of the purposes of NEPA.

THE NATURE OF MY PARTICIPATION

At the outset let me say that I do not pretend to know about the intricacies and subtleties of design of a nuclear power plant. I am not a professional nuclear engineer, nor a health physicist, nor an expert in the effects of waste heat and what to do about it. I am none of these. Rather what I have to say reflects my continuing awareness as a Member of Congress who has strongly supported and closely followed the enactment and subsequent application of the National Environmental Policy Act.

THE DISADVANTAGE OF THE INTERVENOR

In preparing this statement of concern, I have come to learn something of the built-

in disadvantages of AEC's licensing system to the intervenor; disadvantages which from my standpoint may make it too easy for the powerful, wealthy utilities to use big name experts to stifle the voices of the intervenors. So I would hope that the Board will listen carefully to what the intervenors have to say. Despite possible expressions of impatience by the AEC, the utility, or the nuclear industry with the pace of these hearings, I would hope that the Board will give the intervenors the full measure of time they will need to effectively make their case. The additional time this will take will be infinitesimal in comparison with the loss of time attendant upon a nuclear accident in a plant too hastily licensed.

THE FISH KILL ISSUE

Probably the most immediately pronounced environmental effect of Indian Point 2 will be its impact upon the microscopic plants, animals, and the fish of the Hudson River. We already know from the experience with Indian Point 1 and from recent experiences with tests of the water pumps for Indian Point 2, that fish are being killed and will continue to be killed by the systems for taking cooling water from the river. In this connection, I would draw your attention in particular to the statement of the Hudson River Fisherman's Association, submitted to this Board on June 1, 1972.

From my own reading of the draft environmental statement for Indian Point 2, it is clear that the AEC's own regulatory staff see some real and as yet unresolved problems with regard to unacceptably severe effects of this power plant upon the fish and other marine life of the Hudson River. The staff raises questions about the design of the intake structure; the thermal load level; the possibility of waste heat reducing the oxygen contents of the waters and the resulting toxic concentration that will be produced in the Hudson. Further, the AEC staff report on page V-31 discusses the substantial fish kills earlier this year and notes that all the fish kills at Unit No. 1 appear to have been associated with the Plant's condenser cooling water system. The draft statement then says, "Indian Point Unit No. 2 has an intake structure similar to that of Unit No. 1 and is likely to produce similar fish kills."

Mr. Chairman, I realize that a great deal of attention has been given to this environmental effect of Indian Point. Perhaps the utility may argue that a few fish are not worth all this fuss and bother. I can assure you that we who live in the communities and counties along the Hudson River do not see it that way. If the utilities insist upon using modern technologies that can adversely affect the environment, then these technologies must be house broken.

In the case of protecting the fish, the most reliable way to cope with the cooling problem may be to put in cooling towers. This would resolve the effects of waste heat upon microscopic plant life in the river, upon the plankton which is essential to the life cycle of the fish and other creatures, and upon reproduction and vitality of the fish population. It could also reduce the killing of fish and marine life from entrainment in the cooling system and from impingement upon the guards and other barriers of the cooling system inlets.

Putting it another way, there is no social justice in the concept that in order to save the applicant money that the Hudson River at Peekskill should be turned into an aquatic desert. The technical means exist to keep the waste heat from Indian Point 2 out of the river. I submit that this Atomic Safety and Licensing Board should give every consideration to making construction and use of cooling towers a condition of the operating license.

THE REACTOR ACCIDENT ISSUE

A less likely, but potentially urgent cause for public concern, is the possibility of certain kinds of accidents occurring within a large nuclear power reactor of the Indian Point 2 type that could lead to an uncontrolled release of a dangerous amount of radioactive wastes. Certainly, the Board is aware of the questions on the so-called emergency core cooling issue which are being raised at the controversial rule-making hearings still going on before another Atomic and Safety Licensing Board. I would hope, for example, that this Board will examine the statement of the Union of Concerned Scientists of March 23, 1972, in which is submitted a technical evaluation of emergency core cooling systems (c.f. Docket No. RM 50-1). According to their analysis, under unfavorable meteorological conditions, such as a temperature inversion at night, and assuming of 20 percent release of the fission product inventory, lethal effects could extend 75 miles downwind in a strip of as much as two miles wide, with radiation injuries likely from one to two hundred miles.

Now I do not personally know how valid is the analysis of the Union of Concerned Scientists. But I must assume that because it is the product of reputable scientists, at as eminent an institution as Massachusetts Institute of Technology, that it has some basis. This suggests to me the need for some very definite answers to the questions they raise before Indian Point 2 is licensed for operation.

I would hope that at the very least, this Board will restrict the power output of Indian Point 2 to a level well below its maximum design output until the research and experimentation needed to demonstrate the adequacy and reliability of these and other safety features of large power reactors has been satisfactorily completed.

The facts that such results would not be available for several years at the earliest and that such limitation would reduce the income to the utility do not constitute sufficient reasons in my opinion to subject the surrounding communities to whatever degree of risk of an uncontrolled nuclear accident that may be revealed by future safety research and experimentation.

THE PROXIMITY TO POPULATION

At this stage of the evolution of the nuclear industry, I am greatly concerned about a project which would ultimately place four nuclear power reactors so close to large centers of population. While the Board already has in hand information on this population, it bears reiteration that the Indian Point complex is located only a few miles south of Peekskill, that a population of over 50,000 is to be found within a 5 mile radius, that the thriving city of White Plains is but 17 miles away, and that all of the New York metropolitan area is within a 50 mile radius. With Indian Point unit 1 and 2 in operation, they together will contain an inventory of many billion curies of fission products, which is an amount of radioactive material so enormous that I cannot comprehend it. Of course the applicant will provide an impressive array of witnesses as necessary to testify that the protective devices and measures to safely confine these extremely hazardous materials will work as advertised.

I hope that as the Board considers the population issue, it will keep in mind the cautionary letter of the AEC's own Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards of September 1969 which pointed out that the proposed site represents a relatively high population density to be so near a large nuclear power plant. At the end of its hearings, should the Board decide to issue the construction permit, I hope the conditions of the permit will insure that the safety measures are generous

and redundant, rather than the base minimum which the applicant thinks it can specify and still get favorable action.

THE ROUTINE EMISSION OF RADIOACTIVE WASTES ISSUE

Indian Point 2 is designed to routinely emit certain radioactive wastes to the environment. The draft environmental report is specific on this point. It says that the plant is designed to release radioactive materials to the environment "... in accordance with the Commission's regulations as set forth in 10 CFR Part 20 and 10 CFR 50."

I realize that the amounts of radioactive wastes so released are thought to be so small as not to warrant the expense of collecting them. On the other hand, I am aware that principles of radiation protection hold that exposure should always be as low as practicable, that no exposure should be allowed without expectation of benefit, and that all radiation is potentially harmful. To me these principles clearly indicate that if it is technologically feasible to contain even these small amounts of wastes as an alternative to discharging them to the environment, then economics should not be the deciding factor.

Also, as concerns emission of "small" quantities, it is by no means evident to the public what it meant by "small" and, furthermore, whether "small" routine emissions from many large nuclear power plants in the same air and water sheds could lead to accumulations of unacceptable quantities. The issue of levels for routine emissions of such wastes is still very much an open item. The AEC's public rule-making hearing on its regulations which would keep releases of radioactivity from light water cooled nuclear power plants to a level "as low as practicable" has yet to produce any new definition.

Considering this uncertainty as to the basis for AEC regulations governing routine release of radioactive materials, I find it difficult to see how this Board at this time can adequately analyze those features of the Indian Point 2 that relate to such release. While in principle, a licensee could be directed to make changes after the final regulations come down from the AEC; my experience with human nature and organizations and their administration strongly indicates that public safety would better be served by waiting until AEC concludes its rule-making for this matter, rather than trying to change the design after the fact.

THE AUTHORITY OF THE REACTOR OPERATOR

Another important question concerns the authority of the man at the controls to shut down the reactor. I would hope that the Board will carefully explore and find out who has the authority to shut down the reactor should some aspect of its operation indicate that something is not normal. From some things I have heard, it is not clear to me how much the man in the control room can exercise his own judgement and how much he must inform and defer to higher authority, and await their decision. It would seem to me to be more in the public interest that a power reactor may occasionally be shut down for reasons that later prove to be minor rather than that it be operated up to the brink of disaster because no one is readily accessible with personal authority to shut it down.

In a similar vein, the Board may wish to indicate its view as to the desirability of having a resident AEC official present in the control room of the power plant during the first year of its operation with authority to shut down the reactor or to reduce its power level at any time in his judgment, without seeking concurrence from higher authority. Just as the launching of an enormously expensive space rocket is subject to the judg-

ment of a range safety officer, so, too, the initial operation of a large nuclear power plant should be subject to supervision by an officer present in the control room with personal authority to shut it down if, in his opinion, there is any question of safety.

THE NEED FOR POWER ISSUE

Let me finish with a brief discussion of the energy needs issue. Granted that there is much talk of a power shortage in the service area of the applicant. But the AEC draft environmental statement seems deficient to me in the adequacy of its analysis of the true dimensions of this factor. The AEC seems to rely too much upon the self-serving estimates of the applicant and the analyses of the Federal Power Commission which bases its reports on utility-supplied information. This situation reminds me of the recent decision of the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in *Greene County vs. the Federal Power Commission* (3 ERC 1595). I participated as a formal intervenor in this case where the FPC considered a utility's request for authority to construct a power transmission line. The Court held that the FPC had to prepare its own NEPA review, that it could not simply accept the review of the applicant and circulate that for comment. I bring this up in connection with the licensing of Indian Point 2 because so much of the urgency associated with this action is based upon analysis of the power demand situation. It seems to me that the logic of the *Greene County* case would require the AEC to more independently analyze the electricity supply and demand situation, and also the alternatives to immediate operation of Indian Point 2.

I hope the Board will require a thorough, independent, tough-minded analysis of the power situation before it reaches any conclusion that the demand for electricity in this instance is so immediate, real and urgent that the public should be subjected to the still unknown risks that I mentioned earlier in connection with the issue of reactor accidents.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, my overall purpose in this statement of concern is precisely what its title indicates: to express to the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board which will hear testimony on the Indian Point 2 project the concerns and doubts that beset this Member of Congress. I hope that this expression will sharpen the perception of the Board in its realization of the awesome decision they will make, and re-enforce their realization of the need to be conservative and rigorous in its judgment. Finally, in making this judgment, I hope that this Board is guided by the spirit as well as letter of the National Environmental Policy Act.

Thank you.

THE DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE PHILIP PHILBIN, OF MASSACHUSETTS

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply saddened by the passing of my former colleague, the Honorable Philip Philbin, whose dedicated and devoted service for half a century in Congress is exceeded only by the esteem and respect in which he was held by his colleagues. An admired legislator, and a person of integrity and personal charm, Congressman Philbin leaves more than a record of legislative accomplishment;

CVXIII—1394—Part 17

he leaves an example or inspiring leadership. It was a privilege to have known and worked with him and along with my fellow Americans I mourn his passing.

PEKING AND THE TRAFFIC IN NARCOTICS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion in recent days about the role of Communist China in the production of and traffic in narcotics and dangerous drugs.

A report published in England in April 1972, for example, declared that "The Chinese Communist Government exports illicitly 2,000 tons of opium a year to the non-Communist world."

Prepared by James Turnbull, professor of applied science at Britain's Royal Military College of Science, the report states that "The annual sales are estimated to be worth \$500 million to Peking."

Professor Turnbull writes that—

The covert dissemination of opium narcotics, in particular the addictive drug heroin, for commercial and subversive purposes represents one of the gravest threats to the armed services and societies of the free world.

Another recent discussion of Communist China's role in the production and distribution of narcotics came from Lt. Gen. V. H. Krulak, U.S. Marine Corps, retired. Addressing a meeting of the *Copley* newspapers he declared:

The Chinese Reds do want hard money—and opium is probably China's greatest export staple. They are doing everything they can to improve and expand opium culture, and it is estimated that they earn almost a billion clandestine dollars a year from their dope sales.

This situation should be carefully investigated by the Government agencies which have responsibility in this area. In an editorial, the *Indianapolis News* points out that—

The obvious motivation for peddling heroin in this fashion is not profit, but ideology. When we add to this the well-documented history of Communist involvement in the drug trade, plus the highly credible report of Chou En-Lai's statement that Peking was producing drugs for the demoralization of U.S. soldiers, the pieces fit together all too neatly.

The *News* concludes that heroin is, indeed, coming from Communist China and "it takes a monumental act of political will to slice the evidence otherwise."

Declares the *News*:

Unfortunately, the U.S. government at this juncture has pressing reasons to do just that. Unless Red China's drug trade is somehow ignored, the recent hoopla about a new era of peace and amity with the Chinese Communists looks pretty hollow.

I wish to share this important editorial, which appeared in the *Indianapolis News* of May 12, 1972, with my col-

leagues and insert it into the *RECORD* at this time:

PEKING DRUGS

In recent editorials we have discussed the mounting evidence that Communist China is the world's chief supplier of addictive drugs, and that the Nixon administration has been rather studiously ignoring this fact.

Those comments took note of researches by Philadelphia assistant district attorney Jon Steinberg, who conducted an inquiry into the drug situation in Vietnam as an investigator for the U.S. Senate's subcommittee on juvenile delinquency. Steinberg is an objective analyst of the drug problem, with no discernible axe to grind, and it is therefore useful to explore his findings at some length. They suggest, on several counts, that Red China is the principal source of heroin in Vietnam.

In testimony before the Senate subcommittee, Steinberg recited the dismal history of narcotics addiction among Americans in Indochina. He noted that the influx of high-grade and extremely deadly heroin into Vietnam began in the late summer of 1970—in the wake of the Cambodian incursion, which represented a military setback for the Communists. He observed that "known drug-overdose deaths increased 175 per cent in August and September and combined with suspected overdose deaths the increase is 1,000 per cent . . ."

The timing of the drug explosion suggests an obvious strategic motive—permitting the Communists to recoup their military losses by inflicting countervailing losses upon the Americans. That view gains credence from another consideration cited by Steinberg—the fact that the heroin was, "by U.S. standards, practically being given away to our troops." Heroin that would sell for as much as \$80 an ounce in America was going for a rock-bottom \$20 an ounce in Vietnam. It was, in effect, being "dumped."

The obvious motivation for peddling heroin in this fashion is not profit, but ideology. When we add to this the well-documented history of Communist involvement in the drug trade, plus the highly credible report of Chou En-Lai's statement that Peking was producing drugs for the demoralization of U.S. soldiers, the pieces fit together all too neatly. Steinberg's own common-sense conclusion is that the heroin is coming from Red China, and indeed it takes a monumental act of political will to slice the evidence otherwise.

Unfortunately, the U.S. government at this juncture has pressing reasons to do just that. Unless Red China's drug trade is somehow ignored, the recent hoopla about a new era of peace and amity with the Chinese Communists looks pretty hollow.

U.S. COURAGE, CHARACTER, CAPITAL EVIDENT TO WORLD

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I know that I join with millions of Americans and peace-loving peoples around the world in hailing President Nixon's recent efforts to improve relations with Communist China and Russia and to bring the war in Vietnam to a permanent conclusion. I would like to share with my House colleagues a recent analysis of the President's foreign policy initiatives by Elizabeth MacDonald Manning, editor in chief of *Finance*

magazine, reprinted in the June 18 issue of the San Diego Union.

U.S. COURAGE, CHARACTER, CAPITAL EVIDENT TO WORLD

Now, more than ever, we are aware of the American presence making the world scene. The star is President Nixon, and he is living proof that this country and its citizens still have the courage and the concerns which mark and measure the stored-up strength of a nation built on reality, not rationalization.

When future historians reflect on our present problems, free from the impediments of internal politics and wishful thinking, President Richard Nixon will be recognized and maybe revered for his unfaltering faith that peace is possible and coexistence is negotiable without sacrifice of the American character.

Perhaps the Russians believed that we Americans are so tired and dispirited and fused that we would accept the forcible expansion of Communist power in Vietnam and still talk business as usual in an election year. But the Russian assessment that the United States would stand still for humiliation because it might risk a presidency or cancel out trade relations or even trigger a complete confrontation, does not take into account the basic American character represented by its President. He knows, and we citizens know it, too. There comes the moment of truth when, if you don't hit back, you hit bottom.

American political life is not geared to deal with its moments of truth. Large emotions enter the scene, but somewhere, not too far off in the distance, our national common sense sneaks in the back door, bringing a neutralizing antidote to the intensity of strongly-felt differences. At this point, we can understand the urgent need to remove archaic human antagonisms and to find a new conviviality based on respect as well as economic power.

We are shaped by the past even as we endeavor to fashion the future. We are determined to learn to work together, to exchange skills and knowledge, to join our efforts to improve ourselves and others, to use our capital wisely, and to contain the climate of coexistence. These are the concerns which reflect the American character, and if our President prevails, the charting of our lives and millions of others will be affected, and we shall be living in a very different, better world.

A SALUTE TO EDUCATION

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, the cultural, historical, and economic achievements, even the basic health, well-being, and longevity of a state and nation depend in a large measure upon how well we educate each generation charged with the trust of carrying out its responsibilities and traditions.

Here in America we have come a long way since the one-room "Little Red Schoolhouse" and the measure of our progress in today's world is evidenced by our preeminence and leadership as the most advanced sophisticated scientific technological society in the history of mankind. I am pleased to participate with my colleagues here in the Congress in this salute to our educators and their contribution in helping to achieve the preeminence that our Nation attained.

We are all agreed that in the wake of our achievements we have created certain problems in the educational field that offers even greater challenge to our present day educators and those yet to come. Of major significance is the imbalance of inequities in attaining uniform quality education in all geographic areas of our country. It is axiomatic that with the exploding population and our sophisticated advancements in knowledge and the learning process, there is a desperate need for expanded educational opportunities for all levels of our society. Overcrowded, inadequate facilities in our elementary and secondary school systems are glaringly apparent. Higher education has become universal and is a must for many young people and adults alike who are seeking worthwhile careers of expanded career opportunities as well as to satisfy the high idealism of most young people who desire an opportunity for active participation in achieving a better world for all of us.

During the 1971-72 school year, more than 61 million Americans—almost 30 percent of our entire population—were engaged as students in our Nation's educational pursuits. Throughout the month of June, more than 7 million young people will be graduating from our high schools as compared with around 2 million 10 years ago. Today, as a result of the efforts of our educators over the past decade, we find that 60 percent of the adults in the United States can now boast of at least a high school diploma, compared with only 43 percent of U.S. residents in 1960. Meanwhile, at the college level, approximately 8.5 million students were enrolled in our Nation's colleges and universities during the past school year and the number of June college graduates continues at record levels.

The constant and steadfast willingness of America's educators to tackle difficult educational problems and to keep trying to improve the quality of educational opportunities even when there are no easy solutions continues to be of major significance in maintaining our leadership in the educational field throughout the world. In the struggle to better meet the special educational needs of educationally disadvantaged children, for example, a number of teachers and administrators have had to face both disappointment and frustration. Yet most educators have continued to seek and apply resolutions to improve their instructional approaches meeting these problems head on, which is essential if we are to achieve our goals and provide equal educational opportunity for all. In some classrooms, rigid curriculum schedules and bolted desks have given way to more open, flexible classrooms in the hopes of giving today's youth a more complete educational experience which will better prepare them for living in our complex world. And in many school districts, superintendents, principals, and teachers are concerned and working to find ways to more effectively involve parents and other community members in the educational decisionmaking process.

The educational system of our Nation needs substantive indepth revision. The

facilities available, such as modern, up-to-date schools, necessary equipment and sufficient teaching staffs are simply just not adequate to meet the educational needs of our young people and to permit those of our teaching profession who have acquired the most modern, technological and scientific knowledge available today to translate their professional acumen effectively and meaningfully into an educational program that will provide optimum service to the youth of America. You may be assured that I have and will continue to wholeheartedly support the continuing and increased investment in educational development in our Nation through the dedication of more public and private financial resources and the fullest utilization of all available resources—public and private—including physical plants, library and research resources, laboratories, and so forth. I believe we have the expertise to effectively reconcile our objective and provide an educational system compatible to our total resources that can achieve the quality of education and way of life that we seek for ourselves and future generations to enjoy and reach even greater heights of fulfillment and purpose.

The American system of education has contributed much to our national strength in the past and continues to sustain our national life at present. I join with my colleagues here in the Congress in this salute to our educators who deserve our Nation's most sincere thanks and deepest appreciation on behalf of all of our people.

WASHINGTON REPORT OF CONGRESSMAN BOB PRICE

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 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 19, 1972:

WASHINGTON REPORT FROM CONGRESSMAN BOB PRICE

SMALL BUSINESSES EXEMPTED FROM OSHA

Appropriation of federal funds for operation of the Departments of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare was the major item of legislation before the House of Representatives last week. It was an especially important bill to residents in our area, since the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), which operates within the Department of Labor, was included in the bill.

OSHA has been one of the most controversial agencies of the government recently because the provisions of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 require that OSHA enforce health and safety standards against all firms, regardless of size either in respect to the number of persons employed by the firm or in respect to the economic feasibility of the firm's compliance with the standards set by that act.

As a result of the obvious hardship that would have been worked on the small businessmen of Texas had they been forced to comply with the provisions of the act, I introduced a bill in April that would have

amended the act in such a way that small business firms would be excepted from the act.

The general provisions of the amendment I introduced in April were incorporated last week into the appropriations bill covering OSHA. I am happy to report that, working with many other Members of Congress, we were successful. I voted for it. Final vote on the amendment, which passed, was 213-154.

The exact language of the amendment is as follows: "None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be expended to pay the salaries of any employees of the Federal Government who inspect firms employing twenty-five persons or less for compliance with the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970."

It was a great victory for those of us who have been trying to relieve the farmer and small businessman of the unnecessary hardships that compliance with this act would cause. While we must all be concerned about the health and safety of American working men and women, we must also make certain that those men and women have jobs—and compliance with some of the costly jobs—unnecessary portions of the act would have literally put many small firms out of business and cost many people their jobs.

TEXAS DROUGHT VICTIMS MAY APPLY FOR FHA EMERGENCY AID

Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz announced last Friday that the Farmers Home Administration may make emergency loans to eligible farmers and ranchers in all counties in my Congressional district both old and new, through June 30, 1973.

The Department said an extended drought which started in 1970 has caused substantial loss of field and feed crops, and damage to pastures. Many farmers and ranchers will need emergency loans to complete their 1972 operations and for the 1973 operating year.

Farmers Home emergency loans are made to finance crop production, replace livestock, and for other expenses necessary to restore normal operations.

Applicants may apply for loans at the local Farmers Home Administration office serving the area.

To be eligible a farmer must have sustained damage from the drought or some other natural disaster. Farmers who borrow agree to repay their loans as soon as possible consistent with their repayment abilities. Loans are secured by liens as required to protect the government's interest.

GAS SHORTAGE CAUSES HOUSING CRUNCH IN PITTSBURGH AREA

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, citizens in the Pittsburgh area are experiencing a housing problem directly related to the shortage of natural gas. Right now the housing problem is ours. But the gas shortage is threatening to become nationwide.

The inability of utility companies to offer new gas service to patrons are forcing builders to turn to alternate forms of power; namely, electricity for their houses.

The high cost of electricity and oil, in comparison to gas, essentially puts these homes out of the reach of those people seeking FHA assistance.

This problem has been encountered already in Penn Hills Township, a large

municipality east of Pittsburgh. A recent article in the Penn Hills Progress discusses this predicament.

I would like to include this article in the Record at this time for the information of my colleagues and I hope they are becoming as aware as I of the dangerous proportions of the natural gas crisis in our Nation.

The article follows:

COULD AFFECT SUBSIDIES—GAS SHORTAGE PRELUDE TO HOUSING SHORTAGE?

ALLEGHENY EAST.—Moderately priced housing in the east suburbs could become as outmoded as a five-cent cigar within the next few years because of the critical shortage of natural gas.

This is the prediction of both contractors and gas company officials, who believe that a major restructuring of Federal housing subsidization standards must be made this year in order to keep homes within the grasp of middle-income families.

The new crisis in suburban housing, which plagues not only Allegheny County and Pennsylvania but the entire nation, has been brought on by the fact that utility companies are being ordered in many cases to refuse any new customers unless they can meet the requirements of their present subscribers. Late last year, the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (PUC) issued such an order to gas companies in the state.

At first the order applied only to new commercial and industrial consumers but was expanded this year to include private homeowners. The PUC told utility companies that it can take on new customers only if it can supply satisfactory service to both present and future consumers throughout the next five years.

Only one of the two gas companies serving the east suburban area has been able to meet the new PUC standards. Equitable Gas Company has already determined it can satisfactorily serve new residential customers, but does not accept any new industrial load additions that represent a peak-day demand of more than 10,000 cubic feet of gas.

Peoples Natural Gas Co., the other utility serving Allegheny East, cannot take on any new customers, residential or commercial.

So far the natural gas shortage has had little effect on home building in area municipalities. At the beginning of this year, contractors were notified to submit applications for gas service to Peoples before Feb. 15.

But time is running out, officials say, and by as early as next year, contractors may be forced to install oil or electric heating systems in new homes, thereby forcing the cost of new houses out of the range of present Federal Housing Authority (FHA) subsidization requirements.

"The simple fact of the matter is that we can't get gas," explained James Hootor, division manager for Ryan Homes, a major residential building in Allegheny East. "If the situation isn't resolved soon," he said, "the gas shortage will knock out Federal low-cost housing."

Hootor cited two reasons why new homes in the near future will not meet present requirements for subsidization, particularly under the popular 235 Program. "First," he explained, "a person's utility costs will be pushed up to a point where you're probably eliminating 20 to 30 percent of those people who presently qualify for FHA programs. Second, if we are forced to install oil or electric heating systems, the cost of which is almost \$800 higher than gas heating systems, you're increasing the cost of a home anywhere from two to five percent."

"Here it becomes a merchandising problem," Hootor continued. "People see the cost of housing has increased and decide to wait for a few years in the hope that prices will go down. And even if electric companies could

compete with gas utilities, they have to fight the stigma that electric heating is much higher."

Right now, Hootor admitted, the cost of electric heating systems in the home is almost twice as expensive as gas heating. "I know that electric companies are now making a study of the possibility of competing with the gas companies on a lower price scale," he commented, "but that study hasn't been completed."

The ban on new customers, meanwhile, seems to have affected only Penn Hills so far, where Peoples Gas Company sales director Dennis Daschalle reports, "We've been forced to refuse the applications of 10 new residential homes there."

"The applications were submitted by people who intended to build their own home," Daschalle continued, "and no contractor has been turned down yet. This is because we notified contractors by mail that they were to submit applications for new customers no later than Feb. 15 of this year. These private individuals probably never got the word and simply missed the deadline."

In Monroeville and Plum Boroughs, meanwhile, planning directors knew of no instance where developers were refused gas service. Monroeville Planning Director Jack Norris reported, "So far, the people who intend to develop have received approval from the gas company." Plum Engineer Herman DeSimone echoed a similar report for his Borough, saying, "It hasn't affected us at all."

Nor has new light industrial or commercial enterprise been thwarted by new gas company restrictions. "There hasn't been any business to our knowledge that has been turned down because of the gas shortage," reported Mrs. Evelyn Caldwell, director of Monroeville Chamber of Commerce.

"Most people know ahead of time where they're going to build," Mrs. Caldwell explained, "and the PUC order won't hit hard until some business tries to get started which hadn't made plans before the restrictions went into effect."

Peoples Gas Company spokesman Daschalle confessed that the present crisis reflects a "lax policy on the part of all gas companies in the past."

"Before it was company policy," he explained, "that when an individual gets his building permit he's supposed to get a heating permit as well. That's always been our policy and still is. But contractors got in the habit of building the structure, then applying for the heating permit after they had already installed the furnace and the lines. That's all changed. We're following our policy very strictly and it's very possible that as early as next year, we'll have to start turning down contractors."

Ryan Homes' Hootor explained that the problem is not found in Pennsylvania alone. "We build as many as 6,000 homes a year nationally," he said, "and I can tell you frankly this problem stares us in the face everywhere we are."

Hootor added, "There's no question that FHA loan requirements will have to be readjusted." He explained that the difficulty he and other contractors face is that single family homes under the FHA 235 price limitation cannot be built with heating systems other than those using natural gas. Currently, homes with three bedrooms cannot sell for more than \$21,000 while \$24,000 is the top price for four-bedroom houses.

Other problems with alternative heating systems involve the fact that houses with electric, oil or other heating systems are appraised lower for mortgage purposes since increased utility bills make homes less appealing to buyers. The average gas-heating costs per year are now \$367.11 while oil heating systems cost \$515.33 to operate. Electric heating systems are estimated to cost \$674.94 a year to operate in an average sized home.

Neither Daschalle nor Hootor could see any inexpensive solution to the problem. In fact, if new housing construction in the east suburbs doesn't come to a grinding halt within the next 18 months, the cost of heating is expected to increase substantially for homeowners new and old and apartment dwellers as well.

"Right now," Hootor related, "the gas companies are overtly admitting that the price of gas today doesn't allow for the high cost of drilling for new sources of natural gas. We expect that even if new sources of gas are found, today's gas prices will be as distant a memory as nickel cigars.

"Whether homes will have gas or electric heating systems will probably make little difference in the future," he added, "because gas homes will probably cost more anyway. No matter if people are going to rent or buy, their heating costs are going to be higher."

A TRIBUTE TO EDUCATION

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to pay tribute to our 50 million educators and to briefly note the increased significance placed upon education.

For an American born in 1800, the prospects for a good education were limited. There were no State-administered systems of public education. Only if his family was financially able could a student attend a private school or receive private tutoring at home. There were a few free schools for the very poor, but there was certainly no uniformity among the States and territories. At the college level, the system of private institutions had a similar haphazard character, and served primarily the wealthy class. In fact, less than 40 percent of all young people receive any formal education.

Fortunately, by the time the grandchild of a person born in 1800 was ready to start school, the conditions of American education had improved significantly. By 1870, statistics compiled by the Office of Education showed approximately 55 percent of the population between the ages of 5 and 17 were attending public schools.

The Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862 encouraged States to develop State colleges for the purpose of teaching "such branches of learning as are related to agricultural and mechanics arts." By 1920, the State-supported colleges and universities were a strong counterpart to the expanding network of private colleges and universities.

Over the past 50 years, a system of education for young people has been complemented in all States with educational opportunities for adults. In fact, nearly one-third of our population is now involved in the educational system.

I am a firm believer in the continued development of a strong system of education. I have supported numerous efforts on the local, State, and National levels to help our educators in their continuing quest for educational betterment. Most recently, I voted in support of the

Education Amendments of 1972 and appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for fiscal year 1973.

The continuing strength of American education is our best hope for our continued success and future prosperity, and I have no doubts that our American educators will continue to respond to each new professional challenge with strength, vigor, and intelligence. I commend their efforts on behalf of our education system, and pledge my support to them.

VETERANS BENEFITS

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unable to be present for business on the House floor on Monday, June 19 due to the airline pilots strike.

The House passed by overwhelming margins on that day two very important bills which I have long supported. I regret very much that I was unable to add my voice to the unanimity of my colleagues in passing both H.R. 15439 providing additional compensation for disabled veterans and S. 3343 providing an additional housing allowance for disabled veterans.

Mr. Speaker, in the last few years every other group to which the Federal Government provides salaries or allowance has received an increase. Only the disabled veterans have not been provided with an allowance adequate to offset the tremendous cost-of-living increases which we have all experienced in the last few years. These veterans, who have sacrificed so much for the Nation certainly deserve our full measure of support to restore as much as is humanly possible their health, mobility, and comfort.

H.R. 15439, which was tabled in lieu of a similar Senate bill would: First, provide a 10-percent increase to veterans suffering from service-connected disabilities.

Second, abolish the withholding, after 6 months, of compensation of single veterans while they are in a hospital or domiciliary. This was recommended by the Veterans' Administration and there is no cost involved.

Third, extend to Spanish War widows the option to elect, if to their benefit, to receive pension under the "new" pension law we enacted in 1959, now available to widows of veterans of World Wars I and II, the Korean conflict, and Vietnam era. The Spanish War veterans themselves have had this option since 1960 and the failure to include their widows was obviously inadvertent. The Veterans' Administration does not object to this provision and the cost would probably not be significant.

Fourth, existing law authorizes the Administrator to extend certain relief in cases where veterans or their dependents have been denied benefits because of administrative error. This provision liberal-

izes the existing authority, is recommended by the Veterans' Administration, and the cost would be insignificant.

Fifth, this provision liberalizes and simplifies the authority of the Veterans' Administration to waive recovery of overpayments. It also liberalizes a veteran's release from liability under loan guaranty when he has disposed of the property. I am sure many of my fellow Members have run into hardship cases in this area and we are pleased to note that the Veterans' Administration has recommended this long-overdue change in the law.

Sixth, this final provision would authorize the Administrator to review all forfeiture for fraud cases which had been applied prior to September 1, 1959. On that date the law was changed to abolish forfeitures for fraud under the rationale that since criminal statutes were also applicable the administrative forfeiture was, in effect, a double penalty. Unfortunately, the 1959 law was prospective in effect only. This proposal is also recommended by the Veterans' Administration and they are unable to estimate the cost.

S. 3343 will increase the maximum payable to disabled veterans for specially adapted housing. Presently, a severely disabled veteran is entitled to 50 percent of the cost of a home and necessary land up to a maximum of \$12,500. This bill would increase the maximum to \$17,500. Veterans eligible under this provision are those who require special facilities in their homes such as ramps, special bathroom equipment, larger rooms, exercise equipment, and other devices essential for them to live as normal as possible outside a hospital.

Mr. Speaker, the average price of a new home according to the Veterans' Administration is \$25,000. But for veterans who require special equipment in order to be mobile, the average cost of a new home is over \$38,000. I realize that the Administration has stated that the present \$12,500 maximum is sufficient. But it is apparent that the Administration's policies concerning the economy are not holding down prices. It would certainly seem reasonable and fair to provide for the additional costs which disabled veterans must incur.

This bill would also eliminate the provision in the law which preclude the interest rate on VA loans from exceeding the rate in effect under the National Housing Act. Under this bill the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs would have independent authority to adjust the rate of interest on guaranteed loans commensurate with changing loan market demands without regard or reference to the maximum interest rate on FHA loans under the National Housing Act.

A BLACK CHILD LEADS THE WAY

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, there is a little 4-year-old girl in Cleveland, Ohio,

who, for the past 2 years, has helped to focus attention on her grandmother's educational efforts. The little girl's name is Traci Cade, and her grandmother is Mrs. Gloria Cade of the Edac Workshop in Cleveland.

Traci, who lives and travels with her grandmother, helped Mrs. Cade write two children's books—"Traci and the Kids" and "Traci Takes a Trip." These two books are part of Mrs. Cade's efforts to prove that, just because a person is poor, he should not be automatically considered either insane or immoral. It is Mrs. Cade's idea that children should be taught, at the earliest possible age, that poverty is not a disease that always infects the soul.

On June 9, 1972, Mr. George Moore, who writes for the Cleveland Press, devoted his column to Mrs. Cade and Traci. I would like to share their important efforts with the Members of this Chamber today.

Mr. Moore's article follows:

A BLACK CHILD LEADS THE WAY
(By George Anthony Moore)

A four-year-old black child named Traci, who has been basking in the public limelight for more than a year as an author of two books, will receive special recognition next Friday noon at an autograph party for her in Higbee's book shop. At that time, two books will be offered: "Traci and the Kids" and "Traci Takes a Trip." Both are in color.

Actually, Traci is a coauthor with her grandmother, Mrs. Gloria Cade, who is also pioneering in the area of printed matter to provide materials and methods which will help overcome the effects of deprivation and discrimination for children living in the ghetto.

Mrs. Cade is an ex-schoolteacher turned publisher and researcher in black history. She has launched a small publishing company to print and secure wide distribution of her exhaustive research into Negro history and culture. The firm is called EDAC Publishing Co. (Cade spelled backwards).

She is not just concerned with black children, because Mrs. Cade recognized that there are 25 million impoverished, deprived and misunderstood people—black, white and brown—in this country with children who are generally looked upon as psychologically sick and morally deficient. Because of this mentality, Mrs. Cade wants to humanize the school system by changing the materials being used.

When asked if some of the major publishing houses were not working in this direction, she replied that their efforts were too gradual and the results minimal. She is not concerned with criticizing these efforts, but in getting on with the business of correcting things.

Mrs. Cade is also interested in publishing materials for commercial consumption, since parents are the first teachers of children. She is concerned with training others to be familiar with materials relevant to minority children.

This is why she spent the past year as education and house director of the Afro-American House at Oberlin College. This is why she wrote and co-hosted 20 programs, entitled Black Interpretation, over WKYC-TV to the National Broadcasting Co. network. The broadcasts enlisted students from Cuyahoga Community College, Cleveland State University, Case Western Reserve University, Howard University, Kent State University and John F. Kennedy and Shaker Heights High Schools.

Traci has lived with her grandmother and has traveled everywhere with her. "Traci and the Kids" was written at Oberlin College

where Traci was in the Headstart program. "Traci Takes a Trip," the beginning of a travel series, was done in Atlanta, while she was attending an independent school there, Learning House.

Traci Diane Cade is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Donald Cade. She has an infectious smile, pigtails, and boundless energy. Black children will relate to her and her books.

THE DEFEATISTS ARE AT IT AGAIN

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware that there are some people in America who will go to any extreme to depict our Nation as the culprit in Southeast Asia while bending over backward to excuse the naked aggression of the North Vietnamese. These same people are also the ones that will not admit that we are ending U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia and taking steps to bring peace. Because of his timely comments on the subject, I would like to share with my colleagues a speech by Richard G. Capen, Jr., on May 26 before the district convention of Lions International in San Diego, Calif. Mr. Capen is vice president of Copley Newspapers of La Jolla, Calif.:

THE DEFEATISTS ARE AT IT AGAIN

Events of the past few days have moved the world's two great powers a few steps closer to President Nixon's goal of building a generation of peace. The President's statesmanlike leadership during the substantive talks in Moscow can be a source of pride for all Americans.

We now have a major understanding to halt the arms race. We have treaties with the Soviets on conquering pollution and disease. A joint Soviet-United States space effort is planned by 1975. An agreement has been reached to reduce incidents at sea.

Through the spirit of negotiations, an outbreak of war has been averted in the Middle East. The access to Berlin has been reestablished. A treaty involving the use of the world's seabeds has been developed and we have renewed a dialogue with the more than 800 million people of Mainland China.

Regrettably, our desire to negotiate differences has not led to an end of the war in South Viet Nam. But that has not been due to any lack of effort or reasonableness on the part of the Nixon Administration. Rather, our initiatives toward an honorable settlement have been met with only obstinate, negative response from the enemy.

Today it's a new ball game in Viet Nam. It's a new game because the North Vietnamese have made it so, not the United States. The enemy has violated the demilitarized zone. They have rocketed population areas. They have killed more than 20,000 civilians in the past two months alone.

To invade South Viet Nam, the enemy has committed virtually all of its combat forces—12 of 13 divisions. Their goal has been to choke off South Viet Nam's freedom at all cost. The North Vietnamese have undertaken this massive effort in clear violation of international accords and understandings which they themselves agreed to follow.

Despite these facts, the American defeatists are at it again.

They have called the President's decision reckless, foolish and irresponsible. They were convinced that the Moscow talks would be sabotaged, that the Red Chinese would be

forced to intercede. To hear these defeatists talk, one would think that the North Vietnamese invasion was our fault instead of the other way around.

Some of these critics, I am convinced, would rather see America defeated than support any responsible means for extricating this country from a long and frustrating war.

In the frantic search for expedient solutions, they have openly supported resolutions which would tie the President's hands as he withdraws from Viet Nam. Yet, several years ago they were giving full approval to decisions that got us into Viet Nam.

Today, they favor resolutions to condemn President Nixon for seeking to stop the enemy's aggression, but they direct not one single word of criticism against the enemy that started that aggression. Some have gone so far as to believe enemy propaganda while deliberately refusing to accept statements by our own government.

Now these defeatists are seeking to cover up their own errors, and the mistakes of earlier administrations, by labeling this battle "Nixon's War." It's a simple matter for them to criticize their country's current military initiatives. After all, they have no responsibility for the consequences of such casual words. Nor would they be accountable for the loss of credibility in our nation's commitments around the globe should we desert South Viet Nam at this, their most critical, moment.

Some critics have built their entire political career on platforms of obstructionism. They have placed their political interest first and their country's interest last. They have expressed moral indignation when it was convenient to do so.

They have generated the impression that there would be no war in the world if the United States were not in Viet Nam. They have naively convinced others that once the last American soldier was out of Viet Nam, that there would be peace in the world. Do they really believe that settling the war in Viet Nam will settle the war in Ireland? Or the war in the Middle East? Or the confrontation in India and Pakistan? Or the dispute along the Chinese-Russian borders?

No, Catholics and Protestants, Arabs and Jews, Hindus and Moslems and Russians and Chinese have battled for hundreds of years. It's not likely to stop soon. This, of course, is regrettable, but, I cannot really believe that restoring peace in Southeast Asia will restore peace in the world.

Because it's a new ball game today in Viet Nam, I believe it is essential to place recent developments in proper perspective. One cannot do so without taking stock of what has occurred in the past three and one-half years.

In my opinion, President Nixon has shown incredible restraint in the face of irresponsible criticism by those who run away from their responsibility for past actions by seeking to saddle others with the consequences of these actions.

Today, from the privacy of Washington law offices, a former Defense Secretary and a former U.S. negotiator in Paris have all the answers for getting America out of Viet Nam—now. But, where were those ready solutions when these former officials were in positions to act? These were the people who got our country into a war they could neither win nor end. That, in a sentence, is the sad legacy President Nixon inherited when he assumed office.

Since January 1969, conditions have changed substantially through President Nixon's leadership and through his Vietnamization program. It was not President Nixon who sent 550,000 Americans to Viet Nam. He has brought 500,000 home.

It was not President Nixon who was in office when as many as 500 Americans were being killed each week. Under his administration, combat deaths have been reduced

by more than 95%. And I might add that those low levels have been maintained despite the current intensity of ground combat in South Viet Nam.

When the Nixon Administration took office, American troops were handling ground combat. In fact, there was no authorized plan whatsoever for turning that combat role over to our allies. Today, the South Vietnamese have that responsibility and they are doing amazingly well. Sure, they are not winning every battle, but no one ever predicted they would.

In short, Vietnamization is working. We have provided the equipment. We have helped to train South Vietnamese forces, and we have assisted with air and naval support as necessary. As a result, substantial numbers of Americans have been withdrawn. Do you realize that there are fewer Americans in Viet Nam today than there were Americans in Korea when President Nixon took office in 1969. It took 10 to 15 years for the Koreans to take over their own internal security responsibilities. But the South Vietnamese have been forced to assume that responsibility in less than three years. I think they have come a long way.

Three and one-half years ago, there was no comprehensive peace plan for ending the war in Viet Nam. That, too, has all changed. Through secret initiatives and public talks in Paris, the President has sought every reasonable avenue for ending the conflict through negotiations. But the enemy has balked every step of the way, greeting each peace offer with insult and escalation of the war.

I don't see how anyone can possibly criticize the President for failing to do all that was humanly possible to end the conflict. He has offered every reasonable alternative to Hanoi. Even while negotiating—as frustrating as that was—he proceeded to withdraw thousands and thousands of Americans despite any visible progress in Paris.

Today, not only has the President decided to stand up against the enemy's blatant aggression, but he also has made it clear that the North Vietnamese will have to prove their sincerity to negotiate before such talks are resumed. In the meantime, their war-making capacity is being destroyed. It is being destroyed rapidly and effectively.

Overlooked in the dramatic announcement to mine the harbors of North Viet Nam and to step up our bombing of military and strategic targets has been the significant negotiating move made by this country.

That involves our proposal to withdraw all U.S. forces from Viet Nam within four months after American prisoners of war are released and after an internationally supervised cease-fire has begun. There are no commitments for linking our withdrawal to the progress of Vietnamization. There are no commitments linking our agreement to the stability of the South Vietnamese government. In short, it is about the most liberal peace plan anyone—most of all the enemy—could hope to expect.

Even the Senate Doves should be able to support this proposal, but I sometimes think that they are more concerned about defending the Communists than protecting the South Vietnamese.

Fortunately, I feel that most Americans understand what has been accomplished to date and realize what is now at stake. They respect the President's efforts. They recognize that he has taken every possible public and private step to end our involvement. And they know that it is the enemy—not the United States—that is responsible for the current actions in Viet Nam.

Public support from a majority of Americans has come through clearly. It has been seen in the thousands of letters and telegrams to the White House and Congress. It has been seen in the Gallup poll indicating that 74% of the American public

supports the President's efforts toward building peace. It has been seen in the Harris poll showing that 59% endorse the President's decision to mine the enemy's harbors.

It has also been seen in the low level of protest around the country. Sure, there have been some riots and demonstrations, but there always will be regardless of the issue. Those who carry the Viet Cong flag today will carry another banner tomorrow. But you can be sure that their banners will urge the destruction of America not the improvement of it!

If there is to be a negotiated settlement, the time is now. In the meantime, the President has asked for the support of a unified nation. I believe he deserves that support and I believe, for the most part, he is receiving it.

Today this nation has a new direction. The Peking trip has dramatized that fact. The substantive agreements in Moscow have dramatized that fact.

Hopefully, the world can arrive at a point when its leaders can safely discuss and resolve mutual problems. If so, we will truly be moving toward our nation's goal of a generation of peace.

ADDRESS TO PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY COUNCIL OF SENIOR CITIZEN CLUBS

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 20, it was my pleasure to address the Prince Georges County Council of Senior Citizens Clubs, which was attended by two members of each of the 42 senior citizen clubs in the county. I discussed with them some of the major action under consideration by Congress which could have a tremendous impact on their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I now insert my remarks in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

Ladies and gentlemen, I am pleased to be here with you today, and to have this chance to discuss, at least briefly, some of the actions being taken by Congress to enhance the economic security and independence of older Americans.

I would first like to take a few minutes to tell you about a problem confronting a gentleman who visited my office a few weeks ago. He began his career at the age of 17 and worked continuously until the age of 65. He put some of his earnings into savings and always looked forward to retirement as the time when he could enjoy the things he could not do while holding a regular 9 to 5 job. This gentleman, now in retirement, 72 years of age and healthy, told me he has but one fear—that he will outlive his savings.

His fear of an inadequate retirement income is the number one concern of most older people. Unfortunately, the very people who brought our modern urban industrial society to birth, who worked hard all their lives, saved what money they could and maintained a reasonable standard of living during their working years are today threatened by the prospect of being poor.

Since they worked during the years of relatively low wages and before private pension plans had fully developed, they had little opportunity to build a sizable retirement income.

Perhaps as disturbing is the fact that inflation continues to worsen their plight.

Housing and rental costs are rising, food prices are higher than ever, and the cost of needed medical care has become prohibitive.

The 1970 census showed that half of the 7.2 million older families had 1970 incomes of less than \$5,053 while the median income of younger families was \$10,541. Almost one quarter of the older families had incomes of less than \$3,000. For the 5.8 million older persons living alone or with non relatives, the situation was even more grave. Half of these individuals had 1970 incomes of less than \$1,951, an income just barely above the 1970 poverty index of \$1,852.

Another hard fact is that elderly individuals have the poorest prospects of any adult age group to increase their income through employment. Unemployment problems have reduced job opportunities for older people, and even when jobs do become available many employers are reluctant to hire them.

They often feel the older worker is slower to learn and less apt than a younger person to take on long work or job training assignments. As a result, thousands of highly qualified and energetic individuals who are dependable and motivated cannot earn needed supplemental income.

Studies have shown that age alone is no criteria for determining whether an individual can perform on a job. Furthermore, in a country as rich as ours we must have the capacity and resources for expanding job opportunities for our older citizens.

Lack of services available for senior citizens is another serious problem. It is the responsibility of both the public and private sectors to foster the establishment of necessary services. Many older individuals need the help of counselors and social workers. They need transportation.

Some need assistance from home aides to keep their homes in good repair, or to select and prepare nourishing meals, as well as to have someone offer pleasant company to share the joys and ease the sorrows that life sometimes brings. At the present time too few services such as these are available in Prince Georges county and other communities throughout the country.

Numerous proposals have been introduced in Congress to help alleviate them. Many would directly increase the incomes of older citizens and also help to insure their independence and self reliance.

For instance, in 1969 Congress voted to increase social security and cash benefit levels by 15 per cent. And last year, Congress voted another benefit increase of 10 per cent. These benefit increases were enacted in order to keep social security benefit levels up to date with the rise in prices. I am afraid, however, they did not raise the income levels enough to enable elderly people to significantly improve their income position.

As a result, Congress is now considering proposals that would both substantially increase the incomes of the elderly and reform many of the existing provisions of the Social Security program.

Last June the House passed H.R. 1 which would liberalize Social Security and medicare/medicaid benefits and alter our welfare system. But frankly I resent having Social Security lumped as a hostage to welfare reform. Social Security is not welfare.

Since that time we have been waiting for Senate action on the legislation. The Senate Finance Committee passed its version of the bill last Tuesday. How the full Senate will respond remains to be seen.

The House and the Senate will eventually have to reach an accommodation on the legislation and the impact of that decision on older citizens will be enormous. So I thought we might concentrate for a few moments on the differences and similarities between the House and Senate legislation and zero in on the Social Security and medicare/medicaid provisions.

The Senate bill calls for a 10 per cent across the board increase in Social Security and disability benefits. However, the regular minimum payment of \$70 a month for individuals and \$105 for couples would rise only 5 per cent. Up to 30 million people would receive increases. The House bill calls for a 5 per cent across the board increase.

Both the House and Senate legislation provide for an automatic cost-of-living benefit increase if the consumer price index has risen at least three per cent in the preceding year.

The Senate bill would provide a guaranteed minimum monthly payment of \$200 (\$300 for couples) after 30 years in social security covered employment. The House legislation would provide \$150 a month (\$225 a couple) after 30 years' employment.

DELAYED RETIREMENT

Both the House and Senate legislation would provide a one per cent extra increase in benefits for each year an individual delays retirement beyond 65. This would apply to people already retired and to future retirees.

DISABILITY PAYMENTS

The Senate bill would reduce the waiting time for disability insurance benefits from six months to four months. The House version would reduce the time to five months.

WIDOWS' BENEFITS

Both the House and Senate legislation would increase widows' or widowers' benefits from 82.5 per cent to 100 per cent of what the deceased spouse would have received. This is in addition to the across the board benefit increase.

NEW COMPUTATION RULES

Both the House and Senate legislation would correct the current discrimination against male retirees and allow them to drop out three additional low paid years in computing their benefits.

OUTSIDE EARNINGS

Both the House and Senate legislation would also liberalize the so-called retirement test. Under present law, as you know, persons between the age of their retirement and age 72 are entitled to earn \$1,680 annually without any reduction in retirement benefits. Between \$1,680 and \$2,880, however, for each \$2 of earnings, \$1 in benefits is taken away. For earnings above \$2,880, every \$1 earned is lost through a \$1 reduction in benefits.

The new legislation, however, would provide for increasing the amount an individual can earn in employment and still receive his full social security benefit from \$1,680 to \$2,000. And it would reduce benefits \$1 for each \$2 earned above \$2,000. The current provision of losing all benefits above the \$2,880 level would be eliminated entirely.

Those are some of the highlights of the social security changes. Here are some of the proposed changes in medicare/medicaid benefits.

MEDICARE FOR DISABLED

Both the House and Senate legislation extend medicare coverage to persons retired on social security disability insurance, regardless of age, after they have been receiving disability payments for 24 months.

PREPAID GROUP PRACTICE

Both the House and Senate legislation would permit the government to contract with prepaid group practice health maintenance organizations, if a medicare beneficiary so desired, to provide medicare hospital and outpatient benefits.

MEDICARE "BUY IN"

Both the House and Senate legislation would enable persons 65 and over who are ineligible for social security to "buy in" to medicare hospital insurance by paying a spe-

cial premium, which is \$31 a month at present.

SOME DIFFERENCES

The Senate legislation has several provisions relating to drug costs that are not included in the House legislation. The Senate legislation would pay for most of the costs of maintenance drugs, such as insulin. A beneficiary would only have to pay \$1 per prescription.

The Senate legislation also includes provisions to encourage the sale of equally effective but less costly drugs.

WELFARE FOR THE AGED, BLIND, AND DISABLED

One final point of interest on this massive legislation regarding welfare payments for the aged, blind and disabled. The Senate legislation is designed to guarantee aged, blind and disabled welfare recipients a minimum monthly payment of \$130 if they have no other income at all, and to guarantee aged couples \$195. Currently the maximum monthly payment for single aged recipients in Maryland is \$96.

On the House side, the legislation would guarantee single, aged welfare recipients a minimum benefit of \$130 a month.

The Senate legislation would also increase the income of aged welfare recipients who also receive social security benefits by disregarding the first \$50 of income in calculating the amount of an individual's welfare payment.

This means that an aged welfare recipient receiving social security payments would be guaranteed a total income of \$180 a month. Furthermore, the first \$50 of earnings would also be disregarded, thus guaranteeing welfare social security recipients who have a job a total monthly income of \$230.

There are, of course, many other areas relating to the economic security of older people now under study by Congress. One such area is the private pension system in our country. As you know, millions of mature workers lose pension benefits each year because of events beyond their control. Massive layoffs, mismanagement of pension funds, employer bankruptcies and ineffective regulations regarding pension plans are each contributing factors. For these reasons numerous bills before Congress are directed at both protecting the pension rights of older people and making private pension programs more responsive to the economic needs of pensioners.

In essence, the bills would secure the funding of pension programs so that workers could be guaranteed the money in their programs would be there when they retire. They would also protect the assets of pension funds against mismanagement and they would protect the pension rights of workers whose companies go out of business.

Additionally, they would ensure workers their pension rights if they stay with a job for a designated period of years, and they would enable workers to take their pension rights with them from job to job. It is important to note that these bills would assure 30 million individuals currently covered under private pension programs that their particular pension plan is both reliable and effective.

Another income related area receiving close and careful attention by Congress relates to the heavy burden of property taxes on older people. While the incomes of elderly people have remained relatively fixed in past years, property taxes have steadily risen. Between the years of 1967 and 1970 property taxes rose by about 35 per cent, nearly twice the average increase in the cost of living. I wish the State Legislature had directed its attention to this problem which has now reached such a crisis.

Senior homeowners are now paying over 20 to 40 per cent of their limited incomes for property taxes whereas the average urban

household pays about 4 per cent of its total income for property taxes.

Elderly people living in apartments feel this financial squeeze in the form of higher rents. Moreover, it appears that property taxes will pressure older people even more so in years to come if reforms over local tax systems are not made. This is primarily a State problem, but President Nixon, in his message to Congress last March, announced two approaches on the Federal level to deal with this matter. First, he advanced the concept of revenue sharing so that States and local governments would have a better opportunity to grant property tax relief for older people. Secondly, he proposed a value-added tax as a way to raise money for Federal assistance to State governments so the States could take over some of the responsibility for financing public schools.

Congress is evaluating these ideas as well as other proposals aimed at providing ways to relieve elderly homeowners and renters from local property taxes.

In addition to raising the incomes of older people, Congress is considering legislation which would meet other critical needs of the elderly, particularly through changes in the Older Americans Act of 1965.

I am sure many of you are familiar with this act. Seven years ago it was hailed as landmark legislation because of its intent to stimulate the development of community programs for older citizens as well as research and training projects in the field of aging. In the intervening years, however, it has been realized that if this act were strengthened, more services could be provided at the local level.

Proposals being weighed would extend grant programs authorized by this act beyond their expiration date of June 30, 1972, and vastly expand them. They would provide for more comprehensive community services such as transportation, counseling and other social services, employment and volunteer opportunities, and recreational and educational activities, all of which are so vitally needed in Prince Georges County.

We recently enacted legislation to help senior citizens, especially those living alone, who are unable to prepare meals for themselves because of physical handicaps, etc.

Grants will be made through the State agency on aging to public and private organizations to establish and operate meal projects in local communities.

The meals are to be served at a social setting such as a school, senior citizens center or church. In addition, nutrition education classes and pertinent social services will be available for the participants of these programs. The projects are also to provide meals for elderly individuals in the community who are home bound.

As yet funds have not been appropriated for this program, but the President has requested that \$100 million be budgeted for fiscal 1973. If this amount is appropriated, Maryland will be eligible for \$1,465,000 in order to establish meal programs in our communities.

I am sorry time does not permit me to discuss more proposals before Congress. I think it's clear, however, that Congress is deeply committed to meeting the needs of the elderly, and that it is attempting through legislation to make retirement years those which are filled with purpose, dignity and security.

I believe similar action is necessary on the State and county level. In particular, I would like to see the development of a county department similar to the health department which would handle the problems of senior citizens and be their voice in local government.

Again, I would like to say that I am grateful for this opportunity to be able to discuss some of the steps Congress is taking to improve the well being of older citizens.

I value your counsel and advice and am always eager to take advantage of your great experience as I carry out my responsibilities as your representative in Congress.

ATTITUDES, NOT WEAPONS, ARE CAUSES OF VIOLENCE

HON. GENE SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, with all the debate over gun control being heated up here again in the Congress, I believe the following article by Col. Charles C. Oldham, one of my constituents and a former police official, should prove most interesting and enlightening to my colleagues here in the Congress. Colonel Oldham's letter, which appeared in the Louisville Times, is printed below:

ATTITUDES, NOT WEAPONS, ARE CAUSES OF VIOLENCE

(By Charles C. Oldham)

With the attempt upon the life of Alabama Gov. George C. Wallace, another sad chapter has been added to the political history of the United States. This attempted murder has brought about a spate of radio and newspaper editorials condemning the availability of handguns in the United States. A local radio commentator made a point of saying that unless handguns were removed from the American scene within the next decade, presidential elections, as we now know them, will disappear.

This commentator went on to speculate that if handguns were permitted to remain in the hands of the American people, only millionaires could aspire to and obtain the office of the presidency.

The obvious fallacy of such an assertion is that a very small percentage of American voters ever gets within "handshaking" or pistol distance of the candidates. Additionally, one who has spent hours in the planning of security for a presidential visit, and who has taken part in the actual security operation, I know of no absolute way to protect an exposed president even if there were no handguns.

A number of the editorials condemned those who support private ownership of guns. But contrary to the general thesis, it is attitudes that contribute to violence, and not the tools of violence.

This commentary will not be predicated upon statistics regarding the use of handguns, or the use of rifles, or the use of automatic weapons, nor, indeed, will it be predicated upon the use of other weapons such as knives, clubs, or even stones in the hands of capable people. This is not the time to deal in statistics, for no matter how many deaths may have been caused by handguns, or by rifles, or by knives, each man's death is the ultimate to him. No amount of statistics will change or add color or distract from that one passing. However deplorable it is to our political system to see aspirants for public office shot down, it is no greater tragedy than for the person who feels a cold blade enter his rib cage in some dark street, nor is it any more tragic than the helpless victim of a mad-eyed rapist, nor is it more to be deplored than those victims who die at the hands of some demonic arsonist. Death or the injuries that one sustains when an attempt is made on his life is to be deplored no matter what the circumstance.

Philosophically, then, let us consider what we can do about this tragedy, or about all of

the tragedies: the knifings, the clubbings, the poisonings, the burnings, the rapings, the pillage. Our greatest failure, it seems to me, lies in the fact that our courts have not done the job that they have sworn to do, and this may largely be laid at the feet of those who are ever eroding our rules of evidence.

Every time a crime is committed with a handgun or any weapon, or indeed with bare hands, if the courts were to fix the penalties prescribed by law, despite the multitude of extraneous legal manipulations, these would, indeed, be the greatest deterrents.

Courts today, rather than finding that persons are guilty, often seem more bent upon trying the police officers who make the arrests. The proponents of the broader reach of the First, Fourth, Fifth, Eighth and 14th amendments of our Constitution are just as intent upon diminishing the Second Amendment, which gives us the right to bear arms in this free nation.

As law-abiding citizens, it isn't our desire to bear arms or to possess arms, be they handguns or long guns, for the destruction of people, but it is rather for the protection of our homes, of our property, and, most of all, our persons.

Nothing would please me more as an old policeman of long, long standing than to see the need for policemen, for guns and for protective measures disappear from the earth, but such is not about to happen.

Through all of man's history, strife, injustice, assaults have occurred. Only in periods when laws have been rigidly and impartially enforced has there been any diminution of the ravages of crime.

Let's assume for the moment that we were to pass gun confiscation, not registration—for indeed, confiscation is the true motive behind those who talk of registration laws. Let's assume that we were to pass confiscatory laws: From whom would the guns be confiscated?

Only the law-abiding citizens who would go down and turn in their arms or register them would be concerned. The hundreds of thousands and, indeed, millions of weapons that have been stolen from homes, military arsenals, manufacturing plants and from interstate commerce would never be registered, would never be turned in, but would remain in the hands of the potentially greatest dangers to this democracy ever known. The preponderance of these weapons are in the hands of would-be revolutionaries, and criminals who have rationalized the rectitude of their endeavors.

Parenthetically, one is moved to ask some questions, for example: Where were the voices of the gun repressors following the wanton murder of a presiding judge in California when he and others were abducted from the courtroom? Assuming, also, that we were to agree that confiscatory laws were the proper answer, how in a democracy can all clandestine weapons be found?

During the riots of recent memory in New Jersey, when quantities of machine guns were known to have been stolen, the Civil Liberties Union obtained a court order against a house-to-house search for weapons by the police, and strangely enough, I believe this court action was proper. It points up, however, that gun-registration laws cannot be adequately enforced in a nonpolice-state type of government.

An even larger question might be, are we reaping the whirlwind of too many years of too much civil libertarian court intervention? Not only has this meddling been in the area of criminal justice, but more insidiously it has been in the area of weakening our nation's moral restraints.

Thanks to those who weep loudest, now we no longer have prayer in our schools or Bible reading in our schools; on the contrary, channels of filth in literature and motion pictures have been opened through

the expansion of the court interpretations of the First Amendment of our Constitution.

Repression, including gun controls, is not America's answer; America must once more love herself because her people love themselves, and Americans can only love themselves when they once more come to think of themselves as God's special handiwork.

AMERICAN BUSINESS DESERVES A PAT ON THE BACK—NOT A KNIFE IN IT

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, during the past decade, Government at all levels and private citizens have become increasingly aware of the need to preserve and improve the quality of our environment. This is indeed an important and worthwhile undertaking and will have a critical effect on the type of life our planet is able to sustain in future generations. At the same time, some overzealous environmentalists seem to feel that progress per se is wrong regardless of the economic and social benefits to be gained. Ed Reinecke, the distinguished Lieutenant Governor of California and our former colleague in the House, has done an excellent dissection of the basic tenets of the antibusiness ecological extremists and I am certain the Members of the House will find his recent remarks in Pacific Business of particular pertinence.

ONE MAN'S OPINION: AMERICAN BUSINESS DESERVES A PAT ON THE BACK—NOT A KNIFE IN IT

(By Lt. Gov. Ed Reinecke)

One of the most significant social changes to emerge in the last 10 years is the environmental revolution. Within a relatively short time politicians from all sides of the ecological arena have begun calling for stronger conservation laws and an end to any pollution.

Our system has let us down, they say. Industrial development is immoral, worthless and damaging to society. Do away with growth, they say, curb technology, or the world will self-destruct in two generations.

Obscure scientists bask in front page publicity by describing disasters that might occur; politicians hall themselves as defenders of the environment against industrial polluters and crafty consumer exploiters; and the consumer as taxpayer is horrendously exploited. A few opportunistic lawyers, supposedly acting in the public interest, indulge in a kind of publicity-rich legal guerilla warfare to put a stop to anything anybody doesn't like, anything that makes a profit and smells of progress. As a result, the confused public is ready to believe anything that sounds reasonably logical, especially if it also sounds frightening.

NO TO PROGRESS

We are told we've got to put a stop to progress and get off the growth kick if we are to survive. No more power plants. No SST. No Space Shuttle. No increase in the Gross National Product. No more technological advances. Curtail the use of energy. If industrial plants pollute, shut them down. If they present a problem, don't build them. If this throws men out of work, let them find other jobs.

Let single-minded officials set ultimate anti-pollution standards and demand instant adherence, whether or not there are yet practical ways to do it. Put a stop to the mining of coal, curtail highway construction, go to court and delay anything that purports to be essential to growth of any description. This, the neo-conservationists say, is the only way to preserve the world we live in.

This new awareness of nature and our responsibility to preserve the beauty and the wonder of this earth now receives a high priority in almost every activity. Yet, over-exaggerations by groups of emotional extremists hurt the cause of the sincere and dedicated conservationists who have done so much to alert us to the need for environmental safeguards. In the name of ecology or consumerism or some other ology or ism, these extremists are laying siege to state and federal government, demanding laws to regulate industry on the premise that the United States is on the brink of catastrophe and that only a brand new socio-economic system can save us.

An environmental extremist can be identified through his inability to accept reality, as reflected in his cry that man interferes with nature. Such a thing is patently impossible. Man is part of nature. We didn't come here from some other planet. Anything we do, we do as card-carrying members of Mother Nature's brood. We don't accuse a beaver of interfering with nature when it gnaws down a tree to build a dam. Then why condemn humans for chopping down a lot of trees to build a lot of dams . . . or to do anything else that will make their lives safer, longer, more enjoyable or more productive.

When it comes to a choice between saving human lives and saving some fish, I will sacrifice the fish without a whimper. It's not that I'm anti-fish; it's just that I am pro-people.

ENVIRONMENTAL MYTHS

There are a lot of widely accepted environmental myths that don't stand up to fact.

Take the one about the oxygen we breathe. We hear that the burning of fuels by industry is using up the earth's oxygen and that, eventually, there won't be any left and we'll suffocate. But fact doesn't bear this out. The National Science Foundation recently collected air samples at 78 sites around the world and compared them with samples taken 61 years ago. Result: there is today precisely the same amount of oxygen in the air—20.9 percent—as there was in 1910.

What about water pollution? Certain people remember that in the days before America was industrialized, our rivers and lakes were crystal clear. And those crystal clear rivers and lakes were the sources of the worst cholera, yellow fever and typhoid epidemics the world has known. Just one of these epidemics—in 1793—killed one of every five residents of Philadelphia. Our waterways may not be as pretty as they used to be, but they aren't deadly either. In fact, the water we drink is the safest in the world. What's more, we're making progress cosmetically. Many of our streams will soon look as wholesome as they are.

In California we have enacted and are enforcing the nation's strictest air pollution controls. California has probably the largest air monitoring network in the world. We have funded millions of dollars to support crucial research and we have just implemented an agricultural burning program. The California Air Resources Board now reports a year-by-year decrease of air pollutants, such as hydrocarbons, since 1967. Our own state has led the nation in efforts to protect the environment against everything from smog to offshore oil spills. And we are convinced that industrial progress can be made compatible with the necessary efforts to protect the environment.

CVIII—1395—Part 17

CHEER UP

Population control is another popular cause. The spectre of people standing elbow-to-elbow is raised as the frightening prospect if we don't take drastic steps to curb the birth rate. Well, cheer up. The birth rate in the United States has been dropping continuously since 1957 and is now at the lowest point in history. If the trend continues, it is remotely possible that by the year 4000 there won't be anyone left in the country. But things like excessive population growth and decline have a way of adjusting to conditions, and I have no doubt that our birth rate will pick up in due course.

How about the unemployment myth? Certainly even one unemployed person is a grave problem, but we must remember we are making a transition from the inflated wartime boom of the 1960's to a peacetime economy where, hopefully, we will have prosperity without ruinous inflation, full employment without war.

And we are making progress. Early last year I requested Governor Reagan to break state precedent and give the Lieutenant Governor jurisdiction over the California Department of Commerce. That department encompasses world trade, tourism and economic development. We operate on a small budget and with few people, but have succeeded in working as a catalyst to stimulate expansion in each of these areas.

There is certainly much to be done, but I take pride in working successfully to obtain congressional and federal approval of the Lockheed loan. We have made three trips to Washington on this and other sizeable federal contracts, including the Space Shuttle program, which could result in 50,000 jobs and \$12 billion for the California economy. We succeeded in bringing a new ship-building contract for two ore-bulk-oil supertankers to San Diego, and we have worked on numerous other job-bearing contracts such as the \$120 million TRW HEAO Satellite and the \$370.3 million B1 fighter bomber, which could create as many as 4,000 additional jobs in the state. We have formed a Lieutenant Governor's Commission for Aerospace Reemployment and, in fact, received a \$200,000 grant for a reemployment operation center in Sacramento.

The most significant sign of progress, however, is the creation of the new California Commission for Economic Development sponsored by the California Chamber of Commerce and passed by the last session of the Legislature. This commission established a bi-partisan economic planning body to develop meaningful programs for industrial development, tourism and world trade.

But even as we plan for intelligent, thoughtful growth, extremists will look back to the "good old days" when there weren't any factories to pollute the air and kill the animals and drive people to neurosis with misleading advertisements.

THOSE WERE THE DAYS

What was life really like in the "good old days"—say, 150 years ago? For one thing, it was very brief. Life expectancy was 38 years for males—a grueling 38 years. The work week was 72 hours. The average pay was \$300 per year.

But women, in the absence of any liberating force, had it worse. Housewives worked 98 hours a week without dishwasher or vacuum cleaner. Food was monotonous and scarce. In the winter you froze and in the summer you sweltered. And when an epidemic came—and they came frequently—it would probably claim someone in your family. In your entire lifetime you would probably never hear the sound of an orchestra, own a book, or travel more than 20 miles from the place you were born.

Whatever American businessmen have done to bring us out of that paradise of the

"good old days," they deserve a grateful pat on the back—not a knife in it.

The opportunity is ours to establish a new way of getting things done. To set intelligent pollution objectives and press for technological breakthroughs to help us meet them.

We have established procedures, such as the State Clearinghouse and the Environmental Quality Study Council, to investigate major environmental controversies, consider positions and claims and settle controversies out of court, with power to enforce the decision. We can discourage resorting to the already overburdened courts to resolve problems that can be far more constructively resolved by negotiation.

We must encourage the news media and politicians to spend less time fanning the fires of controversy so they will have more time to assess the economic, social and long-range ramifications of important environmental questions. We must encourage opinion leaders to develop the assets of our society, which are many, instead of exploiting its weaknesses. We should oppose those attempts to discourage technological advances on the basis that in them there might be some hidden or latent danger.

TOWARD TOMORROW

We must work together, all on the same team, to solve the environmental problems that we all know must be solved. And we can do it without wounding the Goose that Lays the Golden Eggs.

Industry and commerce, science and technology are our tools, as well as our problems. The proper use of them is the only possible means by which we can improve the quality of life for 20 million Californians. The era of quantity at any environmental cost is gone; the era of reverence for the environment is here to stay.

It won't be easy to fire up enthusiasm in the face of the frustrations, doubts, distrust and disbeliefs that have accumulated. It won't be easy to convince your neighbor that in this world he has the best chance ever of living a full life and getting his money's worth. It won't be easy to make him see there will be a tomorrow, in spite of the dozens of popular crises this state is said to be facing.

But there will be a tomorrow and it won't be nearly as bad as the emotional extremists would have us believe. Let us resolve that 1972 will be the year we convince the people of California that our state is great, that our future is bright.

SALUTE TO EDUCATION

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, passage of the annual education appropriations together with the Hathaway amendment provides me with a chance to acknowledge the vital function performed by the teachers of American schoolchildren.

Great opportunities usually involve great challenges. Certainly that is the continuing experience of the classroom teachers, who daily strive to develop the intellectual potential of our children and to inspire them to high levels of achievement. It is no accident that successful individuals commonly recall particular teachers whose efforts contributed greatly to their development. Such recollec-

tions are but one indication of the indelible impression that effective teachers make upon young people.

Congress is playing a vital role in seeking to allocate adequate resources to enable our schools to achieve greater success in equipping young people to live and work in the complex, technological world of today and tomorrow. As we strive for that goal, we should pause to pay tribute to the persons who are directly involved in American education, particularly to the teachers who daily encounter the imaginations, curiosities, and energies of schoolchildren. I salute them one and all.

ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL SITE IN BUFFALO IS CIVIC PROJECT

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, 6 years ago, the Congress supported my pleas for Federal help in saving from destruction and restoring as a national historic site the Ansley Wilcox Home, downtown Buffalo mansion where Theodore Roosevelt took the oath of office as President in 1901.

One of the requirements of the authorizing legislation was active community participation, including financial. There were skeptics at the time who expressed doubt that the community support would be forthcoming.

I am happy to report to my colleagues, many of whom were Members when my enabling bill was passed, that the skeptics were wrong.

The Wilcox Home has been restored and much of the building refurbished in a widely supported community project. Many organizations are joining with the coordinating Theodore Roosevelt Inaugural Site Foundation in this historical effort.

Many individuals are cooperating in this successful venture, indeed, so many that I hesitate to try to list them for fear I will overlook someone.

Just last Friday, I had the honor to present to the Wilcox Home a flag which had flown over the Capitol. The occasion was the dedication of a new 30-foot flagpole purchased with the aid of Dow & Co., and its chairman of the board, Mrs. Jane P. Dow, and the Landmark Society of Western New York.

Presiding at the dedication and accepting both the flagpole and the flag was Frank D. Leavers, chairman of the Theodore Roosevelt Inaugural Site Foundation. Representatives of the city and the county, as well as private organizations were present.

The progress and enthusiasm associated with this entire project are most gratifying, particularly to those of us who have been a party to the effort from the outset.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I include an article from the Buffalo Eve-

ning News of June 13 regarding further restoration plans for the Wilcox Home.

DINING ROOM NEXT TO BE RESTORED AT WILCOX MANSION

(By Kathy Kelly)

Less than a year after completion of a four-year restoration of the library of the Wilcox Mansion, 641 Delaware Ave., plans are being made to recreate the historic home's adjacent dining room.

Frank D. Leavers, president of the Theodore Roosevelt Inaugural Site Foundation, hopes to have the dining room project complete by Sept. 14, the first anniversary of the home's dedication as a National Historic Site.

Unlike the library, which has been restored to its condition of Sept. 14, 1901, when Theodore Roosevelt stood there to take the oath of office as the nation's 26th President, the dining room will be done in the style of a later period, "but still reflecting the tastes, charm and elegance of the earlier years when the house was in its prime," according to the preliminary report.

Once again, the foundation, the Junior League of Buffalo and the Buffalo & Erie County Historical Society are working together on the project.

This time, their source is a 1930 newspaper photograph of the room.

As in the first restoration, the committee is seeking to locate the original furnishings and to duplicate those that cannot be found. If necessary, other pieces of the same era will be used, Mr. Leavers said.

A major piece being sought is a four-arm crystal chandelier removed from the mansion when it was converted into a restaurant in the 1930s. Its present location is unknown.

The gas chandelier, which bathed the room in soft yellow light, hung from a large plaster medallion in the center of the ceiling. The medallion, decorated with a fan-shaped design and flowered rim, is now framed by a fibreboard ceiling added in more recent years.

The original ceiling will be restored and the chandelier, wired for electricity.

The room's east wall is dominated by an ornate marble fireplace. Its chimney has been closed at the roof, but could easily be opened to make the fireplace usable, the report said.

The adjacent wall features large windows and double doors, topped with a delicate, leaded palladian window, opening to the mansion's south porch. The room also opens to the main stair hall and the middle hallway.

The 400-square-foot dining room, now occupied by galleries of the Buffalo Craftsmen Inc., already has had its painted Georgian Revival woodwork, walls and floor restored.

Major structural work, such as heating, plumbing and electrical work, also was completed in the original restoration. Thus the major job will be collecting the furnishings.

The furnishings shown in the 1930 photograph include a pedestal dining table and six chairs made by Buffalo Furniture Manufacturing, a company located on Washington St. in the first quarter of the century.

Another major piece is a china cabinet with an arch top and glass front.

An oriental rug covered the floor and Oriental bowls stood on pedestals in the room's corners.

The fireplace was fronted with a pierced brass fender. Finally, a large china cat door stop was on the floor before the porch doors.

"Eventually, it's our desire to go into other rooms in the house," Mr. Leavers said.

He also announced the appointment of two new members to 2-year terms on the foundation's Board of Trustees. They are: John M. Finnegan, commercial division manager of the New York Telephone Co., and Donald D. Notman, senior vice president of Marine Midland Bank—Western.

Peter B. Seever, a present board member,

was named to the board's Executive Committee.

MAJOR CHALLENGE TO BANK COMPETITION BEFORE THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important cases involving bank competition in many years will be decided by the Supreme Court of the United States during its next term beginning in October. This case, United States against First National Bancorporation and First National Bank of Greeley, Colo., will in all likelihood provide some important guidelines for the effective administration of the Bank Merger Act of 1966 and the Bank Holding Company Act. To date, these laws, largely because of the effective enforcement record of the Antitrust Division of the U.S. Department of Justice, have been extremely successful in stopping anticompetitive acquisitions in both large communities and small throughout the United States.

The major question before the Supreme Court in the Colorado bank case involves the application of the potential competition principle, which seeks to preserve for the future the possibility of substantially increased competition in a particular market, even though the challenged acquisition may not reduce existing competition. This principle of potential competition is an extremely important concept for bank regulators to have at their disposal, especially now that we are seeking the creation of a large number of new statewide banking systems in many States.

I am particularly pleased that this crucial case is receiving careful analysis by others than the principal litigants before the Supreme Court. For example, in the April 1972 issue of the Banking Law Journal a detailed discussion of the importance of this case is set forth by Dr. Jerome C. Darnell, formerly associate professor of business administration at the University of Colorado and now an economist on the staff of the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia.

More recently, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Commissioner of Banking for the State of New York have filed amicus curiae briefs with the Court expressing their views. In the past, Government agencies that had an important interest in the outcome of administrative and judicial decisions to be made by others have too often failed to express publicly their concern over the impact of these decisions on their own activities. Therefore, I am very pleased to see that in a case as important as the Colorado bank case the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the New York State Banking Commissioner, as supervisory agencies seriously concerned with competition in banking, have availed themselves of the opportunity to give the Supreme Court the benefit of their expertise on this most important issue.

AMERICAN INGENUITY IN LOCAL COMMUNITIES

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I recently was associated with a unique event that provides a new sense of direction for some of our citizens in enhancing the American way.

American businessmen are known throughout the world for their ingenuity, creativeness, and inventiveness, but to apply these attributes to the public service—in an area that will benefit community and charitable organizations—is an added and laudable dimension.

Fred Richmond, a successful businessman as chairman and president of Walco National Corp., and a Brooklyn, N.Y., civic leader, applied those attributes in an unusual conception that benefited 14 Brooklyn organizations and thousands of worthy people, by a plan that none could do by itself.

The very heart of community action is rooted in community organizations—charitable, medical, vocational. Their work is vital. Within the perimeter of their neighborhoods, they are the people the area knows, trusts, and counts on. They are never big. Indeed, that is their strength. Each, by itself, must raise the funds to feed its mission. Each year this gets harder and harder. Each, by itself, could not harness the power needed, the magnet required to fill a great house of the Nation like Carnegie Hall. But what a thrill for a small Brooklyn organization to sit in the hall of the immortals; to sponsor a concert by two of the greatest artists of the world.

That is where my friend, Fred Richmond, came in. He brought his organizational know-how, his creative skill to the problem.

Mr. Richmond decided to rent Carnegie Hall for the evening of June 11 and booked the celebrated cellist, Leonard Rose and the prominent pianist, Misha Dichter. He then selected 14 religious and charitable organizations, who organized their own committees to dispose of some 2,800 tickets at uniform benefit prices. More than \$20,000 was raised—some organizations raising more than others, depending on their efforts. Of course, 100 percent of the funds were kept by the groups. Mr. Richmond said:

It is an opportunity for organizations who need help to help themselves at no cost.

Commenting on the Richmond idea, Hon. Sebastian Leone, president, Borough of Brooklyn, said:

Fred Richmond is a civic leader who cares deeply about people, his community and Brooklyn. Fred is a dreamer and doer. His initiative, energy, vitality and brilliance enables him to build and achieve what often seems impossible.

Typical of his generosity is his presentation of this concert tonight to help 14 Brooklyn organizations help themselves. Some \$20,000.00 has been raised to support their constructive work. It is a demonstration of community inter-action at its best.

Fred is a fully committed Brooklyn citizen who deserves our gratitude.

The event was preceded by the presentation of the annual Star of Brooklyn Award to Hon. Meade H. Esposito, chairman of the County Democratic Committee of Kings County.

Mr. Esposito is deserving of the award, for in addition to being a farsighted political leader, he has worked indefatigably and quietly for numerous civic, charitable, and religious Brooklyn organizations and has been singularly responsible for the resurgence of the Borough of Brooklyn.

I salute the organizations who participated.

B'nai Akiva Youth Movement, Brooklyn Association for Mental Health, Hebrew Institute for the Deaf, Hapoel Hamizarchi Women's Organization, International League for the Repatriation of Russian Jewry, Kane Street Synagogue, Kingsbrook Jewish Medical Center, The League School, Manhattan Beach Jewish Center, Mirrer Yeshiva, Prospect Park Jewish Center, Prospect Park YMCA, Yeshiva of Crown Heights, and Yeshiva of Flatbush.

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 9610—TO REDUCE THE LAG IN VETERANS' PENSION AND COMPENSATION INCREASES

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to call the attention of my colleagues to a bill—H.R. 9610—to provide for automatic cost-of-living increases in VA compensation, dependency and indemnity compensation, and pension payments. The concern that veterans and their families receive the full and true amount of the pension or compensation due them is, I believe, reflected in the operation and intent of my bill. As the cost of living rises, higher prices eat into the small, semifixed compensation or pension provided by the VA. The veteran living on this income must use up some of his savings or cut his consumption of very basic items in order to make do with this pension or compensation payments while waiting for Congress to enact an increase in the pension and compensation rates that would restore the purchasing power of his VA payment. Often it is a year or more before an increase reaches him. Simply, it is to reduce this lag between rises in the cost of living and congressional action that I have introduced this bill.

In the face of our current inflation, the purchasing power of those on fixed incomes, such as people who depend on VA pension and compensation payments, suffers significantly. These men and women are usually too old or disabled to work and consequently do not get the benefit of rising wages. In addition,

these people, many of them aged, are often unable to shop around and take advantage of the best prices thus increasing the impact of inflation. This group of low-income, aged, and disabled citizens must depend on congressional action to match rising prices and maintain the value of their incomes.

In the past, Congress has responded generously and fairly to maintain the real value of veterans' pensions and compensation. As you know, the last of these periodic adjustments was the comprehensive increase in payments made 2 years ago in Public Law 91-558—to take effect January 1, 1971. Though this was largely in response to the 15 percent social security raise which cut into many pensions, it also provided an increase in VA pension and compensation payments which roughly covered the rise in prices since the effective date of the last increase, January 1969. But even with the increases Congress has provided, there still remains the problem of the veteran who had to live on his fixed income during the 2 years between increases and must now pay prices that have risen almost 5 percent since the effective date of the last pension increase in January of this year.

Unfortunately, we in Congress are limited in the time we can devote to consideration of these necessary increases and adjustments of pension and compensation payments. Prompt and frequent as our action can be, there is still a lag between the time a veteran or his survivors need an increase in pension or compensation payments—because of the increased cost of living—and the time congressional action becomes effective.

My bill would, by providing automatic quarterly adjustments in veterans' pension and compensation payments based on the Consumer Price Index, act to maintain the value of pensions and compensation in the face of inflation and remove the necessity of waiting for congressional action. Basically, H.R. 9610 reduces to a practical minimum the impact inflation has on those receiving VA-provided incomes. It would relieve Congress of the extra burden, in an already heavy legislative schedule, of enacting periodic pension and compensation increases to counter inflationary trends.

The system mandated in my bill would operate in the following way:

Each calendar quarter, the Veterans' Administration would determine whether the Consumer Price Index, measuring general cost-of-living increases, has increased more than 3 percent in the previous quarter, compared to a base quarter. If the VA finds that the Consumer Price Index has risen more than 3 percent, then veterans' benefits would be increased by the same percentage—with provisions for rounding off the results. The new increase added to the previous payment would then become the new base for the next computation.

The benefits of these increases would go to those receiving compensation for service-connected disabilities, dependency and indemnity compensation for service-connected death, pensions for

nonservice-connected disabilities, death, or service, and those receiving old-law pensions.

In conclusion, I would like to point out that my bill is not designed to reduce congressional authority over pensions and compensation payments or, in effect, to reduce the generous pension increases that, in the past, Congress has provided. I am aware, as I am sure you are, that, over the long history of the VA pension and compensation programs, Congress has provided a total increase which has gone well beyond the rise in the cost of living. And, I am sure that Congress will continue to review the pension and compensation programs and revise them when it finds inadequacies in their operation or the rates of payment. Rather, my bill frees Congress to act on pressing needs for change in other areas of veterans' affairs and for comprehensive review of existing and proposed programs—including pension and compensation programs—while leaving the necessary periodic adjustments to the operation of a cost-of-living escalator.

I, therefore, call for favorable action on H.R. 9610 so that the modest compensation and pensions that we provide those who sacrificed so much for their country will maintain their real value in the face of any present or foreseeable inflation.

CONGRESSMAN PAUL G. ROGERS RECEIVES OUTSTANDING SERVICE AWARD

HON. WILLIAM R. ROY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, on May 26, the American Gastroenterological Association presented Congressman PAUL G. ROGERS its first Outstanding Service Award. The event was held in conjunction with the association's annual meeting in Dallas, Tex.

As one who has the honor to serve under Mr. ROGERS' chairmanship on the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I was extremely pleased to hear of this award.

In his acceptance speech, Mr. ROGERS discussed the need for greater professional concern about such crucial areas as preventive medicine, health manpower development, and more effective health care delivery systems.

I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD the text of Mr. ROGERS' acceptance speech as well as some introductory remarks by Dr. Howard E. Ticktin of Washington, D.C.:

INTRODUCTION OF HON. PAUL G. ROGERS BY
HOWARD E. TICKTIN, M.D.

As gastroenterologists, we are fortunate to have many friends outside our profession. It is my happy duty this morning to introduce to you one of our most distinguished and most helpful friends.

Congressman Paul G. Rogers is from West Palm Beach, Florida, and represents the 9th district of that state in the U.S. House of Representatives. He has served in the House since 1955 and has risen over that period

to become chairman of one of the most important subcommittees in Congress: The Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. As chairman of this subcommittee, Mr. Rogers exercises jurisdiction over public health, food and drug regulation, health manpower, hospital construction, health research, mental health and retardation programs, and drug abuse, as well as important environmental issues such as air pollution, solid waste disposal and water hygiene. In recent years, he has become known as "Mr. Health" in the Congress.

Mr. Rogers is the son of the late Congressman Dwight Rogers. He was educated at the University of Florida, receiving both a B.A. and a law degree there. Prior to his election to Congress, Mr. Rogers served in World War II, earning two battle stars and the bronze star, and later engaged in the private practice of law in West Palm Beach.

I first met Mr. Rogers last September when Dr. Jim McGuigan and I visited the Congressman to discuss the possibilities of hearings on legislation to establish a separate N.I.H. institute for digestive disease and nutrition.

I was immediately impressed by Chairman Rogers' attitude. We had previously visited many congressional offices and had spoken with several members of Congress, and generally had received polite, but reserved and non-committal reactions. With Mr. Rogers, there was a definite difference. First of all, he gave us almost a full hour of his valuable time on a day I knew was an especially busy one for him. Secondly, he really wanted to know about the problems of digestive diseases. He listened very carefully to what we had to tell him and asked some very penetrating questions—some of which were so penetrating that I had to dig up the answers after our visit and send them to Mr. Rogers by mail!

But what most impressed me was his attitude toward what could be done to alleviate the problems we discussed.

On November 9th and 10th of last year, Mr. Rogers' subcommittee conducted two days of hearings on digestive disease problems. On March 22nd of this year, his committee reported out a bill, H.R. 13591, which made a number of changes in the name and structure of the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases. The Whole House passed this bill on May 3rd, and the Senate followed suit on May 5th. Finally, on May 19, President Nixon signed the bill into law. As a result, the N.I.H. Institute which is charged with the responsibility for digestive disease research and training programs is now known as the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases. As a further result, there will soon be established a special committee on digestive diseases of the institute's advisory council to review digestive disease research grant applications and advise the institute's director on matters relating to digestive diseases. Finally, the position of associate director for digestive diseases has been established by the new law, and hopefully, will soon be filled. The end result of these changes is expected to be a substantial increase in the amount of money allocated to Federal programs of research and training in digestive diseases. We have strong evidence that such funding increase is already developing.

The thirteen million Americans afflicted with chronic digestive diseases have, primarily, one man to thank for this progress: Our distinguished guest today, Congressman Rogers.

I can think of no better way to conclude my introductory remarks than by reading the inscription on the award we are presenting Mr. Rogers today:

"Congressman Rogers is hereby commended for his outstanding efforts during the 92nd

Congress to focus attention on the great unmet need for more research and training in the digestive disease field. At his urging and under his able chairmanship, the House Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment produced a bill, H.R. 13591, which is expected to result in a substantially expanded Federal program of research and training in digestive diseases. The victims of digestive disease, and all Americans, are deeply indebted to Congressman Rogers for his dedicated and effective leadership in health research, health training and health services."

Ladies and gentlemen, the Honorable Paul G. Rogers.

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE PAUL G. ROGERS AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN GASTROENTEROLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

Dr. Hightower, Dr. Ticktin, ladies and gentlemen:

I am very pleased and gratified to accept this Outstanding Service Award. I am doubly honored in that it is the first such award your association has given.

But first, let me congratulate you on the celebration of your Diamond Jubilee Year. Seventy-five years of service in the cause of improved health care for the American people is a record of which you can be very proud.

It has been rewarding working closely with your leaders over the past year or so, especially with your officers and with your own Washingtonian—Howard Ticktin, and your excellent representative John Grupehoff, who is one of the most knowledgeable men on health affairs in the capital. I am very impressed with the AGA's dedication and sincerity. Your concern about the thirteen million Americans afflicted with digestive diseases is highly commendable.

Despite your record of achievement, however, I am sure you would agree that much more needs to be done. In biomedical research, in manpower development, and especially in patient care, we cannot afford any "resting on laurels".

One major step has been taken in the research field with the signing last week of H.R. 13591. I am very proud to have worked with you on this new digestive disease legislation and I am convinced that the net result will be an increase in the Federal government's efforts in research into the causes, cures and treatment of digestive tract diseases.

Your efforts must not stop here, however. The name of the game now is appropriations. I hope you will continue to support your leadership in their efforts to secure adequate appropriations for digestive disease research programs, especially within the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases.

In addition, I might suggest that you consider developing sources of funding for research outside the Federal government. You are all aware of the government's cutbacks in spending on various health programs in recent years. Many worthwhile research projects have had to be abandoned as a result of these cutbacks. Those of us in the Congress who have fought against these "penny wise/pound foolish" reductions have not always been successful. Hopefully, we will do better this year. To skimp in this area—where most hospital cases originate—is false economy.

I am aware you are considering the establishment of a layman-oriented digestive disease society, similar to the American Cancer Society. Without meaning to meddle in your internal affairs, I would simply point out that this seems to be a fine idea. A strong digestive disease society would serve as support for proper funding and also augment government research programs.

In the area of manpower development, I am aware of the need for more specialists such as yourselves. During our hearings on digestive diseases last fall, Dr. Ticktin pointed

out to our committee that there are only about 2,000 M.D.'s with special training and professional interest in gastroenterology, and that only some 500 are board-certified. He also told us that seven states have no such board-certified specialists and nine states have only one.

This is clearly inadequate considering the numbers of Americans afflicted with the diseases in which you specialize. Hopefully, the legislation which became law last week will begin to remedy this situation. The language of this legislation instructs the director of the re-named Institute to carry out programs of support for training in digestive diseases, including support for training in medical schools and graduate clinical training.

I would mention, however, that there is a large and growing tendency to give special emphasis to programs aimed at the development of primary care physicians. Moreover, I support this position. Despite the great need for additional members of certain specialties—and your own specialty is clearly one of the most undermanned—it is nevertheless a fact that millions of Americans have great difficulty obtaining even the most basic medical attention.

This brings us to the area of patient care. As you may know, we in the Congress are working on legislation this year regarding health maintenance organizations. Many of us are becoming convinced that a reorganization of our health care delivery system is very much in order. Most of us are determined to avoid "socialized medicine" in which the providers of care are in effect employees of the government. However, we cannot ignore the spiraling costs of health care, the wide-spread lack of access to health care and health care facilities, and the variable quality of health services.

I strongly urge you to take an interest in these problems and in the various proposed solutions to these problems, including, possibly, health maintenance organizations. Most of you are established specialists. It might be easier for you to sit back and let someone else worry about these problems. It might be easier to ignore attempts in your local community to better organize health care. But let me assure you that if these problems are not solved through HMOs and other reasonable approaches, attempts will be made to solve them with radical new programs which may dramatically change the practice of medicine as we have known it.

You are all aware that it has always been something of a cliché to say that the best health care is that which prevents sickness. Likewise, you are all aware that American medicine has been mainly "curative" rather than "preventive". You may not be aware, however, that these clichés are beginning to take on substance in governmental health programs. Programs to encourage forms of multi-phasic screening are being approved; programs to increase primary care in order to reduce the higher expense of hospital care are being approved; and programs to re-double our efforts to vaccinate against diseases are being approved.

One particular element of preventive medicine—nutrition—is especially applicable to your own specialty. Many people feel that physicians have not given proper attention to nutrition. These feelings are being translated into pressures on Congress to do something about nutrition problems. It seems to me that, as digestive disease specialists, you can perform a great public service by increasing nutritional research and applying that knowledge to preventing nutritional deficiencies. You might also think about expanded programs of public education in nutrition.

I have mentioned only a few of the many aspects of health in which you have a direct interest. I would be negligent, however, if I did not add that all health dis-

ciplines have a responsibility in all other health matters. We cannot afford professional isolationism at this point in time.

Cancer was given a very high priority last year in legislation. But cancer people would be remiss if they do not lend their aid to the added emphasis we are now trying to give heart, lung, digestive and other diseases.

What I am saying is that we must all share a responsibility to give the total health issue our support—even after individual victories have been won.

A new system of health must be devised for the people of this nation. A system based on a solid foundation of our existing system of health, but one which will be more responsive to today's needs.

The focal point of that effort will be the creation of a new, Cabinet-level Department of Health. We vitally need to bring it all together for health. We are now laboring under a fragmented, unguided, patchwork of programs which has become crisis-oriented.

Every aspect of health is related to all other aspects. The minute you enter a patient into a hospital for observation or for an operation, you have engaged a care facility where manpower, space and a payment mechanism come into play. If your patient's ulcer suddenly perforates or bleeds, and he must be taken immediately to a hospital, that emergency service and the status of the blood bank are other links with the overall health service system of which you must be cognizant.

Somewhere I remember the phrase "bring us together". Well, I can think of no other segment of our life that needs bringing together more than health.

That is why it is absolutely necessary for us to give health a proper priority, to bring together all of our health efforts where a Secretary of Health can propose and advise the President on the health care to be provided to all Americans—where a national plan can be projected to reach a national goal.

I ask you here today to join in this effort. It will not be an easy task. And for just that reason, your help and leadership is needed all the more.

Our challenge—to provide the best medical care for our citizens—is a great challenge. But the rewards of accomplishment will be equal to that challenge.

LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCILMAN TOM BRADLEY HONORED

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, this Friday the people of Los Angeles are honoring city councilman Tom Bradley.

While serving as a policeman for 21 years and a city councilman for the past 9 years, Tom has shown enormous understanding for the needs of Los Angeles citizens. His tireless efforts have made the city a better place to live for all Angelenos. His public service has also brought him a national reputation as an authority in urban problems.

As one who has been privileged to know and work with Tom for many years, I must say that this acclaim is more than well deserved.

Tom is a pioneer in coordinating the activities of urban government around Los Angeles, throughout California, and

the Nation. Among his many duties he serves as chairman of the State, County and Federal Affairs Committee; president of the National Association of Regional Councils; president of the Southern California Association of Governments.

Honoring Tom Bradley is a pleasure and a privilege. His legislative achievements in crime prevention, a clean environment and economic betterment plus a myriad of other social problems are cause for due tribute. I join the many who have benefited from his presence in Los Angeles in extending my deepest appreciation and wishes for his continued success.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND POLITICS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the political season has again arrived when the temptation to promise gifts to everybody overcomes dedication to good government—especially is this true when the gifts and promises are to be paid with other people's money.

I insert the following news clipping detailing the "shell game" perpetrated by legislation proposing either a 10 percent or 20 percent increase in social security benefits and explaining the real effect of such legislation on the American economy and financial picture in the RECORD.

[From the Richmond News Leader,
June 20, 1972]

SOCIAL SECURITY HOAX

Every time that Congress starts tinkering around with the Social Security program, Americans ask only two questions: (1) How much more will I get? from Social Security recipients, and (2) How much more will I have to pay? from workers who have to finance new increases.

This summer, the public should ask more than those two questions, unless it is willing for Congress arbitrarily to derail the traditional system. This may come about as the Senate considers a House-passed bill providing for five per cent benefit increases; the Senate Finance Committee has seen the House's five per cent and raised it to 10 per cent. Some 60 members of the Senate vow to try for a 20 per cent increase. If either the 10 per cent or 20 per cent increase goes through now, it will cause a radical departure from the traditional method of Social Security funding.

In the past, Social Security has operated on a theory thought to be actuarially sound, whereby reserves covered future commitments. This method kept the level of payroll taxes roughly tied to benefits, exerting a measure of self-discipline; i.e., Congress could not lavish generous benefits on recipients without simultaneously increasing payroll taxes enough to finance its generosity. Now, however, the Senate may abandon this traditional system to a non-actuarial system. If it succeeds, it will be able to use reserves to finance unparalleled election-year increases for recipients without raising payroll taxes to the drastic level necessary to finance those benefits.

In this manner, 28 million Social Security

recipients would benefit from a one-time windfall that would wipe out Social Security trust fund reserves, without forcing Congress to enact unpopular tax increases that could cause resentment among 80 million American workers. And, in an exercise of political cynicism, members of Congress hope to get the benefit increases through in time for recipients to receive the increases, retroactive to June 1, in their November 3 checks. That's only four days before election day. Draw your own conclusions.

Although inflation hits those on fixed incomes the hardest, it still is possible for Congress to enact equitable benefit increases without going overboard. From the outset, the program never was intended to provide full retirement benefits; it may be recalled that the maximum tax paid annually in the late 30s was \$30 a year each by employer and employee. As late as 1954, the maximum contribution was \$72 each for a worker and his employer. Under the House-passed bill, the maximum contribution from employer and employee would jump to \$754.80 each, or to a total of \$1,509.60 a year. By raiding the trust fund, the Senate probably could avoid such steep increases before 2010, when the number of persons retiring will jump as those born during the post World War II baby boom reach 65. Then the tax would have to rise to 25 per cent or 30 percent to finance benefits.

Along the line, no one has seemed too interested in where all of these proposals may take the program: Let the Congress of 2010 grapple with that problem. Historically, Congress has maintained at least a pretext of benefit-contributions restraint; now the Senate Finance Committee would abandon even this pretext by raising monthly benefits for small contributors to \$200 a month for a single worker, and to \$300 a month for a retired couple. This action would further undermine the program by turning it into a method of income redistribution through a system of regressive taxation that bears most heavily on medium and low wage-earners.

By trying to combine a welfare program with a contributory retirement program, Congress eventually may succeed in alienating young workers who must pay for Social Security. Under the current system, an 18-year-old who works 46 years will pay in an average of \$19,200 before retirement. If that money were invested at 5.5 per cent, and added to his employer's matching contribution plus interest, at retirement he would have a \$171,316 nest egg. If he purchased an annuity with his payroll tax, matched by his employer's contribution, plus interest, he would have a principal that would pay him \$17,316 a year, or \$224,200 during his average life expectancy after retiring. At most, he can expect to get a total of \$80,888 in benefits from Social Security under the current system, or \$94,400 under the House-approved measure.

The income from Social Security taxes now represents the government's second largest source of income, exceeded only by income from the individual income tax. This income runs around \$50 billion a year now, giving Congress a nice piece of change to play around with in election years. This year, given the chance, Congress may go the whole route and wipe out Social Security reserves to accomplish a one-time windfall benefit. That might be a shrewd move, on a temporary basis, during a recession or a depression, but it hardly makes sense at a time of economic recovery, when no more inflationary pressures are needed.

It also would add to the Federal deficit under the unitary budget system, because trust fund surpluses are borrowed to offset deficits in government operations. If the Senate, and then the House, goes along with this proposed shell game, it may endear itself to the gimme vote, but it will make no friends

among those who recognize a hoax when they see one.

A CATASTROPHE

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the entire Nation and most of the world is aware of the tragedy that struck Rapid City a couple of weeks ago because of the heavy loss of life in that flood.

A similar tragedy, without the loss of life, is taking place in western Minnesota and eastern South Dakota, which draws hardly any notice, outside of its immediate area, but which might cost the people just as much as the Rapid City disaster.

The area to which I am referring had an abnormally wet fall and plentiful spring rains. At about the time the land was ready for planting, additional heavy rains began to fall. Some areas had as much as 10 inches of rain within 2 weeks.

Fields are flooded. Crops that had been planted have been washed out. And the rain is still falling.

Margery Burns, one of my favorite rural Minnesota newspaper columnists, treats with this problem in a recent column which I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with your permission, and which I hope all of my colleagues will read:

A CATASTROPHE

A catastrophe hit western Minnesota. If it had come in one day, the whole country would know about it. But the rain took a whole month to turn western Minnesota into a disaster area.

Flooding rivers are spectacular. Flooded fields are only sodden masses of land which can't be seen from the highways. And because this catastrophe isn't a spectacular disaster, the extent of it and the results of it don't get the attention. But the results will be as devastating as a hit-and-run tornado.

The time it takes to plant the crops is short here in Minnesota. If June comes without most of the corn being planted, then there is no use to plant corn. No crops of any kind, small grain, sugar beets, soybeans, can be planted if farmers can't get their machinery into the fields.

And that is the situation in western Minnesota.

This is tough on farmers. And it's tough on everyone living in western Minnesota. This affects bankers and implement dealers and appliance dealers. It affects clothing stores and school teachers and cafes. Doctors and insurance agents and feed salesmen are affected. There isn't one single person who won't feel this catastrophe in the next year.

There are plans being made now by different groups to get Congress to change the regulations so that farmers can plant other crops besides their allotments wherever they can get their machines in. More plans are for disaster loans for farmers. Every avenue for help is being pushed.

When a sudden catastrophe strikes, everyone rushes in with all kinds of help and aid. But when a catastrophe creeps in, it is so unbelievable that it paralyzes everyone. Until it's almost too late.

If Congress and if the Department of Agriculture will help western Minnesota now,

they will save many people along with the farmers.

HAMS SERVE US

HON. CHARLES THONE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. THONE. Mr. Speaker, radio amateurs, licensed by the Federal Communications Commission to operate broadcasting stations on a noncommercial basis, call themselves hams. They form one of the most valuable groups in the United States in giving public service, particularly in times of emergency.

There are more than 270,000 hams licensed by the FCC and more than 100,000 are members of the American Radio Relay League, the ham's association. Hams have provided advances in radio techniques, bouncing signals off the moon, and developing the single-sideband system, since adopted by the military as their means of communication.

Hams provide the only link for the outside world in remote areas, such as Pitcairn Island. Hams were the means by which Thor Heyerdahl's Ra expeditions remained in touch as they crossed the ocean.

Whenever there is a disaster, such as the flood at Rapid City, S. Dak., in 1972, or the Alaska tidal wave of 1964, the hams are on the air 24 hours a day providing communication. They serve in little publicized ways also. For example, a fire on railroad property in Nebraska was quickly extinguished earlier this year because it was reported by a radio amateur.

One of the greatest public service ventures involved with the war in Vietnam was organized by a Nebraska ham, Hugh Tinley. Back in 1967, he arranged with the Pentagon for establishment of an amateur radio station in Vietnam, operated by hams in service. Through this station and the hams in America, about 30,000 mothers, wives, and children have talked to their servicemen in Vietnam in a project called Operation Hello.

A man who had just escaped after being a prisoner of the Vietcong was able to inform his mother personally of his safety through Operation Hello. A mother who had just been informed that her son had been wounded was reassured by a personal call from him. A wife and mother of a Marine captain talked to him shortly before he was killed in battle in Vietnam. They wrote: "You can understand how precious that call was."

The radio amateurs are organized to work both with the American Red Cross and Civil Defense. The week of June 18-24 is Amateur Radio Week and a celebration of the 58th birthday of the American Radio Relay League. This weekend will be the annual field day for thousands of hams, who will travel to unpopulated areas to test their abilities to operate under emergency conditions. With their own power supplies, they will be operating portable equipment; so that

they will know they are ready to function in event of disasters.

America is grateful for the hams who serve us.

SALUTE TO EDUCATION

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, today as we salute education in America and stress the important role it plays in a free society such as ours, let us take a moment to consider the unique opportunity we have as lawmakers and public servants to work together with educators for the betterment of that society.

It is our fortune that our lifetime is marked by the most dynamic changes and far-reaching challenges ever faced by a human generation—from science and technology to economics, politics and culture. For education in this country, there has been no escape from this pattern of accelerating change and challenge and we are steadily moving closer and closer to quality education for all Americans.

Changes in student population and attitudes, teacher supply and demand, public tax bases and resources, public aspirations and expectations, plus professional demands and innovations have all resulted in central and immediate challenges to the contemporary American educator.

Yet a second look at these educational challenges reveals that the educator is not alone in the search for the best responses—for issues involving students, teachers, taxpayers, public desires and professional debate also deeply involve the lawmaker at all levels of Government. In fact, it is proper to speak of the educator and the lawmaker as in partnership for the promotion and advancement of American education.

Within the last 20 years, Federal aid to impacted areas, the National Defense Education Act, the Higher Education Act of 1965, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the Education Professions Development Act, the Education Amendments of 1972 and a host of other statutes have greatly increased the Federal contribution to American education. At the same time, the State governments have likewise increased their concern for and contribution to elementary, secondary and higher education.

William Allen White once said that:

In education we are striving not to teach youth to make a living, but to teach youth to make a life. . . .

To ensure the best life for youth and for all Americans, we, in Congress, must continue to work together with educators throughout our Nation to evolve a harmonious, complementary relationship which will allow us to bring to bear our finest talent as we face the educational changes and challenges in the years ahead.

SPORT MAGAZINE HONORS PITTSBURGH AREA COLLEGE STUDENTS

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, each month Sport magazine picks an outstanding student athlete as its "College Athlete of the Month." This young man or woman not only is an individual who has performed capably on the intercollegiate athletic fields but he or she is a person who has made significant contributions to society in nonathletic activities.

Of the 12 young men and women chosen last year by Sport, three of them either live or go to school in the Pittsburgh area.

John Babinecz, an outstanding varsity football player at Villanova, is a resident of the Oakland section of Pittsburgh and a constituent of mine; Joel Klimek, who lives in Seanor, Pa., was one of the last year stars of the University of Pittsburgh's football team; and George Karl, of Penn Hills Township, just outside of Pittsburgh, was a sparkplug for the University of North Carolina's basketball and baseball teams.

Each of these young men distinguished himself in sports competition and each made a much greater mark contributing something of himself to his fellow man.

I would like to introduce into the Record at this time the "College Athlete of the Month" articles on these men, which appeared last year in Sport magazine. And I want to wish them congratulations and success in whatever endeavors they choose.

COLLEGE ATHLETE OF THE MONTH

(By Don Kowet)

JOHN BABINECZ, VILLANOVA UNIVERSITY

At Villanova University, linebacker John Babinecz was an agile and devastating tackler. Quick at reading enemy defenses, Babinecz consistently turned his territory into a graveyard of busted plays. He was steady under fire. He was ruthless. And the Dallas Cowboys made him their second-round draft choice this year.

There's another dimension to the man: John Babinecz the straight-A student at Central Catholic High School in Pittsburgh, who was elected to the National Honor Society and to the student council. Now add a third dimension: A man with a deep and abiding love for kids.

Babinecz was born in Pittsburgh, the second of three brothers. His father was an ironworker who died in an on-the-job accident when John was only six. "It was kind of difficult for my mother," he recalls. "She received some money from Workmen's Compensation, but we never lived in luxury."

John played football in high school, tight end and linebacker. At Villanova, he took a general social science major, plus the organic chemistry and biology courses required for pre-med students. He soon excelled both scholastically and on the gridiron, two activities demanding enough to consume all the time of most undergraduates. But not for Babinecz. At the beginning of his junior year, a seminarian (a student preparing for the priesthood) asked him if he'd be willing to go to the St. Edmund's Home for Crippled Children once a week to help out with a

physical therapy program. "I went down there," John says, "and I really had a good time with the kids. So I just kept on going for the next two years."

It's a bald, factual statement, but overly modest. Says G. A. Macklin, the novice seminarian who first brought Babinecz to St. Edmund's Home: "Every Friday night, when the social fraternities were at their peak, Babinecz and his friend Jim Coneys, along with a handful of seminarians from St. Mary's Hall, were at the Main Line YMCA, giving the children from St. Ed's their physical therapy. Even during the spring, after their Friday practice, those two would come running over to St. Mary's to catch the ride to St. Ed's and then to the 'Y.' On Sunday mornings, you'd see these two come to Mass with the children, take them out for rides in the 'Babinecz-mobile' in the afternoons. Sure the kids were crazy about the two 'jocks,' but anyone who would drag himself off a field on a Friday afternoon to take 20 screaming kids swimming . . . well!"

Eventually, Coney's visits were curtailed by a football injury. But Babinecz, alone, still kept up his visits. "I don't know why," he says, laughing. "I just love kids, yeah, I do. I love them because they'll tell you how it is no matter what. Even if it hurts."

The first time he went to the Home, it did hurt. "I'd never been among kids like that before," he says. "I was really despairing, because you see all these kids—and you wonder what kind of future there is for them." He saw kids with cerebral palsy, kids with birth defects, paraplegics, the mentally retarded. And on that first visit they were suspicious of him. It was a challenge. "I started going down there every week," he says. "I'd take them swimming, and after a while they began to ask me to hold them while they tried swimming—and I knew they were beginning to accept me." Soon he was taking them out in the "Babinecz-mobile." "I took them in my car out to a farm nearby to see a horse named Rocky—Roan old nag who's always out by the roadside." Babinecz always took along a supply of sugar and apples. "Most of the kids were afraid of Rocky at first," he says, "but by feeding him they lost their fear and ended up petting him. You can't imagine how they loved it."

With a contract from the Cowboys in the offing, Babinecz has decided to postpone his dreams of becoming a pediatrician, at least temporarily. "The Cowboy linebackers, Howley and Jordan, are great vets to learn from," he says. "I figure I can wait around maybe a year or two just learning from them, and then when they retire, I'll be able to step right in. After this season I'll have time to decide if I want med school bad enough."

So, some future time, when you watch John Babinecz in a Cowboy uniform, remember that you're seeing only one dimension of the man. Under the helmet there's an acute intelligence that earned him academic honors. And the hands that can slap an opponent into the dirt are the same hands that guided crippled kids in a swimming pool, that reached out to kids maimed by fate.

JOEL KLIMEK, UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

Joel Klimek, the University of Pittsburgh's 6-2, 225-pound tight end, was born in Seanor, Pennsylvania, a mining town tucked in the hills outside of Johnstown. "I think we were lucky if we had 100 people in our town," he says. "You knew everybody. The only way you met someone new was to hitchhike out of town for the day—say, to a town with 200 people."

But Joel rarely rode out. As a boy, he says, he was shy. And even with the free ride, without cash to spend small towns can be cold towns.

Joel's father was a miner. Periodic work stoppages meant interminable weeks of waiting, relieved only by daily trips to the mining

office and weekly queues for unemployment benefits. "My mom was always able to take care of my sister and me, even when things got tough for my dad," he recalls. "But sometimes it was a struggle."

In a small Pennsylvania town isolated from city diversions, street football became, for kids like Joel Klimek, the drive-in movie, bowling alley and miniature golf range all in one. "Football was about the only thing I knew how to do in those days," Joel says.

Of course, football was more than a game to the kids of Seanor. It was a short-cut to the good life, a meal ticket to prosperity. Success at football meant a ride in the American Dream Machine. And the prerequisite was a college scholarship.

At Conemaugh High School Klimek lettered in basketball, track and football. But football held top priority when he matriculated at Pitt in 1965. However, that year so few authentic candidates showed up for early practices that Pitt cancelled its freshman schedule. Klimek spent the year daydreaming about the gridiron instead of studying. The following year he found himself in overwhelming academic difficulties. He left school, returned home to work for a mining company. A few months later he was drafted for the war in Vietnam.

"I was a mortarman with an infantry company and we were in the field for the whole year I was in Nam," he says. In June of 1969 he came home, with five medals (including the Bronze Star) and scar tissue from three wounds.

But Joel brought back something beside the medals and combat scars. When he returned to Pitt in the summer session of 69, it was with a new commitment. "I'd really matured in the Army," he says. "Besides the pressure of combat—what you see, what you do to survive—what helped me was meeting so many different people and talking about different views and ideas."

First proof of this new maturity came when Klimek's name appeared on the academic Dean's List. It also showed on the football field. Last season he caught 29 passes for 329 yards and one TD, while establishing a reputation as one of the fiercest blocking ends in the East. When his eligibility for the 1971 season was temporarily in doubt, a half-dozen NFL teams asked him to come to their training camps as a free agent. But Klimek decided to stay at Pitt. His teammates needed his football skills. (By the fourth game of '71, Klimek had caught 15 passes for 177 yards, including seven for 102 yards against West Virginia.) Besides, some kids needed his compassion.

For his most enduring souvenir of Vietnam was a vivid knowledge of human suffering. When his class of 20 in a physical therapy course was offered work in a special on-campus program for the mentally and physically retarded, only four students accepted the challenge. Klimek was one of them.

Initially he devoted two days a week to helping retarded kids, five to 18. "We just tried to get them to do normal, basic things with their hands. Little things. Like rolling a ball." But soon he started showing up after classes, too. Joel began to get involved—with one child in particular. The boy was about 15, had been a bright child till the age of six, when he had suddenly developed epileptic seizures.

Joel says: "Here was this big kid, maybe an intelligent kid—and we had to half-carry, half-walk him around the room all day to keep him from dropping off to sleep. He had to have the drugs because without them he was hyperactive, which brought on the attacks. But with the drugs he became listless. It was depressing."

But Joel—along with the other staff—persevered. And by the end of last year the boy was transformed. "The change was amazing," Joel says. "We had him stepping through innertubes and following and understanding verbal commands."

Change. The child trapped in a body short-circuited by seizures had begun to respond. Change. The miner's son who had only known how to play football had become a Dean's List student who knew how to care.

GEORGE KARL, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

A high school basketball star in suburban Penn Hills, Pennsylvania, George Karl filled his days with varsity sports: A year of football; four years of baseball, volleyball and basketball. And after sports came his studies—and after homework came drive-in movies and dates. It was an affluent town, and kids like George Karl could afford to indulge themselves with harmless entertainments.

Except that some kids got restless. A drug mania drowned their emptiness. "There were two or three people—great people—and I saw them get destroyed by the drug culture," George says. "They not only ruined their basketball careers, they ruined their minds. All of them could have been leaders, so by ruining themselves they ruined a lot of other people, too. People they could have helped."

After graduating from high school George entered UNC at Chapel Hill with a basketball scholarship. For one year he forgot the friends he had seen drift off in a heroin haze. He played six games for the UNC freshmen, he had a back operation. Nothing changed until the beginning of his sophomore year, when he renewed an old Penn Hills friendship with Duke basketball player Dick DiVenzio. DiVenzio told George about a new narcotics rehabilitation center that had opened in Chapel Hill, on a farm only five miles away from the UNC campus. George says, "Dick asked me to go around and make talks to raise money on campus for Genesis House."

Genesis House, George explains, is a privately funded drug rehabilitation center operated by Dr. Robert Senior. "Dr. Senior doesn't want federal, state or local government funding. He wants to avoid taking money that has strings attached to it," George says. Genesis House is unorthodox—a farmhouse located on 127 acres of farmland, where 16 ex-addicts keep busy working on such tasks as raising crops and tending cattle, horses and pigs.

"There's no professional staff living with them," George says. "They're all on their own, except for one guy who was cured through the program and then asked to stay on to help the others, in a semi-official way. Of course," he adds, "Dr. Senior keeps a close watch on the entire operation."

The economic goal is to make the farm self-supporting. The psychological goal is to nurture in the ex-addicts emotional tools for their return to mainstream society. "They sit around after work and discuss their problems," George says. "They're a tightly knit group and a kind of love comes out of what they're sharing now, the experiences they went through outside. They feel loved and realize they're lovable." This new-found self-esteem eventually enables them to leave Genesis House without fear of an eventual relapse into addiction.

Unorthodox, yes—and therefore dependent for survival on private contributions. "I go around and speak at women's groups, Kiwanis Clubs, business organizations, fraternities, sororities—and I ask for donations," George explains. "Mainly I fill my talks with statistics. I tell them how there are 25,000 heroin addicts in the state of North Carolina, how that represents an increase of 55 percent over the past five years. I use statistics to try to scare them into facing reality: That the drug problem isn't just something that happens in New York City; that the drug problem is in their high schools, their universities—right here in Chapel Hill."

According to Karl, last year Genesis House collected \$26,000. "This year," he says, "we were lucky enough to start off with a \$30,000 grant from a local church group. And the

basketball team held a day this year when we sold autographs, gave away basketballs, got fans to pose for pictures with us for a small contribution—we raised \$1000 that day alone."

On that North Carolina basketball team, one of the top ranked in the nation, the 6-1, 183-pound junior is "point man" or "quarterback"—the guard who calls all offensive and defensive signals. "When I graduate I might go into coaching," George says. "If I don't play pro ball. Or else I might go into the Peace Corps for awhile—I'm a political science major and the Peace Corps would tie a few of the things I'm interested in doing into a bundle. One thing I have decided," he adds, "is that I want to get into a career where I can really help people."

So his goals, his attitudes have altered since high school. His involvement with Genesis House has led to a personal genesis of his own—a creative start toward a lifelong commitment.

SALUTE TO EDUCATION

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, today, June 21, 1972, educators from around the nation are joining in a Salute to Education. Education is the lesson of the past, the source of today and the hope of tomorrow. This salute is only a small tribute to our educational institutions and to those men and women who have dedicated themselves to the enrichment of this country's educational process.

The rapid growth of educational quality in our Nation is perhaps the major reason for our assumption of leadership in the world. We are simultaneously a model to the emerging smaller nations of the world and respected by the larger nations. It is largely through the accomplishments of our educated men and women that this country and others have flourished.

All of society benefits from the education of its members; technological and medical breakthroughs result from the research, philosophies, and dreams of our educated. These advancements have strengthened the foundations of the societies of the world, and in this country, we can now look forward to a longer and more leisurely life. Education is the essential base from which society grows and prospers.

Our educational system prepares its men and women to realize the full potential of themselves and their nation and to create new horizons for which to strive.

More important, however, education has and must continue to teach each man to become a free thinker in society. It must encourage man to thrust his individuality into the world of the unknown—to think, choose and act for himself in relation to those around him. Education is more than the knowledge gained from books. It is, rather, an ongoing process of life.

Through education comes change, and change is the heartbeat of society. The future of all nations depends on the educated man's dissatisfaction with the present. Education has taught man not

only to desire positive change, but also to accept it.

Therefore, I am proud to join in this salute to education—for what it has done, for what it is doing, and for what it will accomplish in the future. We must continue to support and encourage our educational system. We deserve it.

"PLUTONIUM AND THE ENERGY DECISION"

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, at an appropriate time during the debate on the Public Works/AEC appropriations bill, I will offer an amendment to delete all funds for the liquid metal fast breeder reactor—LMFBR—demonstration project. I feel that this project will put us on an irreversible course to an energy economy based exclusively on plutonium, one of the most toxic substances known to man.

This is a highly complex area of public administration, but after close study, and after noting the opinions of some of America's foremost scientists, including several Nobel Prize winners, I have concluded that it would be wise to delay this demonstration project until we have evaluated all the alternatives. For example, fusion reactors are considered a feasible and safer means of power production than the LMFBR's. Have attempted once to delete the LMFBR research funds from the appropriations bill, I will not offer that again, but the demonstration project should be seriously questioned.

I would like to invite my colleagues to read the article I will append below which discusses the consequences of our Nation committing itself to plutonium technology. It is by Donald P. Gessaman and was published in the September 1971, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists.

PLUTONIUM AND THE ENERGY DECISION (By Donald P. Gessaman)

In our social climate of aggressive change, technology has evolved to a special station. As a catalyst of change, technology has become a basic implement of economic and political power. As a consequence, technological decisions are made on the limited social and physical scales dictated by specific economic and political responsibilities. This decoupling of decision from the complete world is the indulgence of a society that is socially diffuse and physically unconfined. It is an indulgence that can no longer be sustained.

The premium value placed by our society on growth and innovation manifests itself in a promotional attitude towards technology. Within this basis, benefits are regarded with indelicate optimism, and detriments as the hobgoblins of small minds. In the absence of any effective institution of contrary bias, the promoter's influence has become the dominant and hence the characteristic influence in our society attitude toward technology. This situation deprives society of an overall appreciation of alternatives and implications, and hence, in the largest sense, is not beneficial.

Technology has conferred upon our society a way of life. Society is now vaguely coming to realize that something must be done to assure that this way of life is acceptable and sustainable. If these expectations are to be realized, then decisional decoupling and promotional bias must be recognized as defects in the present relationship between society and technology. The energy crisis, the reactor controversy and, more specifically, the proposed plutonium economy of the future are representative of this problem. It is in this context that they will be considered.

The present energy crisis in this country is largely confined to the electrical sector of the energy market. During this century the electric utility industry has enjoyed an uninhibited growth through orders of magnitude. The dilemma in which this industry presently finds itself is a consequence of the intrusion of new growth limiting factors on its former economic isolation. Because of this intrusion the industry has begun to recognize the distinction between markets and needs. It is certainly true that the markets for electric power are not saturated, and to the extent that they are decoupled from the social and physical world, the markets could be expected to grow exponentially for some time to come. But it is naive to believe that saturation of the markets will painlessly place the ultimate limit on the growth of the electric power industry. In fact, what the present crisis demonstrates is that physical limitations such as fuel availability, biological limitations such as air quality, and social limitations such as siting criteria are factors that intercede long before market saturation.

Recognition of this fact would be wider spread if a heavily subsidized nuclear technology had not materialized in the 1960s, and offered the possibility of bypassing these growth limiting factors. The Atomic Energy Commission and the reactor vendors promised clean, safe, cheap, abundant electrical power; and the utility industry accepted the nuclear solution to their restricted responsibilities, and in the years 1964-67, 60 reactors were purchased for some \$10 million in an unprecedented economic commitment to a new technology. As a result of promotional bias and isolation of decision, the determination to implement this major technology was easy for society. Too easy in fact, for now when the reactor arguments are belatedly raised in a larger forum, society is faced with its own fait accompli, and technological judgement is further distorted by deep economic involvement.

FISSION CUL DE SAC

It has been eight years since the sale of the Oyster Creek reactor precipitated the rush to nuclear power. Some 110 commercial reactors are now completed or on order, and only now are the simplest implications of the commitment being widely appreciated. Radiation standards are being contested because of the potential increase in low level radiation exposure. The threat of major reactor accident has become aggravated as reactors have accumulated more rapidly than operating experience. The disposal of high level radioactive waste is an unsolved problem; no disposal site has been finally approved; and the practicality of large scale solidification of wastes is still undemonstrated. But reassessment of the reactor decision is awkward with so much committed, with some tens of thousands employed by the industry, with billions of dollars of reactor-funding utility bonds held by pension funds, insurance companies and foundations, and with the Federal Power Act's tradition of "greatest possible economy" as an added constraint on the production of electrical power.

In the final analysis the present generation of light water reactors is a technological cul de sac, with little relevance to a solu-

tion of the ultimate energy problem. This technology is probably no more than a final offering at the altar of exponential growth of electric power. The future and the substance of the fission program is the breeder reactor, and the representative fuel of the breeder is plutonium.

Plutonium is an element virtually nonexistent in the earth's natural crust; for all practical purposes it is of man's doing. It has several long-lived isotopes, the most significant being plutonium-239, which because of its fissionable properties and ease of production is potentially the best of the three fission fuels. Plutonium-239 is an alpha emitter with a half-life of 24,000 years, hence its activity is undiminished within human time scales. It is 30 years since plutonium was first produced and isolated by Glenn T. Seaborg, now chairman of the AEC, and his colleagues. Until recently it was significant only as a nuclear explosive. Now, the Atomic Energy Commission is promoting it as the energy source of the not too distant future. How is this new technology to be assessed and appreciated by society? From Chairman Seaborg's "child-in-the-manger" descriptions of plutonium's origin; from romanticizations of the future, reminiscent of Jules Verne; from speculative projections of energy needs and markets to the year 2020? The more favorable side of the picture will assuredly be there; but is that enough for society or even utilities to judge by responsibly when considering the conjectured primary energy source of the future.

If the liquid metal fast breeder reactor is developed and implemented according to AEC projections, then by the year 1980 commercial plutonium production will be 30 tons annually, and in excess of 100 tons by the year 2000.

Plutonium is a fuel that is toxic beyond human experience. It is demonstrably carcinogenic to animals in microgram quantities. (Pure plutonium-239 in this amount would be roughly the size of a pollen grain). One millionth of a gram injected intradermally in mice has caused local cancer. A similar amount injected into the blood system of dogs has induced a substantial incidence of bone cancer because of the element's affinity for bone tissue. It is fortunate that the body maintains a relatively effective barrier against the entry of plutonium into the blood system.

Under a number of probable conditions plutonium forms aerosols of micron-sized particulates. When lost into uncontrolled air these particulates can remain suspended for a significant time, and if inhaled they are preferentially deposited in the deep lung tissue, where their long residence time and high alpha activity can result in a locally intense tissue exposure. The lung cancer risk associated with these radiologically unique aerosols is unknown to orders of magnitude. Present plutonium standards are certainly irrelevant and probably not conservative. Even so, the fact that under present standards, the permissible air concentrations are about one part per million billion is a commentary on plutonium's potential as a pollutant. Its insolubility and long half-life make the continuing resuspension of particulate contamination another unresolved concern of serious proportions.

Nor is plutonium contamination an academic question. In May 1969 the most costly industrial fire in history occurred in Colorado at Rocky Flats, the weapons-making plant operated for the Atomic Energy Commission by Dow Chemical. This major plutonium handling facility lies 10 miles west of Denver. A subsequent environmental study by an independent party, E. A. Martell, revealed that offsite plutonium contamination was two to three orders of magnitude greater than would have been expected from measured plutonium losses in the heavily filtered air effluent of the plant. After-the-fact ex-

planations seemed to fix the source of this anomalous contamination as wind blown plutonium that had leaked from openly stored barrels of contaminated oil. The plutonium involved in the fire was largely contained and apparently was not implicated in the off-site contamination. Nevertheless, it is hardly reassuring that consequent to this fire Congress voted a special appropriation of \$25.5 million (of a projected \$118 million) for the upgrading of "fire protection, safety and operating conditions" at Rocky Flats and similar facilities. And there is little comfort to be found in the irresponsible waste disposal practices which were revealed by the investigation after the fire. The leakage of plutonium from the contaminated oil led to an uncontrolled source of plutonium which was some orders of magnitude larger than the integrated effluent loss during the 17 years of plant operation. As a result of this source, tens to hundreds of grams of plutonium went off site, 10 miles upwind from a metropolitan area. The loss was internally unnoticed, the ultimate deposition is now speculative, as is its human significance.

Is present society so psychically stable, so civilly docile that it can have its energy addiction based on a material whose radiological toxicity is such that a few ounces might cause a million undetected and irremediable fatal injuries? A complex and sophisticated society must bear the burdens of vulnerability and constraint that are inherent in its technologies.

Implicit in the present nuclear industry is the production of fissionable material. Our transition to plutonium as a major energy source will inextricably involve our society with the large-scale commercial production of a substance that is a suitable nuclear explosive. A mystique of scientific accomplishment surrounded the development of nuclear weapons during World War II. That mystique has become illusory. The main practical impasse to nuclear weapon manufacture was perfecting and implementing the expensive technologies for manufacture of fissionable material. Gaseous diffusion enrichment of uranium and reactor breeding of plutonium were major industrial projects in their own rights, but they are now implicit in the nuclear power industry. A reactor of even the present generation will produce some 250 kilograms of plutonium per year, and since the amount necessary for an explosive device is described by Theodore Taylor as "a few kilograms," the substantial weapon capability of one commercial reactor can be inferred.

By the year 2000 plutonium is conjectured to be a major source with an annual production in excess of 100 tons. Can these quantities be handled without internal subversion? Underworld involvement in the transportation industry is legendary, and theft in the industry is epidemic. University unrest is ubiquitous, radical activism is a reality. So far as accountability experience is concerned, Nuclear Materials and Equipment Corporation (NUMEC), over several years of operation, was unable to account for six per cent (100 kilograms) of the highly enriched uranium that passed through its plant; and at a recent safeguards symposium the director of the AEC's Office of Safeguards and Materials Management observed that "we have a long way to go to get into that happy land where one can measure scrap effluents, products, inputs and discards to a one per cent accuracy."

[A number of "misroutings" of special nuclear materials has occurred and these have pointed clearly to the need for enhanced safeguards to prevent loss by theft or hijacking.]

On March 5, 1969, a container of highly enriched UF-6 (uranium hexafluoride) was shipped from Portsmouth, Ohio, to Hematite, Missouri. It did not reach its destination in Missouri. The AEC, the Federal Bureau of

Investigation and many individuals searched intensively. Finally, on March 19, the shipment was found in Boston.

In the same month of 1969, a shipment of highly enriched uranium destined for delivery at Frankfurt, Germany, wound up in London. In April 1970, a drum of waste containing some 70 per cent enriched uranium which was being shipped locally from one firm to another in the same California city ended up in Tijuana, Mexico. U.S. Representative Craig Hosmer of California, a member of the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy who described these incidents in a talk last year, recalled that the report on the Tijuana diversion was entitled: "Inadvertent export of special nuclear materials." Ed. Note]

When plutonium commonly exists, the possibility of theft will exist, and accountability will be difficult and the technology needed to make an explosive device will be available in textbooks, as it is already. Finally the social price for dealing with the problem effectively may be paid for dearly by the loss of some poorly seen freedom.

Quite aside from this, if the plutonium economy is implemented in the United States, then by symmetry it will inevitably be implemented by other major powers, and the technology would be marketed in all the small and underdeveloped countries that are struggling for stability. With reactor fuel plutonium, fission weapon capabilities are only days away. This capability makes nuclear disarmament seem remote, and is part of the responsibility of accepting the nuclear economy.

Since the Eisenhower administration the exchange of peaceful nuclear technology has been a component of our foreign policy. The peaceful atom has been internationally promoted with enough effect in obtaining signatories to the Nonproliferation Treaty. Without criticizing the Treaty or its intentions, it must be recognized that the line drawn between peaceful and nonpeaceful nuclear technology may effectively define no more than an irony.

Unless fusion reaction feasibility is demonstrated in the near future, the commitment will be made to liquid metal fast breeder reactors fueled by plutonium. Since fusion reactors are presently speculative, the decision for liquid metal fast breeder reactors should be anticipated. Considering the enormous economic inertia involved in the commitment, it is imperative that the significance of the decision be symmetrically examined prior to active promotion of the industry.

In our present society, it is doubtful that this will be done. Promotional bias and isolation of decisions will preclude it. The Atomic Energy Commission, in its posture of promoter, will be functionally unable to serve also as a critical advocate for society in general. This responsibility will be outside the restricted economic sphere of utility and vendor. In this unbalanced situation uncertainties will be unnoticed and shortcomings degraded. Public, industry and government will be effectively uninformed. Unless some new institution of assessment intercedes the consideration affecting the decision will be defective. Technology is too dominant and society too restricted for such defects to be tolerable. A flawed judgement involving plutonium, and all other decisions could be irrelevant.

FISSION AND FUSION REACTORS: THE ALFVEN MEMORANDUM

In the long run fossil fuels cannot satisfy rising energy demand in the world. There are only three sources of energy known which are sufficiently powerful: (a) solar energy, (b) fusion energy, and (c) fission energy. The first one is completely pollution-free, the second one almost pollution-free. The third one is necessarily combined with

production of large quantities of radioactive poisonous elements.

In my opinion, the dangers associated with fission energy have not received necessary attention. Whether the pollution caused by fission reactors in normal operation is below a safe level or not is a controversial matter. If a reactor goes out of control, the consequences may be terrible. Even if extreme safety precautions are taken, the large quantities of radioactive material in them constitute a permanent danger. For example, in periods of political or social unrest, sabotage against reactors may cause catastrophes. Furthermore, in a full scale fission program, the radioactive wastes will soon become so enormous that a total poisoning of our planet is possible. Under such conditions safety margins, which are acceptable in other fields, are inadequate. It is not evident whether the waste problem can be solved in a satisfactory way.

If solar energy or fusion energy were available now at comparable cost no one would use fission energy (for peaceful purposes). Unfortunately this is not the case. Solar energy is available but at prohibitive cost. However, there are new interesting solar energy projects which should be examined carefully.

Concerning fusion energy, there is a general agreement that no fundamental obstacle is likely to prevent the construction of a fusion reactor, but there are a number of difficult scientific and technical problems which must be solved. There is much speculation about how much time is needed to solve these problems, but it is just as much a question of how much effort has to be spent.

In my opinion a solution of the fusion problem is less distant today than the Moon was when the Apollo project started. This means that if a national effort of the same kind as the Apollo program were made, fusion energy would be available in a comparable time. If this is achieved, the fusion reactor, especially the breeder, will be of interest only as a danger which must be eliminated as soon as possible.

The views expressed here are shared by many competent physicists. They are basically different from those on which present policy is based. An important decision about the future energy policy of the United States—and of the whole world—should not be made until a thorough discussion has taken place involving advocates for all the three different alternatives for solving the energy problem. (Hannes Alfven, 1970 Nobel laureate in physics, in a memorandum to Senator Mike Gravel, April 2, 1971.)

TOM BRADLEY

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate a close friend and outstanding civic leader, Tom Bradley, for his 30 years of public service to the people of Los Angeles.

I first met Tom when I was on the city council more than 20 years ago; he was then serving as a police officer in the district I represented. For the past 9 years, Tom has served as a city councilman, working tirelessly on behalf of the city and its people.

As chairman of the State, county, and Federal affairs committee, he has been a strong voice and advocate for the city before Congress and the Federal Government.

Tom has dedicated his whole life to solving urban problems, to achieving equal education and fair employment for all, and to building a safe, clean environment for Los Angeles.

I have only the deepest respect for this energetic and dedicated man. And I know the people of Los Angeles join with me in honoring him today.

VIETNAM: AN ILL-CONCEIVED STRATEGY

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested by a friend and constituent in Arlington, Va., to insert an article by Father Denis Dirscherl which appeared in the June 11, 1972, issue of Our Sunday Visitor, a National Catholic family weekly newspaper into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This article is on a subject on which thousands of articles have been written and on which there are many many areas of disagreement. The last paragraph is one in which I would hope there would be solid agreement and I would like to add extra emphasis to it:

VIETNAM: AN ILL-CONCEIVED STRATEGY

(By Father Denis Dirscherl, S.J.)

No issue has seared the heart and soul of our country more in the past ten years than the Vietnam War.

This bitter struggle has provoked a wide variety of moods in the American people. In the early years a sense of patriotism prevailed. A feeling of need to stop Communism in its tracks, a responsible movement to help defend the Vietnamese people from Viet Cong aggression, a desire to see that freedom might survive in our time—these were the predominant moods and tempers in the early days of the war.

Over the past few years the mood of many people has changed dramatically. True, the need to stop Communist aggression is still alive and conscious to the vast majority of people. But a deep seated sense of anguish and weariness has woven its way into the hearts of most Americans. Frenzy, disgust, grief, and outright exasperation are common emotional expressions of many Americans these days. As one elderly gentleman vented his full frustration in my direction the other day, "Where is the wisdom of it all? We've poured our resources down a rat-hole!"

Though it is relatively easy to find the "whys," the rationale of our involvement in the Vietnam War, the American strategy, or the lack of one, and the execution of that strategy is quite another question. As we look back to the initial stages of the war there seems to be no clearly conceived theory or conclusive strategy of conducting the war. Instead we find a great deal of patchwork, a hodge-podge.

One of the major failures was the inability to make our involvement in the war compelling to other old allies. Support, even moral, was minuscule from other friendly nations. This situation made the United States more vulnerable to propaganda blasts from the Communist countries. It was an "American" war they would say.

Another factor that came home to haunt us as the years grew longer was the inability or unwillingness to put a disciplined, well-equipped Vietnamese Army on the field. It has been only late in the game, relatively

speaking, that the South Vietnamese began to take their proper place in the war. After all, it is their country and their people.

The third and perhaps the greatest failure of the Vietnam War is the strategy itself. The United States employed a "no-win" policy. The combatant that allows the enemy free access to import supplies and arms is defeating himself. Until recently, few attempts were made to cut off the ability of the North to continue the war. The war became largely a widespread tactical skirmish. Though air power has been vastly over-rated, particularly in this war, our air force has not been able to deliver the punch that could have demoralized and weakened to submission the might of the North.

The military of our country serve as convenient scapegoats for the setbacks in Vietnam. But they are not the policy makers of our country. The President, the State Department, and the various security advisers of our country make the policies. The military only carry it out. The military, in true perspective, deserve little of the wrath that has been heaped on them in recent years.

Amidst all this controversy it took great courage and determination for the American soldier to take his place of duty in South Vietnam. How discouraging it was for him to hear all the political mayhem back in the States. It is no small wonder that more Americans did not desert to foreign shores. Most soldiers returned from Vietnam with very little welcome or appreciation for risking their lives for us. There should be no talk about the absence of heroism or the demise of the hero in American society; the real hero was often found in Vietnam.

There is no question that any consideration of the war must include a look at the "enemy." Unquestionably the soldiers and war machine of the North proved much tougher and more resourceful than the United States and South Vietnam thought possible. They have suffered heavily in the war of attrition, but they have perhaps shown us what the will to win means. They have not been deterred in their mission to this date. True, the leaders of the North, as other Communist wars and uprisings in the past have revealed, place very little value on individual life. And when it comes to treaties or negotiations they know that the only position to bargain from is a position of strength.

Vietnam has clearly shown us that the United States can no longer be the world's policeman alone. And if ever we are called to enter another struggle, we should have what is the most basic common sense: a strategy that is viable and effective, and a will to execute that strategy to victory. No less makes no sense at all.

CONGRESSIONAL CHARTER FOR POP WARNER JUNIOR LEAGUE FOOTBALL

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the Judiciary Subcommittee of the House District Committee will hold hearings tomorrow on H.R. 15188, a bill I introduced on May 24 to incorporate in the District of Columbia, the Pop Warner Junior League Football program. H.R. 15188 is very similar to legislation I introduced with a total of 111 sponsors in the first session. The purpose of both bills is to recognize the Pop Warner program for its splendid contribution to the

character development of our Nation's youth. Pop Warner football is now active in over 40 States. Through emphasis on physical fitness, cooperative team play, self-discipline, and scholarship, it is preparing over 700,000 young men for civic responsibility and leadership.

Because H.R. 15188 has been classified as private rather than public legislation, it is not possible for Members to cosponsor the bill. However, I would like to indicate for the RECORD that the following Members have endorsed this legislation:

LIST OF MEMBERS

Mr. Addabbo, Mr. Barrett, Mr. Biester, Mr. Blackburn, Mr. Boland, Mr. Brinkley, Mr. Burke of Massachusetts, Mr. Don H. Clausen, Mr. Collins of Illinois, Mr. Conable, Mr. Conte, Mr. Coughlin, Mr. Daniels of New Jersey, Mr. Dellenback, Mr. Dent, Mr. Derwinski, Mr. Donohue, Mr. Dulski, Mr. Duncan, Mrs. Dwyer, Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Ellberg, Mr. Findley, Mr. Fish, Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina, Mr. Fisher, Mr. Flynt, Mr. Forsythe, Mr. Frelinghuysen, Mr. Garmatz, Mr. Goodling, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Howard, Mr. Johnson of California, Mr. Kazen, and Mr. Kemp.

Mr. Leggett, Mr. McFall, Mr. Madden, Mr. Clancy, Mr. Matsunaga, Mr. Mazzoli, Mr. Moorhead, Mr. Morgan, Mr. McCs, Mr. Murphy of New York, Mr. Pelly, Mr. Pepper, Mr. Pettis, Mr. Rodino, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Spence, Mr. J. William Stanton, Mr. Teague of Texas, Mr. Terry, Mr. Van Derlin, Mr. Veysey, Mr. Anderson of Tennessee, Mr. Dorn, Mr. St Germain, Mr. Waldie, Mr. Whitehurst, Mr. Winn, Mr. Wolff, Mr. Wyman, Mr. Baring, Mr. Collier, Mr. Nichols, Mr. Vander Jagt, Mrs. Grasso, Mr. Sisk, Mr. Kuykendall, Mr. Gude, Mr. Long of Maryland, Mr. Mizell, and Mr. Gaydos.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a great honor for me to sponsor congressional recognition of Pop Warner football. I wish to thank those of my colleagues who have joined me in this effort and the House District Committee for its prompt action on our legislation.

SALUTE TO EDUCATION

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, today, June 21, the National Education Association is sponsoring a salute to education. At this time I would like to commend the NEA for its fine consistent leadership in the education field.

From its inception, American democracy has shared a belief in the importance of equal opportunity of education for all citizens. It was Thomas Jefferson who said:

No republic can maintain itself in strength without general education to enable every man to judge for himself what will secure or endanger his freedom.

And in our own time, President Kennedy stated to Congress:

The education of our people is a national investment. It yields tangible returns in economic growth, and improved citizenry and higher standards of living. But even more importantly, free men and women value education as a personal experience and opportunity—as a basic benefit of a free and democratic civilization. It is our responsibility

to do whatever needs to be done to make this opportunity available to all and to make it of the highest possible quality.

Our salute to education today must be a continuing commitment to these goals.

In the years since Kennedy's statement we have seen the Federal Government tangibly acknowledge the tremendous value of education in our society by enacting a variety of new programs to expand educational availability—programs to aid the disadvantaged, the handicapped, the preschool child, colleges and universities, low-income college students, teachers, vocational students, and libraries to name just a few.

This must continue to be the direction of our salute—not merely an acknowledgement of the value of education, but rather a specific commitment to education. As an example, I would particularly like to see the Federal Government expand its efforts in preschool education. As President Kennedy said:

We must do whatever needs to be done to make this opportunity available to all and to make it of the highest possible quality.

OUR TEACHERS

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the National Education Association has designated June 21 on which to hold a "Salute to Education." Any "Salute to Education" is, to me, first and foremost a salute to the hundreds of thousands of individual teachers who are rendering dedicated service to our young people in elementary and secondary schools, technical and vocational institutions, and colleges across our Nation. Too often we consider education only in terms of organized methods or philosophical concepts. But it is the individual teacher upon whom the greatness and effectiveness of our American educational system depends.

Our teachers are exerting a tremendous influence on their students and on all of the many people they come in contact with in their work. Teachers have played a large role in shaping my own personal life and career goals. Both my mother and my father were teachers. Before the age of six, I used to visit schools with my father, and so many of my earliest memories are associated with education. As early as the fourth grade, what I was taught in school about our Nation and our Government gave me a desire to participate in making the laws for our land. Various teachers also encouraged me to participate in speaking and declamation contests. Today I continue to visit schools in my district and throughout the country as often as possible, and I can truly say that I have never met a teacher who did not want his students to succeed and do well.

Mr. Speaker, the best description of a teacher's vocation is found within the very word "education," which is connected with the Latin word *ducere*, meaning "to lead." A teacher is a leader. A good teacher has all of the hard

duties and heavy responsibilities of a leader facing and directing a difficult task. A good teacher must guide, urge, explain, challenge, exhort, sympathize, assist, encourage, and at times demand. What our teachers do inside and outside of their classrooms not only molds intellectual development, but also affects the moral, social, and spiritual development of their students. I commend the teachers of our Nation for the outstanding work that they are doing. I am grateful to them for their dedicated and devoted services as leaders for the youth of America and for all of us.

SALUTE TO EDUCATION

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to take a few moments to celebrate the progress of education in this country. I have long been involved in the process of reform for American education, and it is with much pleasure that I consider its accomplishments.

For 7 years I served on the House Education and Labor Committee and was chairman of the ad hoc Committee for the Handicapped. I was one of the original sponsors of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Many exciting changes have taken place since I first became involved with education legislation. Some would argue that there has been enough change, that the need for innovation and reform far outstrips the supply. I cannot agree with this.

Progress has been made. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act has afforded educational opportunities to thousands of disadvantaged youngsters. It has not only reached young people from economically and culturally deprived homes, but it has also reached young handicapped, non-English speaking, and gifted children. Through other Federal programs such as Headstart and Follow Through, we have seen successful attempts to reach and help the preschool and early school disadvantaged child. These children are receiving help at a crucial age; they will be spared the pain of remedial programs that come too late and do too little.

The American educational system, at both the Federal and local level, is also making exciting steps to incorporate true innovation into the programs of the schools. The U.S. Office of Education is conducting an experimental school program in three cities throughout the country. By carefully studying and evaluating the effectiveness of the various innovations introduced in these systems, the educational establishment has a means of knowing what is successful.

There is so much to be excited about in American education today. It is certainly true that there is much to be done, but as one who has watched education closely, I can confidently say that the potential and the desire is there to do it. I welcome the opportunity to join this Salute to Education.

SALUTE TO EDUCATION

HON. MIKE McCORMACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and privilege for me to make a few remarks of tribute to the American educational system in conjunction with the June 21 Salute to Education, which is being sponsored by the National Education Association.

It should go without saying that it is an honor to pay homage to such an outstanding educational system. And it is a privilege to have this opportunity to salute the many fine educators—from grade school through college—to whom each of us here, as well as citizens across the country, remain deeply indebted.

It is particularly appropriate, in my judgment, that today's Salute to Education closely follows House passage of two vital bills in the field of education—the conference report of the omnibus higher education bill and the Labor-HEW appropriations bill. Among the important new departures in the first bill are: Direct aid to colleges and universities for operating expenses; grants of emergency assistance to institutions of higher learning facing severe financial crisis; special grants to institutions which increase their enrollment of veterans; and programs to encourage Indian education, consumer education, and ethnic heritage programs. Moreover, if adequate appropriations follow this authorizing legislation, low- and middle-income students will be guaranteed financial aid for tuition, based on their family's ability to assist them. Matching grants will be available for new and existing community colleges as well as assistance to States in the development and conduct of occupational education programs.

While I strongly opposed the inclusion of antibusing language in this legislation, I did feel that it would be impossible to pass preferable legislation at this time and that approving new assistance was imperative at a time of increasingly severe financial strain on too many students and institutions of higher learning.

Concerning the Labor-HEW appropriations bill just passed by the House, I was particularly pleased that the administration's budget was increased by \$912 million in committee and an additional \$364 million during consideration by the whole House. The total \$1.27 billion increase over the administration's request represents a funding level \$418 million higher than that of the same programs this year.

As an active member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, I also strongly supported its action increasing authorizations for science education as a part of the National Science Foundation fiscal year 1973 legislation. During committee consideration, we added \$23,800,000 for graduate student support in science education improvement and \$11 million for institutional improvement for science. This legislation passed the House in April.

Recognizing that about one out of every four persons attending an institution of higher education is enrolled in a community college, the committee increased the technician/technologist education projects by \$1.5 million and restored \$2.1 million for science faculty fellowships and research participation. It was our intent that the community colleges be major participants in these two programs in order that their faculties and curriculums be made more effective in areas related to science and technology.

Other specific programs increased by our committee action included \$3 million for secondary schoolteacher projects, \$1.6 million for undergraduate scientific instructional equipment, and \$1.4 million for the high school talented student program, which is designed to identify and train future leaders in science and engineering.

But however worthy these congressional contributions, they are no cause for complacency. For this is a time when more and more is being asked our educational system while the resources to fill the requests are being diminished. In 1900, according to Ralph W. Tyler, only 5 percent of our population was needed in professional or highly skilled occupations and 60 percent in unskilled. But now, that situation has been completely reversed—60 percent of our population earns its living in professional and skilled occupations and only 5 percent of the work force can be absorbed in so-called unskilled labor.

The Federal Government encouraged greatly expanded educational opportunity in conjunction with the massive American technological advance in the post World War II period. And the scope was even further expanded with the legislative program of the 1960's to include special programs for the physically and mentally disadvantaged, manpower programs for the jobless, VISTA and the Peace Corps, Headstart and Upward Bound, as well as vocational and environmental education.

But the progress made, to say nothing plans for the future, are severely threatened. Even the most basic inputs into any educational system—a full school day and year, adequately compensated teachers, and simply enough teachers for each classroom—are in jeopardy due to the financial crunch being forced upon educational institutions. Inflation has placed immense pressures on school budgets. The constitutionality of existing property-tax financing of elementary and secondary schools has been questioned by legal actions throughout the country. And the taxpayers are in open revolt, with rejections of school bond issues having increased from 11 percent in 1960 to 53 percent last year.

The result is as unacceptable as it is deplorable. A recent survey of the 100 largest school systems in the country revealed that almost half have had to lay off teachers, shorten the school year, close libraries, or in some way seriously curtail their educational program. In my own State of Washington, recent defeats of levy measures have threatened the positions of 2,000 teachers.

The solution, in my judgment, must originate with the Federal Government. As a Congressman, I would be remiss if I did not admit that there is much that we in the Congress should do that has not been done. All too often, although our authorization requests are at least adequate, our action on appropriations measures falls far short of the goals envisioned. Moreover, when action comes late on these measures, all too often after the fiscal year is well in progress, there is no way States and school districts can make rational and necessary plans for the future. These shortcomings must be overcome. We must pass appropriations measures into law before the beginning of the fiscal year and we must appropriate moneys at a far closer level to the authorization authority.

But the root of the problem runs far deeper. We would hardly make a dent in the overall problem by simply increasing appropriations to authorization levels. What is needed is a drastic reorientation of our thoughts and actions regarding the Federal role in education. At the present time, Federal taxes consume 64 cents of each tax dollar. But that money contributes a mere 7 percent of the revenue for our elementary and secondary schools. At the same time, local sources contribute 53 percent of the moneys for elementary and secondary schools while receiving only 17 cents of each tax dollar.

If we are to continue to expand and improve our educational system, as we must, that situation must be changed. The legitimate grievances of property taxpayers must be redressed. The Congress must move toward financing one-third of the costs of elementary and secondary education.

But as we think about the future of our educational system, we must not limit ourselves to considering necessary financing. We must act to deal with the new requirements which will be placed on the nature and scope of education, if it is to continue to make the contributions tomorrow that it made so well yesterday.

As a scientist, I am particularly interested in the contributions which technological advances can make to our educational process. For example, how can we most effectively use computers to reinforce classroom learning, to facilitate library services, to match intellectual interests and research in progress? We must further concern ourselves with increasing the interrelationship between schools and communities. We must explore new ways to make education available to more people at a lower cost and with less inconvenience. One example here is a pilot program recently underwritten by the National Endowment for the Humanities. Titled "Courses by Newspaper," this program will include 20 lectures in selected newspapers which will be designed for the casual reader as well as those interested in paying a token \$15 enrollment fee, receiving additional material, taking exams, and receiving credit. And finally we must focus on continuing career education. Today, far too little attention is given to occupational education, despite its increasing importance to the market-

place. And almost no attention is given to the need for continuing education, although the average person changes jobs five to seven times in his life and technology and national priorities are eliminating old jobs and creating new employment needs.

We look to education to help us meet these needs. But in a time of rapidly increasing change, we must be sure that we are in control of change rather than change in control of us. This can only be accomplished with the proper emphasis and creative investigation in the field of education. Let us accept the challenge today to fulfill our responsibilities for forging a better tomorrow.

A TRIBUTE TO EDUCATORS

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the classroom teacher, and all other educators working on the cutting edge of both the problems and the limitless opportunities that the immediate future presents to education in this country.

Few necessities of life, if any, are more basic to the well-being of the individual American, and of the Nation. Lack of education is as serious as lack of food. The illiterate is a starved person. These things are, of course, universally recognized, fully as readily by those who hate the American ideal of human life as by those who share it.

Man comes to true and full humanity only through culture, that is, through the cultivation of his own potential, the goods and values nature has given him. But there is one irreducible prerequisite for such cultivation—one must want it. To create an atmosphere in which young people can find such motivation is surely the most difficult art for teachers to practice today, for it must be an atmosphere of moral optimism. Only in such an atmosphere will young people see educational requirements not as something negative, limiting, imposed by adults, but as something positive, a step forward to the kind of future they themselves want.

Only in such an atmosphere of optimism will today's young people open out to social cooperation, to acceptance of an orderly and interdependent society in which the requirements of the common good will no longer be regarded as obstacles, as traps set for individuals, but as advances, elements of development, liberating, and enriching all.

Rare indeed, and most unfortunate, is the American who cannot recall at least one teacher who made a contribution of this sort to his life. I find it a matter of justice, and a personal pleasure, to pay tribute to education and to all teachers for what they have contributed in the past and for what they can do in the future. In the words of Henry Adams, "The Education of Henry Adams:"

A teacher affects eternity; he can never tell where his influence stops.

ORATION CONTEST AWARD TO
JOSEPH W. McLEAN, ALEXANDRIA,
VA.

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, on June 11, Joseph W. McLean of Alexandria, Va., won first place in the Douglas G. High Oration Contest at the 82d annual Congress of the Sons of the American Revolution in Indianapolis.

Young Joseph McLean, a graduate of T. C. Williams High School in Alexandria and the son of Mr. and Mrs. Woodfen McLean, won over 10 other finalists in the competition with his fine address on the preservation of constitutional principles.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Joseph McLean's oration, entitled "Dissent or Destruction," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

DISSENT OR DESTRUCTION

It has been said that the oldest struggle in civilized society is that struggle between the individual seeking freedom, and the state seeking order. Our Founding Fathers had looked on six thousand years of human history, and had seen the God-given rights of man burned to a crisp at least once in every generation by the fires of unjust governments. These men knew that man should not be ruled by a despot, but should endeavor to govern himself by a system which would be acceptable to the majority of his peers, and, in which he would have an equal voice. The designers of our Constitution believed that all men should be free, and to achieve this freedom, the political structure of man's society would have to be flexible enough to adapt to changing circumstances within that society. But they also realized that a nation in constant turmoil and revolt has no chance of success in a highly competitive and aggressive world; therefore, their system of government would have to provide avenues of political change without social upheaval. We have only to read the document which our Founding Fathers drafted to see that they were excellent political theorists, but when we watch their system function, it becomes apparent that they were also magnificent, practical politicians. They have given us an instrument which in itself provides all the needs of a free society.

In the first amendment, the people are given the right to assemble peaceably and to petition the government for redress of grievances. Thus change is provided for within the system, where it is constructive, but not outside the system, where the intent is simply to disrupt the status quo.

In a free society, dissent is an essential part of liberty; however, when protestors infringe en masse on the rights of others by using force and violence, we should re-examine their character and their true intentions. Vice President Agnew said, "I believe in constitutional dissent and the right to petition. However, it is worth remembering that our Founding Fathers wisely shaped a constitutional republic, not a pure democracy. The representative government they constructed never intended that elected officials should decide crucial questions by counting the number of bodies cavorting in the streets."

The Principles of the American system represent more social, political, and economic

progress than any other civilization in history. Our values are those of the Judeo-Christian ethic of individualism and human dignity. Yet these activists tell us that our values are lies. They belabor intolerance, but they, themselves, scream abuse at those who differ with their views. In the name of freedom, they destroy academic freedom. They denounce violence, yet they seize or bomb buildings.

On August 24, 1970, a bomb was planted by anarchists in one of the world's most sophisticated and specialized nuclear physics laboratories at the University of Wisconsin. The bomb demolished virtually everything of value in the center and took the life of a lab technician. The knowledge lost, that may never be regained, is epitomized by the work of Professor Joseph R. Dillinger. Professor Dillinger had spent twenty-three years of his life constructing, step by painful step, an intricate assemblage of cryogenic apparatus. The blast wiped out the work of a lifetime. Such will be the end of all that we value if we allow these criminals to go unchecked on a continued rampage through our country. The American right of freedom of protest is being exploited by avowed anarchists who detest this country and want to destroy it.

Dissent is the right to disagree openly with the policies of the government, not a license to advocate revolution or to deprive others of their constitutional rights. The first premise on which a free society is based is equality before the law, and the first equality before the law is that every man must abide by the law, else no one has any protection from a hoodlum. Further confusing the issue have been recent court decisions emphasizing the rights of the criminal at the expense of the rights of society. We must find a balance—between the unrestricted liberty of the individual and the over-control of the individual by the government.

It is time to lead our country back to the rationality of moderation and a new pride of patriotism. Today, as never before, America needs doers, men of the courage and moral strength of our forefathers. We need to be re-educated as to our responsibilities and our values. Then—and then only—can America reach the potential that our forefathers envisioned when they gave us a new policy for freedom and the fundamentals for greatness.

COMPLAINTS AGAINST FOREIGN
FISHING VESSELS

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, serious complaints against foreign fishing vessels have been registered with me. The complaints stem from incidents involving eastern bloc fishing vessels that run through marked lobster pot areas off our shores.

As a result of similar incidents, last year an agreement was made whereby our lobster fishermen radio the exact location of their lobster gear to the Coast Guard, who broadcast this information several times daily to all fishing vessels in the area.

Recently the Soviet Union, in an effort to prevent such incidents, reported that one of their vessels is assigned the duty of monitoring the actions of the other Soviet ships.

It is apparent that these and other similar efforts to prevent damage to our lobster fishermen's gear have not been successful. In the past several weeks a rash of new incidents have been reported, causing serious financial losses to our fishermen.

My purpose in bringing this to your attention this afternoon is to focus on H.R. 7117, the Fishermen's Protection Act amendments bill, which as passed by the Senate would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to pay out of a fishermen's protective fund the costs of damage to gear or vessels of U.S. fishermen caused by foreign vessels.

I have been discussing this bill with my colleagues on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and in the Congress. The bill is awaiting conference. I hope and trust that the Senate amendment to assist our fishermen who suffer gear or vessel damage caused by foreign vessels will be retained and that soon this amended bill will be approved and enacted into law. Our fishermen need this assistance.

RELIEF FOR SMALL BUSINESS

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am most gratified that the House has adopted an amendment to the Labor-HEW Appropriations Act that, in effect, carries out one of the basic purposes of a bill I introduced several months ago. That bill, H.R. 14360, was designed to correct the fundamental deficiencies in the Occupational Safety and Health Act which had become apparent after a year's experience of its operation. The most pressing problem that has arisen under that act has been the harassment of small businessmen and farmers with unrealistic and unnecessary safety requirements—with requirements that the small businessman has no way of finding out about; requirements that are unreasonably burdensome and with requirements that are unnecessary in light of the safety record.

One of the provisions of my bill would have exempted from all of the act's requirements any employer with fewer than 25 employees per firm. The amendment to the Labor-HEW Appropriations Act achieves substantially the same result by prohibiting the use of moneys under the act from being used to pay the salary of any Federal inspector who inspects firms employing less than 25 persons.

My bill would have exempted almost 90 percent of all business establishments but only 25 percent of all workers. Thus it provided the maximum relief to businessmen while having a minimal impact on employees. Further, the very limited data that exists suggest that firms with less than 20 employees have a better safety record than those with a somewhat higher number of employees—and an exemption from the act's require-

ments based on a 25-employee limit is a reasonable response to the financial burden that the act places on the small employer.

I commend the House of Representatives for passing this small business exemption provision and I hope that all my colleagues who voted for it will remain vigilant to insure that it is not dropped in conference.

EDUCATION FINANCE

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the school finance situation will be reviewed by the Supreme Court before very long, and as yet, no coherent strategy for coping with the many facets of this problem has been developed. However, Robert E. Merriam, the chairman of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations recently outlined his six-point proposal for dealing with school finance at the 64th annual National Governors' Conference in Houston, Tex. In light of the timeliness of his suggestions and the important role that the ACIR will play in a solution to the school finance problem, I insert excerpts from his remarks:

OUTLINE OF REMARKS BY ROBERT E. MERRIAM, CHAIRMAN, ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS BEFORE THE 64TH ANNUAL GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE, HOUSTON, TEX., JUNE 6, 1972

I would like you to consider with me the following basic facts:

1. In 1971 the combined Federal-State-Local tax bite out of the gross national products was 31% of which—

14% was in Federal taxes.
10% was in State and Local taxes.
7% was largely in social security payments.

2. Of the total government expenditures of \$323 billion, 14% or \$47 billion went for schools (this by coincidence is also 47% of local government expenditures).

3. Of this \$47 billion for schools—
52% was from local taxes (\$24 billion).
41% was from State taxes (\$19 billion).
7% was from Federal taxes (\$4 billion).

4. Of the \$24 billion in local spending for schools 88% (\$21 billion) came from the property tax.

5. This local property tax share of school financing represents almost 8% of all government taxes collected and is 4 times the state expenditures for welfare.

6. Federal grants in aid total \$30 billion of which over \$9 billion is for welfare.
7. The property tax is a highly unpopular tax—our recent public opinion survey shows it 2½ times more unpopular than the Federal income tax and 3½ times more unpopular than State sales taxes.

And now a set of unique happenings:
1. Four separate court decisions recently have drawn essentially the same judicial conclusion—namely, that the current use of local property taxes as the primary source of school financing is discriminatory and therefore unconstitutional.

2. The President of the United States has asked the ACIR to study and consider a new federal tax to aid the states in meeting the emerging challenge of the courts to our present school financing system and to provide relief for residential property owners.

3. The likelihood of significant direct, essentially non-earmarked assistance (revenue sharing) to states and local governments appears near reality.

4. While by no means assured, Federal assumption of at least a greater share of welfare financing is now a possibility.

I submit that this array of facts, happenings and philosophy offers us an unparalleled combination of circumstances which may never occur again. It is like one of those rare occasions when the planets appear in a line behind the moon. Let me elaborate with particular reference to school financing and the property tax. I would like to share with you how we are trying to unravel the string.

In consideration of the proposal submitted to us by the President, we have separated our studies into three parts:

1. Consideration of equalization of school financing, with first emphasis on intra-state disparities.

2. Analysis of the property tax in theory and in practice.

3. Study of the Value Added Tax and its alternatives.

I know some of you have urged that we keep these matters separate. I respectfully wish to disagree for four compelling reasons:

1. The courts most likely will tell you what to do with reference to school financing and the property tax if we don't get together on a program.

2. It is clear to me that sense can be made out of government taxing policy (and remembering that 31% of the GNP goes for taxes) only when we develop a National Fiscal Policy which inter-relates all major fiscal actions and takes into account the effects of Federal government action on the states and localities and vice versa. For example, we can no longer tolerate the unilateral reduction by Congress of Federal income taxes without reference to its massive effect on state and local governments.

3. Quite frankly, in the public view (as painfully shown again in our recent public opinion survey) the states are suspect and while many of you have forcefully bitten the tax bullet (at great political risk, we all know) the growing and frightening resistance to unilateral state and local tax increases again tells us we must look at the totality of our problems, not isolated pieces.

4. If we cannot unite on a mechanism to achieve these objectives, I fear one of two nightmarish alternatives:

a. A massive direct Federal financing program for public education with all that it would entail in limitations on State and local control over educational policy and practice; or

b. Court mandating of new school financing arrangements.

Either of these alternatives, in my humble judgment, would be disastrous to the balanced federal system which all of us still cherish. Certainly the administrative chaos caused by the 535 categorical grant programs of the 1960's and the specter of judicial mandating of bussing and reapportionment should be sufficient reminder of these twin dangers.

What then, Mr. Merriam, is, your suggestion, you might properly ask? Any Chairman of a 26 man, bi-partisan, tri-level body of "sovereign" political leaders who suggests he knows what his peers will decide is either a fool or a knave. I will now prove that I am both.

First, I would not attempt to solve so complex a problem in the midst of a Presidential election.

Second, I would nonetheless strive for legislation early next year whereby the Federal government would offer special aid to states enabling them to assume the added costs of equalizing expenditures between school districts. This action would, in my opinion, sub-

stantially meet requirements of the Serrano-type decisions.

Third, I would require that any such Federal assistance be temporary with an automatic phase-out provision as revenue sharing dollars balance out the increased state school spending.

Fourth, I would not tie this new temporary Federal assistance for school financing to Federally mandated property tax reduction.

Fifth, I would provide a separate Federal incentive program to stimulate those states desiring to assume substantially all of the cost of financing public education thus allowing state action resulting in the reduction of local property taxes. Such a program might include enactment of a low-rate Federal Value Added Tax with a 100% credit feature for those states enacting their own state Value Added Tax, perhaps dedicated in part to school financing equalization and in part to property (and/or sales) tax reduction. This new tax program like the temporary aid suggested earlier also could be phased out as the Federal government assumes a greater share of the total welfare burden.

Sixth, I would establish a mechanism or designate a group whereby other future major tax proposals at all levels of government, including the recent Mills-Mansfield proposal to drop all special tax treatment for Federal income taxpayers, could be reviewed for their impact on all levels of government, as the first step in developing a National Fiscal Policy.

Above all else, I urge this distinguished body to avoid the election year temptation to jockey for partisan position. The issue of schools and their financing is too important to all of us! And the specter of judicial intervention is too real!

GENERAL WALT'S STATEMENT ON THAILAND'S DRUG CONTROL EFFORTS

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there has been action and talk recently about the Royal Thai Government's actions on drug control.

In view of the attention given to this matter, I want to share with my colleagues the recent statement of Gen. Lewis Walt during his visit to Thailand.

Having just returned from Thailand myself, and having had the opportunity to talk with U.S. officials about this problem, I believe General Walt's statement deserves the thoughtful attention of all Members:

STATEMENT OF GEN. LEWIS WALT

I have been commissioned by the Senate Sub-committee on Internal Security to conduct a study of the world drug traffic, and in this connection I have spent the past few days in Thailand. While I was here I met with all of the American officials and advisors concerned with the problem of controlling the international drug traffic. In addition, on the Thai side, I have met with General Nitya, Secretary-General of the Central Narcotics Bureau, and other RTG enforcement officials. I also met with both Thai and United Nations officials working under the UN Fund for Drug Abuse Control which is striving to end opium cultivation by the Hill Tribes.

As you all know, there has been much criti-

cism of the Royal Thai Government based on its alleged lack of cooperation in dealing with the drug problem.

I will not tell you today that there is no room for criticism of Thailand—nor will I tell you that there is no room for criticism of the drug control effort in my own country.

I have been assured categorically by the American drug control officials that they have absolutely no information pointing to the involvement of anybody in the Thai Government at policy making level. I have no doubt that there are corrupt police officials at the lower levels—but then there are also corrupt police at the lower levels in the United States and probably every other country.

Any government can be made to look bad if one focuses only on the failures and the weaknesses and unfounded allegations. But I believe every government is entitled to credit for its record of positive accomplishments—and after my visit here I am convinced that some of the accounts that have appeared in my country have failed to give the Royal Thai Government credit for all that it has done, especially over the last year to help bring the flow of drugs under control on a national and international scale.

The Memorandum of Understanding of last September between the RTG and the United States Government was the first document in which two countries jointly committed themselves to an all-out battle against the international drug traffic.

Thailand was also the first nation to enter into the agreement with the UN Committee for Drug Abuse Control, and together they are now engaged in a pioneering international project aimed at the suppression of the opium cultivation through education and crop substitution.

In April-May of this year, the Royal Thai Government, with US technical and logistical assistance, created a special mobile enforcement unit designed to interdict narcotics in the North. This operation now has five offices in Northern Thailand. Only last week it struck a major blow against the drug traffickers with the seizure of 1600 kilos of opium, concealed in the wells of tank trucks, as well as a large amount of chemicals used in the manufacture of heroin. On Wednesday morning of this week in the Chiang Mai area the Thai police authorities took me to see the tank trucks and the seized balls of opium. It was an awesome thought that when converted into heroin, the amount seized would be worth some 35 million dollars on the streets of New York, and that many thousands of human lives could be destroyed or wasted by this amount of the deadly drug.

Following up on the seizure in Northern Thailand, the largest opium seizure ever made in the kingdom, Bangkok Police over last weekend seized the first #4 heroin laboratory discovered in the city. There have been many other seizures, large and small of heroin & opium.

One of the greatest problems the Royal Thai Government had to contend with involved the activities of the Chinese Irregular Forces (CIF) along the northern Thai frontier. It has been common knowledge for years that these forces were heavily involved in the flow of opium. The Royal Thai Government in March of this year moved to resolve this problem by granting resident status and resettlement assistance to elements of the CIF in return for their promise to get out of the opium business completely. The CIF, on the conclusion of this agreement, turned over to the RTG 26,245 kilograms of opium which was publicly destroyed on March 7th of this year. For some reason, this event received next to no attention in my country, despite the staggering amount involved—I am told that the street value in the United States would have been well over one billion dollars.

The American officials to whom I have spoken have been full of praise for the cooperation they have now been receiving from the Thai authorities—and I personally find it impossible not to be impressed by the record of accomplishment which I have listed above.

There is of course much more to be done, on the Thai side and on the American side. But I am confident that, with the good will of both governments, and with the collaboration of other governments, we can build an international machinery of control which will in the not too distant future effectively restrict deadly traffic.

WHY WE ARE IN TROUBLE

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, few stories better illustrate why America is in trouble today than the modern version of "Little Red Riding Hood" that follows these remarks. Unfortunately, there is more truth than fiction in the ridiculous extremes of the parables.

Segments of any society that would make a hero of a man who deliberately steals and publishes secret government papers—or continue uncensored, a college president who, when supposed to be an example for young people, nevertheless deliberately breaks the law by sitting down in the public streets to block traffic—or fails to truly investigate under oath charges of serious misconduct on the part of a sitting Justice of the United States Supreme Court—or remains silent and unhelpful while a woman is assaulted, raped, and shot in a public parking lot—or permits vandalism, criminal misconduct and worse by student activists to pass without suspension or expulsion—or sanctions the countless acts of civil disobedience and willful criminal misconduct that have taken place in the protest over American involvement in Southeast Asia—are materially responsible for contributing toward making the modern saga of "Little Red Riding Hood" a reality, circa 1973.

This must not happen. Whether it does or not is up to concerned citizens—who remain apathetic or indifferent to criminal activism in our society only at their peril.

The article follows:

A MODERN RED RIDING HOOD

(Author unknown)

Once upon a time, in a far-away country, there lived a little girl called Red Riding Hood. One day her mother asked her to take a basket of fruit to her grandmother, who had been ill and lived alone in a cottage in the forest.

It happened that a wolf was lurking in the bushes and overheard the conversation. He decided to take a short-cut to the grandmother's house and get the goodies for himself. The wolf killed the grandmother, then dressed in her nightgown and jumped into bed to await the little girl.

When she arrived, he made several nasty suggestions and then tried to grab her. But by this time, the child was very frightened and ran screaming from the cottage.

A woodcutter, working nearby, heard her

cries and rushed to the rescue. He killed the wolf with his axe, thereby saving Red Riding Hood's life. All the townspeople hurried to the scene and proclaimed the woodcutter a hero.

But at the inquest, several facts emerged: (1) The wolf had never been advised of his rights.

(2) The woodcutter had made no warning swings before striking the fatal blow.

(3) The Civil Liberties Union stressed the point that, although the act of eating grandma may have been in bad taste, the wolf was only "doing his thing", and thus didn't deserve the death penalty.

(4) The SDS contended that the killing of the grandmother should be considered self-defense since she was over 30 and, therefore, couldn't be taken seriously because the wolf was trying to make love, not war.

On the basis of those considerations, it was decided there was no valid basis for charges against the wolf. Moreover, the woodcutter was indicted for unaggravated assault with a deadly weapon.

Several nights later, the woodcutter's cottage was burned to the ground.

One year from the date of "The Incident At Grandma's", her cottage was made a shrine for the wolf who had bled and died there. All the village officials spoke at the dedication, but it was Red Riding Hood who gave the most touching tribute.

She said that, while she had been selfishly grateful for the woodcutter's intervention, she realized in retrospect that he had overreacted. As she knelt and placed a wreath in honor of the brave wolf, there wasn't a dry eye in the whole forest.

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I learned of the passing of our former colleague, Congressman Philip J. Philbin.

Phil Philbin was an accomplished man in every sense of the word. As a youth, he was a star athlete as well as a tenacious debater. As a young man, Phil was a successful lawyer, farmer, and businessman. He first came to Washington as secretary to Senator David L. Walsh and went on to serve as special counsel to the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. He was later appointed referee with the U.S. Department of Labor.

Elected to the House from the Third District of Massachusetts in 1942, Phil Philbin's service in the Congress spanned 28 years. As a Member of the House, Phil will long be remembered for his leadership and dedicated work on the House Armed Services Committee. Phil was widely recognized as an accomplished expert in the complex area of national security—never a partisan but always a patriot and devoted American. A further mark of the man was his abiding compassion for "the little man" in the uniformed services and his intense interest in improving the operation and quality of our system of military justice.

Congressman Phil Philbin served this Nation and his constituents with honor,

ability, and integrity. His breadth of knowledge, his genuine warmth, and his compassion for people earned him the highest respect of his colleagues. We are all profoundly grieved for his leaving us.

Virginia and I extend our deepest sympathy to his family and join with them and his thousands of friends and admirers in mourning his passing and in wishing for him a well deserved seat of honor in the happy hunting grounds of eternal peace in the great beyond.

SOCIAL CLUB OF WILMERDING, PA.

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the Italian Social Club of Wilmerding, Pa., in my 20th Congressional District, has contributed much to the heritage of the community and to the Nation. This organization was founded in July 1937, and over the years it has participated in many fraternal, civic, and religious programs and projects. Its interest in the people of the community ranges from the sponsorship of a Little League baseball team to a week-long celebration honoring its patron saint, Our Lady of Mt. Carmel.

I was, therefore, quite proud to take part in the latest accomplishment of this group—the June 4 dedication of a new building which will stand as a monument to all members of the Italian Social Club, past, present, and future, and to their patron saint.

The building was constructed under the guidance of Dominic L. Parisi, Gabriel J. Bacco and Nicholas A. Fiasco, members of the building committee. The dedication program was planned by Daniel Marguriet, Raymond Volpe, Gabriel J. Bacco, Nicholas A. Fiasco, Leo J. Lucarelli, Lewis J. Lucarelli, Armond J. Matarazzo, John Palumbo, Dominic L. Parisi, and Eugene F. Rizzo.

The speakers at the dedication banquet included many outstanding residents of the community and prominent figures in the area. Among them were Gabriel J. Bacco, treasurer of the club; Rev. James A. Sites, pastor of St. Aloysius Church; Daniel Marguriet, president of District 6, United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America; John Sandrovich, mayor of Wilmerding; Dr. Frank Leonardo, first president of the Italian Club; Joseph Bonetto, a member of the Pennsylvania State Legislature; Henry Slaczka, postmaster of Wilmerding; John N. Milberger, director of the Turtle Creek Valley model cities program; Dominic L. Parisi, the 1972 president of the club; Raymond Volpe, chairman of the dedication committee; and Rev. John T. Flaherty, pastor of St. Michael's Church in Pitcairn.

Dr. Leonardo was elected president of the Italian Social Club in 1937. His staff at that time included Enrico Salvi, vice president; Arcangelo Cuoco, recording secretary; Philip Marguriet, financial secretary; and Germano Botti, treasurer.

These men adopted a constitution whose preamble can stand as a guide for all Americans. It read:

We, the natural born and those Italian-born who have chosen these United States of America as the land of our adoption, pledge allegiance to this country and undertake to defend its honor at all times from any foreign foe; to obey its laws and abide by its traditions, and to keep alive that heritage handed down to us by our forefathers, to teach and to educate those who come to our shores so that they will become fine, moral, honest, upright law-abiding citizens; furthermore, to keep alive the Italian language and traditions of our native land and build up fine specimens of manhood by encouraging tolerance, fair play and American idealism.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the Italian Social Club is led by men such as Dominic L. Parisi, president; Leo J. Lucarelli, vice president; Gabriel J. Bacco, treasurer; Eugene F. Rizzo, recording secretary; Armond J. Matarazzo, financial secretary; Lewis J. Lucarelli, Neil Cananlungo, Joseph Fiasco, Patsy A. Cortazzo, Joseph S. Parisi, Albino S. Muro, Joseph J. Lucarelli and Jerry Parisi, trustees; Louis F. Botto, steward.

The officers have changed, Mr. Speaker, but not their faith and belief in the words of that preamble written 35 years ago.

A SALUTE TO AMERICAN EDUCATION

HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the bicentennial year of our Nation's birth, it seems appropriate to pause and consider the contributions of American education in our past and its crucial role in our future. At the time of our declaration of independence from Great Britain, free public education for all children was only a distant dream in the heart of the most ardent democrat. Slowly, but steadily throughout the succeeding years, thousands of dedicated men and women, often under the most trying and difficult of conditions, worked to instruct each generation of young Americans. At the same time these educators and their allies struggled to fashion a system of education worthy of the ideals of a Republic founded upon the principle of the equality of man.

The outcome of this struggle has not always been success, but over the course of the years there has emerged a clear pattern of steady progress in extending educational opportunities to an ever-increasing proportion of the American people. The result has been that each succeeding generation of Americans has been a little better educated than its predecessor just as each passing decade has witnessed the continuing growth in strength of the American Nation.

Today, as we look about, we find free public educational opportunities available in every corner of the land. Yet as in the past, the struggle to improve the

quality of this educational opportunity continues as part of the quest to properly prepare our youth to meet the challenges which they must face in the years ahead. And as always, our teachers and administrators are once again the key to the success of the endeavor. We cannot predict the future of the American people, but we do know that this future depends in large part on the quality of our education. And based on the past and present performance of our educational profession, I have no doubts that both the future of American education and the American Nation shall continue to be marked by success and achievement.

TELLING THE TRUTH ABOUT SOCIAL SECURITY

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the current period in American Government is one in which there is a great deal of stress upon the concept of truth telling, of exposing myths in advertising, in campaign financing, and even in military planning.

Advocates of such truth telling have sponsored "truth in labeling" legislation to be applied to private business and industry. No similar legislation has been passed, however, with regard to Government agencies. In this respect, sacred cows have remained.

It is high time that those who advocate such "truth in labeling" apply this policy not only to private citizens, but also to public ones. It is ironic indeed that government is permitted to misrepresent its programs with impunity, while businessmen are subjected to severe penalties for doing precisely the same thing. This comes dangerously close to being a situation in which bureaucrats believe themselves to be above the law, something which cannot be tolerated in a free society.

Few, for example, have investigated with any care or thoroughness the organization of the Social Security Administration. Few have sought to discover whether or not that agency does what it says it does, and whether the American people are being properly served by it.

A booklet distributed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare declares that:

The basic idea of social security is a simple one: During working years employees, their employers, and self-employed people pay social security contributions which are pooled in special trust funds. When earnings stop or are reduced because the worker retires, dies, or becomes disabled, monthly cash benefits are paid to replace part of the earnings the family has lost.

This statement, according to Prof. Milton Friedman, of the University of Chicago, is "Orwellian doublethink." He points out that:

Over a decade ago the Social Security Administration estimated that the present value of the old age pensions already promised to

persons covered by social security was over \$300 billion. The corresponding sum must be far larger today. That is the size of the trust fund that would be required to justify the words of the booklet.

Points out Professor Friedman:

The fact is that taxes currently being collected from current workers are being used to pay benefits to persons who have retired or to their dependents and survivors. No trust fund in any meaningful sense is being accumulated. . . . What nine out of 10 working people are now doing is paying taxes to finance payments to persons who are not working. The individual worker is in no sense building protection for himself and his family—as a person who contributes to a private vested pension system is building his own protection.

Many Americans are also unaware of the fact that millions of people who pay taxes will never receive any benefits attributable to those taxes because they will not have paid for enough quarters to qualify, or because they receive payments in their capacity as spouse. In addition, persons who pay vastly different sums over their working lives may receive the same benefits.

The social security system is not only unfair, but has been misrepresented to the American people by its own governmental agencies. Professor Friedman declares that:

People who would not lie to their children, friends or colleagues . . . have propagated a false view of social security—and their intelligence and their exposure to contrary views make it hard to believe that they have done so unintentionally and innocently.

In an era when people really seek the truth about their Government and its programs, the article written by Professor Friedman in the May 1972 issue of the Washington Monthly, entitled "The Poor Man's Welfare Payment to the Middle Class," is important reading.

I wish to share this article with my colleagues. The text follows:

THE POOR MAN'S WELFARE PAYMENT TO THE MIDDLE CLASS

(By Milton Friedman)

(NOTE.—Milton Friedman teaches economics at the University of Chicago. This article is adapted from Social Security: Universal or Selective?, a debate between Milton Friedman and Wilbur J. Cohen, published this month by American Enterprise Institute.)

A widely distributed, unsigned booklet from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) entitled "Your Social Security" begins:

"The basic idea of social security is a simple one: During working years employees, their employers, and self-employed people pay social security contributions which are pooled in special trust funds. When earnings stop or are reduced because the worker retires, dies, or becomes disabled, monthly cash benefits are paid to replace part of the earnings the family has lost."

This is Orwellian doublethink.

Payroll taxes are labeled "contributions" (or, as the Party might have put it in the book, 1984, "Compulsory is Voluntary").

Trust funds are conjured with as if they played an important role when, in fact, they are extremely small (\$32.5 billion as of December 1970) and consist simply of promises by one branch of the government to pay another branch. Over a decade ago the Social Security Administration estimated that the present value of the old age pensions already

promised to persons covered by social security (both those who had retired and those who had not) was over \$300 billion. The corresponding sum must be far larger today. That is the size of the trust fund that would be required to justify the words of the booklet. ("Little is Much.")

The impression is given that a worker's "benefits" are financed by his "contributions." The fact is that taxes currently being collected from current workers are being used to pay benefits to persons who have retired or to their dependents and survivors. No trust fund in any meaningful sense is being accumulated. ("I am You.")

A worker paying taxes today can derive no assurance from trust funds that he will receive benefits when he retires. Any assurance derives solely from the willingness of future taxpayers to impose taxes on themselves to finance benefits being promised by present taxpayers to ourselves. This one-sided "compact between the generations," foisted on generations that literally cannot give their consent, may be sufficient assurance, but it certainly is a very different thing from a "trust fund." A chain letter would be a more accurate designation.

The HEW booklet goes on to say, "Nine out of 10 working people in the United States are now building protection for themselves and their families under the social security system."

More doublethink. What nine out of 10 working people are now doing is paying taxes to finance payments to persons who are not working. The individual worker is in no sense building protection for himself and his family—as a person who contributes to a private vested pension system is building his own protection. Persons now receiving payments are receiving much more than the actuarial value of the taxes that they paid and that were paid on their behalf. Young persons who are now paying social security taxes are being promised much less than the actuarial value of the taxes that they pay and that are paid on their behalf.

More fundamentally yet, the relationship between individual contributions (that is, payroll taxes) and benefits received is extremely tenuous. Millions of people who pay taxes will never receive any benefits attributable to those taxes because they will not have paid for enough quarters to qualify, or because they receive payments in their capacity as spouse. Persons who pay vastly different sums over their working lives may receive identically the same benefits. Two men or two women who pay precisely the same taxes at the same time may end up receiving different benefits because one is married and the other is single. A man who continues working after age 65 will be required to pay additional taxes, and yet may receive no benefits at all. This list can be extended indefinitely.

Social security programs involve annual expenditures of roughly \$43 billion. These programs appear on balance to transfer income from relatively low-income classes to middle- and upper-income classes. They are flourishing, are widely regarded as highly successful, and seem destined to expand.

Welfare programs involve annual expenditures of \$15 billion. These programs appear on balance to . . .

the income from middle- and upper-income classes to lower-income classes. They are in a state of crisis, are widely regarded as intolerable, and seem destined to be transformed.

My own attitude toward the two programs is almost the reverse. Bad as the welfare mess is, at least public assistance does go mainly to needy persons who are at lower income levels than the persons paying the taxes to finance the payments. The system badly needs reform, but at the moment it serves an essential social function. It seems

impossible to eliminate it promptly, even though its elimination should be our long-term objective. On the other hand, social security combines a highly regressive tax with largely indiscriminate benefits, and I believe that it serves no essential social function. Existing commitments make it impossible to eliminate it overnight, but it should be unwound and terminated as soon as possible.

As I have gone through the literature, I have been shocked at the level of the arguments that have been used to sell social security, not only by politicians or special-interest groups, but more especially by self-righteous academics. People who would not lie to their children, friends, or colleagues, whom I would trust implicitly in personal dealings, have propagated a false view of social security—and their intelligence and their exposure to contrary views make it hard to believe that they have done so unintentionally and innocently. The very name—old age and survivors insurance—is a blatant attempt to mislead the public into identifying a compulsory tax and benefit system with private, voluntary, and individual purchase of individually assured benefits. What am I to make of professors at leading institutions, of high-level bureaucrats, of cabinet and sub-cabinet officials who compare the future benefits promised to young workers solely with the tax nominally levied on employees, often not even mentioning the equivalent tax levied on employers? They know very well that commonsense, economic theory, and empirical evidence all support the view that the distinction between the social security tax paid directly by the employee and the tax paid by the employer is primarily the label attached to components of the employers' cost of labor. Both are proportional to wage rates; both enter labor costs; both are borne equally by the employee.

Or what am I to make of high-minded gentlemen protesting in one breath the accuracy of the insurance terminology and objecting in the next to full payment of benefits to persons between 65 and 72 who continue to work on the ground that the "need" of these elders is less than that of other persons to whom the money could be paid. If, indeed, the benefits are linked to "contributions," the need argument is irrelevant. If the criterion of need is relevant, then the talk about "insurance," about benefits linked to "contributions," is simply hogwash.

TAXING SECURITY

The social security tax is a flat-rate tax on covered earnings up to a maximum. As of early 1971, the rate of Old Age and Survivors Insurance (OASI) alone is 8.1 per cent, split between employers and employees, and 6.075 per cent on the earnings of the self-employed, in both cases up to the maximum earnings of \$7,800. The rate for OASDHI (Old Age, Survivors, Disability, and Hospital Insurance) is 10.4 per cent on wages and 7.5 per cent on the earnings of the self-employed, and there is an additional tax for unemployment insurance. Coverage is by now nearly universal.

What can we say about this tax viewed solely as a tax?

1. This is a very heavy tax on very low incomes. For most persons with incomes less than the maximum covered, the social security tax is many times larger than the personal income tax.

2. The tax is regressive because of the maximum limit and the absence of exemptions.

3. It is hard to see any excuse for the differential between the rates on wages and salaries and on earnings from self-employment.

4. Several categories of employment are excluded from the program altogether. This

is unjustifiable from the tax point of view, but it is now trivial.

5. No allowance at all is made for family size.

6. The tax is solely on realized income from personal services. All property income is excluded, along, of course, with imputed income from services.

7. The tax rate is raised drastically for persons between 65 and 72 who are eligible for benefits, choose to work, and earn more than \$140 a month. The marginal social security tax rate on earnings from \$140 a month to \$240 a month is 60.4 per cent, and from \$240 a month until benefits are reduced to zero, 110.4 per cent. When the unemployment taxes and federal, state, and local taxes are included, the overall marginal rates are still higher.

8. The tax has risen very rapidly. Tax receipts for OASI alone have risen more than 11-fold from 1950 to 1970, and the average tax paid per covered person, by over 7.5-fold.

The payroll tax is almost surely far and away the most regressive element in our tax system and a significant disincentive to work. Over 10 per cent of any worker's wage cost, at the low levels, which means up to \$7,800 now and it will be \$9,000 soon, is taken out and sent to social security. Indeed, one of the great problems of providing sufficient incentive for a person to get off welfare is that, if he takes a job, then besides any reduction in his welfare benefits, he has to start paying social security taxes. He has to pay 10.8 per cent of his wage cost in taxes, and that raises the marginal rate.

I was astounded when I went through these figures. I had always thought that disincentive to work was associated with the high rates of the personal income tax. I am now persuaded that the social security tax is a greater disincentive to work than the personal income tax, because it hits people lower down; it hits people who have the alternative of relief and it hits them hard.

SPECIAL INTEREST RAG BAG

I have long believed that the major defect of our present arrangements is the proliferation of special programs either for special groups or special commodities: OASDHI for some retired or disabled, Old Age Assistance for others, unemployment insurance, aid to the blind, Aid to Families with Dependent Children, food stamp plans, public housing, urban renewal, medical aid, farm subsidies, etc. Whatever the good intentions of the initial proponents of these programs, the programs tend to become the preserve of special vested interests and come to serve purposes very different from those that they were initially designed to serve.

The total amount of money spent on these and similar programs, federal, state, and local, exceeded \$75 billion in 1969-70. If this were divided among the 24.3 million persons classified as "poor" in 1969 under the arbitrary social security definition (4,950,000 families plus 4,851,000 unattached individuals), it would come to over \$3,000 per person, a sum that nearly equals the average income of all persons in the United States. The problem is not that the government is spending too little on redistributive programs, but that most of the money spent is not going to the poor.

The correct direction in which to move, I believe, is to replace all these programs by a single program designed to give assistance to persons with low incomes, regardless of the reason why their incomes are low—whether because they are old or unemployed, unskilled or ill, physically or mentally handicapped, or whatever. Such a comprehensive program would cost far less each year than the present ragbag of programs. Yet it would come far closer to alleviating true distress.

How can the existing program be wound down without doing injustice to persons now covered? My agenda is as follows:

1. Repeat the payroll tax.
2. Terminate any further accumulation of benefits.
3. Enact a negative income tax, treating benefit payments under social security as income for purposes of determining eligibility for benefits.
4. Continue to pay all existing beneficiaries the amounts that they are entitled to under current law, except that these amounts should automatically be escalated over time by any changes in the cost of living. This will meet our commitments in real, not nominal, terms. Give such beneficiaries an option to accept a capital sum equal to the present value of the payments instead of continuing payments.
5. Give every worker who has earned coverage under present law a commitment to the retirement and survivors' benefits that he would be entitled to under present law, given his present tax payments and earnings record. This commitment would be in the form of either a promise to pay the specified annual sum at the future date when under present law he would be entitled to the sum or government bonds equal in market value to the present value of those benefits, calculated at the market interest rate on government obligations of corresponding maturity, at the option of the worker.
6. Give every worker who has had taxes paid on his behalf who has not yet earned coverage capital sum equal to the accumulated value of the taxes that have been paid on his behalf.
7. Finance payments under 4, 5, and 6 out of general tax funds plus the issuance of government bonds.

Note that in the main these items simply recognize explicitly and fund obligations that now exist in an unfunded form. They do not add in any way to the true debt of the government, but simply terminate the accumulation of any further obligations. These steps would enable the bulk of the present social security administrative apparatus to be dismantled at once. It would be necessary to keep only a declining staff to administer item 4.

REFORMING A SACRED COW

Social security is in no meaningful sense an insurance program in which individual program in which individual payments purchase equivalent actuarial benefits. It is a combination of a particular tax—a flat-rate tax on wages up to a maximum—and a particular program of transfer payments, in which all sorts of considerations other than the amount paid determine the amount received. Hardly anyone approves of either part separately. Yet the two combined have become a sacred cow. What a triumph of imaginative packaging and Madison Avenue advertising!

The argument against reform seems to be that social security's disproportionate benefits to the middle class are the political price of getting the program enacted, and that any program designed explicitly for the poor, "will most likely to be a poor program." What puzzles me is this. Are we really helping poor people by saying to them, "Here is a program under which we will take two dollars from you and give you one back, and we can get that program passed, but we can't get a program passed which will take a dollar from you and give you a dollar back?"

If that is the case, it seems to me that if I were one of those poor people—if I were one of the people to whom we are saying, "Don't worry, we'll take care of you, we promise that for every two dollars we take from you, you will get one back"—I would repeat Thoreau's comment: "If I knew for a certainty that a man was coming to my house with the conscious design of doing me good, I should run for my life."

WASHINGTON REPORT TO NINTH DISTRICT ON REVENUE SHARING

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I include the text of my recent Washington Report to the Ninth District on revenue sharing.

WASHINGTON REPORT

To solve the long and complicated national agenda requires the commitment of all levels of government—federal, state and local.

Unfortunately, our federal system is hampered in meeting these problems by a serious fiscal and political imbalance. The basic difficulty (admittedly overstated) is that the federal government has most of the money, while state and local governments have most of the problems.

The federal government, with its strong and growing fiscal base, has monopolized the leadership in responding to these challenges. State and local governments, depending primarily on property and state taxes, do not have the same strength or capacity for growth of revenues. The result has been a proliferation of federal programs, the shifting of power to Washington, and stultification of state and local initiatives.

In the last 15 years, local and state government expenditures have increased three times in terms of current dollars. Meanwhile revenues have been increasingly difficult to obtain, and the future viability of these governments, especially in the cities, is in question.

A new order of things is needed to build a vitality into our governmental institutions. A basic premise has to be that state and local governments are here to stay and they play an indispensable role in the federal system. Their power and resources have to be strengthened.

There are three primary tools the Federal government can use in an effort to bring about balanced federalism: (1) categorical aid, (2) block grants, and (3) revenue-sharing. These tools must be used in the proper mix to meet our problems. Categorical aid, the funding of specific programs under federal guidelines, has exploded from \$6.7 billion in 1959 to \$36.8 billion in 1972, and it has become unwieldy to administer. Block grants, federal allocations for broader-ranging programs without precise federal guidelines, have been moderately successful. The House of Representatives is acting now on the third tool—The State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972.

This revenue-sharing bill would appropriate nearly \$30 billion of federal revenues over the next five years to state and local governments under two procedures:

1. Money is distributed to the states through a formula which allocates half the funds on a basis of each state's overall tax effort (total state and local taxes as a percentage of personal income, and half by giving each state 7.5 percent of its individual income tax collections. This money would go directly to state governments with no restrictions on its use, except that it could not be used as the state's share of a federal matching funds program.

2. A second procedure would allocate aid to each county and to most local governments representing more than 2,500 residents on the basis of population, number of urban residents and per-capita income levels. The money must be used for (a) maintenance and operation of public safety, environmental protection and public transportation, and (b) capital expenditures for sewage collec-

tion and treatment, refuse disposal and public transportation.

The proposed legislation also authorizes the U.S. Treasury Department to collect state income taxes if (1) at least five states which account for at least 5 percent of all federal tax returns request this service, and (2) if the state taxes are based on the federal definition of "taxable income."

While I believe the bill can be improved, I support it because it will help correct the present fiscal and political imbalances, help preserve the viability of the federal system, and help meet the increasing demands for state and community services. It also represents a step towards tax fairness, increasing the emphasis on progressive income tax and reducing the emphasis on regressive sales and property taxes.

The enactment of a revenue-sharing plan is going to have an impact on an already strained budget; however, the current budget already includes a revenue-sharing plan, so the adoption of this bill will not increase the federal deficit. Furthermore, to deny funds to states and local governments is to jeopardize their vitality and to say that their problems are of low priority.

PEACE TALKS

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a few remarks to the question of the recently concluded SALT talks. I admire and commend the President for his diligence and success in this matter. Such talks are difficult and time consuming. Sir Winston Churchill clearly recognized this in October 1928, when disarmament among nations was being considered. Then they were concerned with battleships. Would that the world's problems were battleships now. Mr. Churchill made the following speech.

Once upon a time, all the animals in the zoos decided that they would disarm, and they arranged to have a conference to arrange the matter. So the Rhinoceros said, when he opened the proceedings, that the use of teeth was barbarous and horrible and ought to be strictly prohibited by general consent. Horns, which were mainly defensive weapons, would, of course, have to be allowed.

The Buffalo, the Stag, the Porcupine, and even the little Hedgehog, all said they would vote with the Rhino. But the Lion and Tiger took a different view. They defended teeth, and even claws, which they described as honorable weapons of immortal antiquity. The Panther, the Leopard, the Puma and the whole tribe of small cats all supported the Lion and the Tiger.

Then the Bear spoke. He proposed that both teeth and horns should be banned and never used again for fighting by an animal. It would be quite enough if animals were allowed to give each other a good hug when they quarreled. No one could object to that. It was so fraternal and that would be a great step toward peace. However, all the other animals were very offended when the Bear, and the Turkey fell into a perfect panic.

The discussion got so hot and angry that all those animals began thinking so much about horns and teeth and hugging when that argued about the peaceful intentions that had brought them together, that they began to look at one another in a very nasty way.

Luckily, the keepers were able to calm

them to go back quietly to their cages and they began to feel quite friendly with one another again.

I believe this demonstrates the problems the President faced and overcame.

A CITY OF TWO TALES

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 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, 1952:

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. Vivian Kellums broke the withholding tax law deliberately in order to try to force a test of that law. She did not get a clear determination on the constitutional issues involved, but neither did she lose her case. So that question involving "involuntary servitude" prohibited in the Bill of Rights is still largely unsettled.

Mrs. 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 governments. 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 resource 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 delusion whose falsity is written in the blood of millions.

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

WHAT IS AN AMERICAN?

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to read into the RECORD the poem by Capt. Arthur L. Barnes, USAF, of Colorado City, Tex., for which he received the Freedoms Foundation's Defender of Freedom Award. One usually hears only of the reluctance of the American soldier—of his reluctance to serve, of his reluctance to fight, of his lack of even basic respect for his organization. Rarely considered is the soldier who is loyal; the patriotic soldier is mentioned so infrequently that his existence is questioned. Captain Barnes' poem is an affirmation of the patriotism. I wish to honor not only Captain Barnes here, but also those men both military and civilian who ascribe to the same spirit.

(The poem follows:)

WHAT IS AN AMERICAN?

(By Capt. Arthur L. Barnes USAF)

If one can look at America's tall, snow capped mountains and realize that she is beautiful, and see her miles upon miles of waving fields of grain and realize that she is fruitful, and watch her mighty rivers flowing to the sea and realize that she is powerful, then he is an American.

If one can look at America's vast, dry wilderness and know that she is harsh, and walk through her lush, green forests and know that she is wild, and observe her soggy, damp swamps and know that she is full of adventure, then he is an American.

If one can gaze at America's towering skyscrapers and know that she is progressive, and watch her men walking on the moon and know that she is constantly seeking knowledge, and watch machines probing into her abundant natural resources beneath the earth and know that she is rich, then he is an American.

If one stands a little taller when he hears her National Anthem, and senses a thrill when he sees her flag waving in the gentle breeze, realizes her freedom when he watches her great bald eagles winging silently in space, then he is an American.

If one can be proud when she is faithful, and hurt when she has been wronged, and fearful when she is restless and violent, then he is an American.

If one can read her history and realize that she is not perfect and look upon her many races of people and cultures and see only one, and attend one of her numerous religions and know that she is devout, then he is an American.

If one is willing to speak in her behalf when she has been criticized, and willing to fight for her when she has been threatened, and willing to die for her if she calls him to her aid, then he is an American.

If one can dream impossible dreams and know that America dreams also, and hope with all one's heart for a better and more perfect tomorrow and realize that she is trying with all her might, and have faith in her when she fails but turns to try again, then he is an American.

If one can watch her long, straight lines of men in uniform and know that she is strong and watch her gather the world's needy to her bosom and know that she is compassionate, and observe her courts in process and know that she is just, then he is an American.

If one can speak one's thought without

fear of punishment, and write one's ideas for the whole world to read, and simply be allowed to be one's self without fear of criticism from others, then he is an American.

If one can sing when America sings and shout when she shouts, and laugh when she laughs, and pray when she prays, and struggle when she struggles, and cry when she cries, then he is an American.

SALUTE TO EDUCATION

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, today the National Education Association is holding a well deserved salute to education.

I am honored to join in this salute. As a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, as a college trustee, and as a concerned citizen, I am deeply committed to the goal of improving the quality of education of our children. The future of our greatest natural resource—our children—is far too important for us to be content with anything less than the best possible educational opportunities for our young people.

We can be proud of the educational achievements of this Nation. Our schools have helped prepare students for productive roles in an increasingly complicated technological society. The diversity and improvement of many school programs—on the elementary, secondary, and college level—have given each succeeding generation of young Americans new opportunities for exciting and fulfilling careers and participation in community affairs.

We can be proud that our schools are improving in both services and educational equipment—from teachers for children with learning difficulties to advanced science and language laboratory equipment. Most importantly, the ability and commitment of the Nation's primary and secondary schoolteachers have made it possible for generations of students to pursue their full academic potential. Teachers have improved on their already high standards—facing the complexities of education in the 1970's with compassion, dedication, and renewed vigor. Our children benefit from their concern and guidance as well as their pledge to prepare youngsters for the responsibilities and challenges of the future.

To be sure, we must constantly improve and update both educational services and educational technique. I have confidence in our schools and institutions of higher learning, as well as in the truly dedicated public servants who turn our schools into living workshops for learning. This is why I have and will continue to give my strong support to legislative proposals in Congress which are designed to build and strengthen the educational process in America. An example is the recently House passed appropriations bill to provide over \$2 billion for needy elementary and secondary schools.

Those who have made education a lifetime profession deserve to be applauded

during this salute to education for service to our young people and for helping to realize the hopes and dreams of America's future.

SALUTE TO EDUCATION

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, today we are paying tribute to American education, and it is indeed a pleasure to participate in the program this afternoon.

For some, education has become a point of controversy, and in recent weeks we here in Congress have spent many hours discussing the various approaches we might take to better our educational system and to insure its progress. Improved education is a goal we all share.

However, one of the most pleasant aspects of serving in this House, for me, is the opportunity it affords to work with many former teachers and educators, for I have found that my colleagues who have previously served in the field of education bring a special insight to this aspect of our work in Congress.

Although I was not an educator, I have long been active and interested in the field. When my son was growing up in Elizabeth, N.J., I had normal maternal concerns about the quality of education he was receiving in the local public schools. Like many other mothers, I joined the local PTA and, within time, became president of the Elmora elementary school chapter. This was my first chance to see the process and problems of education on the primary school level from the inside. It was a most valuable experience.

Later, when I served for 6 years as chairman of the education committee of the State assembly in New Jersey, I never forgot the problems I saw as a PTA president. My observations in the PTA led to my strong support of legislation establishing the first substantive State school aid plan in New Jersey, and my firsthand contacts and friendships with teachers and educators contributed to my support of the first legislation establishing a minimum pay schedule for teachers in the State. Incidentally, the passage of this legislation remains as one of my proudest achievements.

Many of my colleagues here today have saluted one of their favorite teachers. I would like to salute, and also thank, all the teachers and educators I have had the pleasure of knowing and working with through the years. I also want to take this opportunity to recognize the many fine ladies and gentlemen I have met who represented the National Education Association and the New Jersey Education Association, both of which do a most admirable job of presenting the views and needs of educators to legislators on the State and Federal levels. It has been an honor for me to be associated with them, and I wish both organizations and all others in the field of education continued success.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY
RICK MEYER

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, in Houston a few weeks ago, a young man received a great deal of attention when he charged that he had been struck by a high school official after he made a disturbance during commencement exercises.

The man was not a student at the school, and his claims have not been substantiated; but that event overshadowed something that was, in my view, far more significant. Another young man by the name of Rick Meyer delivered the commencement address to his fellow classmates that evening. It was, by any measure, outstanding. It showed commendable insight and maturity for a high school senior—but most of all, it showed understanding of the society in which we live.

I believe that Rick Meyer represents the vast majority of the graduates at Spring Woods High School this year. He represents the young people who realize that we have many problems in our country and who are committed to solving them—not through violence and civil disobedience, but through determination and hard work.

These are the people who should be in the public eye, but it is a sad fact of life that the actions of an irresponsible few can often blot out the efforts and conduct of the responsible majority. When we hear and read so much about this minority, I think we get a distorted view of what is really going on in our country.

It may not be as exciting or sensational, but once in a while we should look around us and take stock of the constructive forces in our society. We need to cite what is wrong in order to improve ourselves; but sometimes we should remember all that is right, so that we do not lose the spirit that made our country great.

Rick's speech offers some sound observations for our next generation of leaders, and it is unfortunate that it did not receive the coverage that was afforded to the rowdy young man in the audience. I would like to share that speech with my colleagues:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS

(By Rick Meyer)

Dr. Landrum, Board Members, Mr. Emmons, Mr. Atsinger, Our Teachers, Rev. Mathis, Honored Guests, friends, parents, and fellow classmates:

I ask you to look around yourselves and see some of the most remarkable people ever to walk the earth. These, your parents, grandparents, aunts and uncles, are the people, who within just the last five decades have helped to create the most advanced civilization ever to exist. They have by their own work doubled our life expectancy and through their achievements in medicine and health have performed open heart surgery, succeeded in transplanting most vital organs, controlled tuberculosis and eliminated polio. There are no longer epidemics of typhus, diphtheria, scarlet fever and smallpox.

These are the generations that placed men on the moon and brought them safely back. They overcame the most devastating depression in the world's history. And, through their work and efforts they have welded one of the strongest economies ever known. Many of them knew what it was to be poor, to be hungry and to be cold, and, because of this, they were determined that it should not happen to us, that we should have a better life, that we should always have food to eat, a warm home, better schools and far greater opportunities to succeed. These are also the people who fought man's grizzliest war. They are the people that defeated the tyranny of Hitler, and who, when it was all over, had the compassion to send billions of dollars to their former enemies so that they could rebuild their homeland.

Since these past generations had the foresight to be what is labeled as materialistic, we will have to work fewer hours and will be able to enjoy more leisure time. Their generations learned to live in an economic world. They have come a long way in proving that money is not necessarily evil, by converting money into jobs and libraries, hospitals and roads. Because they gave us their best, we are the tallest, healthiest, brightest and no doubt the best looking generation ever to inhabit the earth.

Their economic society is an infinitely complex mixture of science and technology, systems and techniques, men and machines; all of which, they have developed in their last fifty years of work. These generations have made more progress by their own sweat and blood than in any previous era—and we can never forget it. And yet, these generations know better than anyone else that theirs is not a perfect world. For today the land is filled with many problems and of seemingly insurmountable odds, which cry out for solutions. Our world should certainly be an awakening world, for what shall be different than our parents' will be the broad awareness brought about mainly by developments in all forms of instant mass communication. This new awareness shall be our greatest strength.

Someone once wrote, "Learn the nature of man, and have compassion for his weaknesses, seek glory in his strengths and in his goodness, for whatever else he is, he is trying to be and to become."

Keeping this in mind, we must make ourselves even more aware of the problems, the conflicts, the philosophies, the fundamental values, the individual rights, the many injustices and the many possibilities that exist. For only through knowledge shall we find the answers.

We might have a more difficult world, and if not a more difficult one it certainly is a more demanding world, but surely it is not a worse world, for these problems will be our opportunities. We must find and set ourselves a goal, united—under which we all can work to provide equality for the races and for the sexes; for reforming our government to function on a forthright and honest basis; to absolve the problems of increasing crime; to seek solutions to heart disease, multiple sclerosis, cancer and the common cold and to find a means to bring the teeming masses from poverty into life. It shall not be so important that we reach these goals as that we are united, in working to solve them.

For ours is an age of unprecedented change and one in which a person, regardless of persuasion can play a vital part. This is the age of the protesters and dissenters, the protectors and defenders. This is the age of the peacemakers. It is the age for all those who are firmly grounded to the rock, which is our past and with hearts which are filled with faith and hope for that which can be our future. It is the age of those who are determined to build, not destroy—to love, not

to kill—to understand and find compassion for all men of every race, not just for now, for all time.

For we are tomorrow, and tomorrow is ours, and what we do with it shall be our legacy.

POINTS WELL TAKEN

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, some of the most provocative editorials in the area which I represent appear in the Chula Vista, Calif., Star-News. Mainly, they are written by Lowell Blankfort, the publisher of this newspaper.

While I do not always agree with Mr. Blankfort, I have never been able to fault the quality of his writing, or the courage and consistency of his convictions.

An editorial with which I concur fully appeared in the Star-News on June 15, a week ago. As usual, Mr. Blankfort is able to make his point with commendable economy of words.

The editorial, which I commend to the attention of colleagues on both sides of the aisle, follows:

WORDS TO LIVE BY

President Nixon, Vice-President Agnew and others in the administration entourage have indicated that Americans who criticize the administration's Vietnam policy, if not downright disloyal, at least should have their patriotism questioned because they are giving "aid and comfort to the enemy."

What is needed, they say, is "unity"—which, translated, means blind, uncritical sheep-like obedience to whatever Richard Nixon thinks America should be doing in Vietnam.

Readers of Star-News editorials, of course, know that we do not share these views. But recently we read two statements on the subject of wartime dissent which perhaps state the case better than we could.

The first statement was:

"During recent years, a theory has developed that there shall be no criticism of the foreign policy of the administration, that any such criticism is an attack on the unity of the nation, that it gives aid and comfort to the enemy, and that it sabotages any idea of a bipartisan foreign policy for the national benefit.

"I venture to state that this proposition is a fallacy and a very dangerous fallacy . . . Members of Congress, and particularly members of the Senate, have a Constitutional obligation to reexamine constantly and discuss the foreign policy of the United States.

"If we permit appeals to unity to bring an end to that criticism, we endanger not only the Constitutional liberties of our country, but even its future existence."

The second statement was:

"What is more important (than unity) is that we adopt the right policy in a moment of great national danger. This means that, above all, our policy should represent the best thinking of our national leaders, including those who disagree with the President as well as those who agree with him.

"The country wants unity, but not unity on a policy which has led to disaster on the perpetuation in power of those who made that policy and cannot be expected to make good on any other . . .

"Disunity hurts our cause without question, but unity on a policy which was wrong

in the first place could bring even greater disaster."

Both statements were made on the Senate floor in 1951, during the Korean war. The first statement was made by "Mr. Republican"—the late Senator Robert A. Taft.

The second statement was made by Senator Richard M. Nixon.

EDUCATORS FINDING SOLUTIONS IN TROUBLED URBAN SCHOOLS

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the fact of mandatory public education for every American child is one that can be viewed with both pride and concern. We can be proud of our Nation's extensive and advanced system of schools and the dedicated teachers and administrators who give life to these institutions. We can also be proud of the progress that has been made over the past years in eradicating illiteracy and producing generations of high school graduates who are better educated every year. Certainly those who give their time and devotion to educating America's youth deserve the highest praise and tribute.

However, while saluting education today, I must also express concern for the health of our educational system. It is obvious that the many years of schooling our children receive have great influence over their lives. It is also well known that many of our inner city schools are rapidly deteriorating into convenient buildings to push drugs and likely places to get knifed. What child can escape being emotionally, and perhaps physically scarred by such an environment? Such problems are also spreading to suburban schools, where racial tension and use of drugs are common phenomena. Happily such situations can be alleviated with a combination of patience, hard work and tact. This was demonstrated last year in Easton, Pa., a city in my congressional district. When racial troubles emerged in the city's high school, an interracial student-faculty committee was immediately established so that grievances could be rationally discussed. The members of this group became deeply involved, and spent much time and effort to improve conditions. Ultimately, the whole city became concerned, and public meetings were held, often in extremely emotional atmospheres. Further trouble, however, was averted by the prompt response of faculty and administrators. Today the school is calm, and both students and teachers have learned much from the year's experience.

Easton, however, is a small city with a generally high standard of living. This sort of problem is so much magnified in larger cities that many view the situation with despair. I believe, however, that our schools can be saved, with the help of Federal, State, and local governments and with the skill, dedication, and understanding that our Nation's educators bring to their jobs. Improvements in

American education will undoubtedly be reflected in her students. It is of vital importance to our country's future that our children receive the best possible education—and the safest.

Easton's experience is but one example of American educators' determination to guarantee both.

BUILD DOZENS OF NUCLEAR REACTORS

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, at the present time proposals have been made to build dozens of nuclear reactors all over the country to meet predicted power needs.

Because of the potential danger to the population around these nuclear plants we should be able to assume that safety is the prime consideration of the builders and operators of these plants and the Atomic Energy Commission, which is supposed to regulate the use of atomic power.

Unfortunately, in at least one case, this has not been true. Public Service Electric & Gas Co. of New Jersey has asked for permission to build a nuclear powerplant on Newbold Island in the Delaware River and the staff of the AEC has approved its plans.

This installation, if it is ever built, will have reactors that are among the largest in the country. It will be closer to more people than any other plant already in operation, under construction, or proposed for the future. This facility will also have the smallest safety distance, 1½ miles, between it and large numbers of people.

I am opposed to the construction of this plant, which is 11 miles from my northeast Philadelphia district, because it is too close to too many people and because there is great doubt about the effectiveness of its safety and emergency equipment.

During the week of June 12 the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board of the AEC held hearings on the company's application for a construction permit for the Newbold Island plant.

The company's witnesses were unable to give precise answers to questions about how safety factors were calculated or the number of people who live and work near the plant was determined.

At this time I enter in the RECORD two portions of the transcript of that hearing. The first was an exchange between the chairman of the hearing board, Samuel W. Jensch, and the project manager for P.S.E. & G., Robert Mittl. The second is a conversation between Mr. Jensch and Troy Conner, the attorney for the company:

EXCHANGE BETWEEN CHAIRMAN, ROBERT MITTL, AND TROY CONNER

Chairman JENSCH. Excuse me just a moment. Before we do recess: What information did you have for your basis of the estimate for the number of employees at the Fairless

Works, plus the 250 in this blast furnace area and so forth?

Witness MITTL. Our approach here was to determine the total number of people at the U.S. Works, which was not available in a breakdown by shift, which then required that we assign a certain number of people.

Now, we made the conservative assumption that there are more people on the day shift than on the other two shifts.

So therefore we have assigned more people to that day shift.

Now the approach that we used for assigning a number of people, or estimating a number of people to occupy the area within the one-mile, or the 250, was based on such factors as the facilities, the structures that they had there, the buildings, and a general awareness of the activities as we talked about the blast furnace, the power plant, or the sintering plant, and factoring those things in as to the type of activities, and what in our judgment would require more people to carry on the operations. And we then did a, to the best that we could, in referring to aerial photographs, that I believe are presented in our document here, to the distribution of the automobiles as far as the parking facilities and where automobiles were parking. In our judgment this represented a good approach to the distribution of people in an area with the assumption and in our judgment a proper assumption that one does provide to the extent possible for the convenience of the workers to give them the ability to park as close to where they are going to be performing their duties.

So those factors, the type of activities that we went through, the extent of our awareness, as judged by the magnitude of the structures, existing in the area of the distribution of the participating lots with the activities, such as the blast furnace, and the power plant activities, and the activities related to the handling of the ships that come in, the loading and unloading of those. And in our judgment, that was a reasonable approach for the estimate of the 250 which appears in Exhibit 5.

Chairman JENSCH. Did you consider making a gate count? Do I describe it correctly? You know, when the men walk out the gate, you have a count, 1, 2, so forth.

Witness MITTL. I understand your question, sir. I think the answer is no, we did not. I don't think we considered it at the time, either.

Chairman JENSCH. I see. Well, now, as I understand it, you walked by the Fairless plant, you looked at the building, and that was a blast house. Did you look at the size of the building, or width of the building, or was it the size of the roof that indicated to you the number of people inside?

Witness MITTL. I didn't say the size of the building itself.

Chairman JENSCH. You said you looked at the structures.

Witness MITTL. That was one of the considerations in our assigning a distribution of people in developing that estimate. Knowing the type of activities, let's say, being in general, familiar with the type of activities that went on in the facility.

We heavily weighted the parking distribution.

Chairman JENSCH. How many people to a car did you assign?

Witness MITTL. We did not do that, sir, but our approach was to come up with a general estimate of the proportions, or if you will, percentage of parking in the various areas, and then distribute among those proportions the number of people that we assumed working on the day shift.

Chairman JENSCH. How many did you assume in each car when you looked at the parking lot?

Witness MITTL. Sir, we did not make a car count, nor did we assume a given number of people per car. But we did it on the ap-

proach, as an illustration purpose only, if, for example, if we knew that in a case in there had been a hundred—I would like to use this as a hypothetical case. I believe it will make the point. If we assume that there is a facility that employed 100 people, for example, and if we determined that there were three parking areas associated with that facility, if we then determined that one parking facility was twice as large as the other two which were of equal size, then we would have assumed that associated with that larger parking area, there would have been half of the total of the people, and half of that other area, there would have been 25 people associated with those areas and that was the approach that we use.

Chairman JENSCH. Did anybody ever think of asking the United States Steel Company people themselves?

Witness MITTL. We have asked the U.S. Steel people, sir.

Chairman JENSCH. And they have refused to give you the information?

Witness MITTL. They have at this point not come forth with the information.

Chairman JENSCH. Did you talk to the union leaders who know the number of union people employed there?

Witness MITTL. No, we have not approached the union, sir.

Chairman JENSCH. It was a judgment that you made in looking at the cars and the buildings and what you thought was inside the building, and coming up with a figure, is that right?

Witness MITTL. That is correct. As I described it, sir.

Chairman JENSCH. Very well. At this time let us recess to reconvene in this room at 11:15.

(Recess.)

Chairman JENSCH. Yes.

Mr. CONNER. Excuse me, sir. On the point of the motion, we oppose any suggestion which that data, as I said, is correct, accurate and valid, strike that from the record, as serving absolutely no purpose. And it does in fact, represent the land use information as it was available at that time.

Chairman JENSCH. Well, I don't think for the moment in view of your statement, we need to spend much more time on this thing because if you bring in something more than this—there are certainly better ways to get information about the number of people in the area than the process that was undertaken here.

Mr. CONNER. Would the Chair like to tell us how it would like the study to be conducted.

Chairman JENSCH. You take another shot at it and do it in a way that is acceptable for ordinary accounts. You say you have a method that you follow—

Mr. CONNER. We propose to use professionals.

Chairman JENSCH. Well, that will be an improvement, I am sure, because I think the approach so far has been very amateurish and I think that insofar as you ascribe difficulties in getting data to place in the regulatory proceedings, I have not known any hesitancy when a number of amendments have been filed, that when you have data related to some hardware or process, you can bring it in, and likewise, since you filed this in January 1971, you happen to come across the fact that the '70 census came out and I imagine you could update the information that you have.

Mr. CONNER. Sir, the significant data has been updated as we pointed out on a couple of charts. The general land use information was illustrative. We do not propose in the ultimate to provide any census, to offer the U.S. census for this area, to support the application in any event.

Chairman JENSCH. Just do a better job than what you have done so far and I am sure it would be helpful to this proceeding.

VIOLATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN SOVIET-OCCUPIED BALTIC STATES

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, recent developments in relations between the U.S.S.R. and the United States have led many to believe that the Soviet Union is softening its militaristic attitudes and genuinely seeking a more respectable position in the spectrum of world opinion. These developments should not lull Congress or the American people into forgetting the true nature of the U.S.S.R.

An essay from the Lithuanian American Community of the United States reminds us of the continued Soviet oppression of the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. The Baltic people have been deprived of their basic human rights and denied even the semblance of freedom. However, these proud people have not acquiesced quietly to this occupation. The Balts have waged an intensive fight for freedom, which resulted in a short-lived independence in June 1941. Recent demonstrations among the Roman Catholics in Lithuania show us the desire of the Baltic people to continue to resist against Soviet Russia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the essay entitled "Violation of Human Rights in Soviet-Occupied Baltic States" and House Concurrent Resolution 416, submitted in the 89th Congress, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

VIOLATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN SOVIET- OCCUPIED BALTIC STATES

RED TERROR IN LITHUANIA, LATVIA AND ESTONIA

The Soviets dominate Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, and Russian troops are at hand to squelch any resistance. The Baltic peoples are deprived of their very basic human rights and freedom. They are unable to speak for themselves. It is the responsibility of all the people in the free world to be spokesmen for enslaved Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians and other captive people.

The Kremlin is fond of saying that Russian imperialism died with the czar. But the fate of the Baltic nations—Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia—shows this to be a cruel fiction. The Communist regime did not come to power in the Baltic States by legal or democratic process. The Soviets invaded the Baltic States in June of 1940 and grabbed them by force of arms. The Baltic peoples have been suffering in Russian-Communist captivity for more than 30 years.

SAD AND GLORIOUS EVENTS OF JUNE

The month of June is very sad as well as glorious to the Balts in all parts of the world and to other freedom-loving people. Thirty-two years ago this month—in June of 1940—the Soviet Union invaded the grand old Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia and took over these three peace-loving republics by force of arms. One year later—in June of 1941—the Russian Communists started mass deportations of the Baltic people, and over 150,000 Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians were swallowed up in Siberian slave and labor camps. Several days before the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union on

June 22, 1941, the people of Lithuania succeeded in getting rid of the Communist regime in the country: freedom and independence were restored and a free government was re-established. This free, provisional government of Lithuania remained in existence for more than six weeks. At that time Lithuania was overrun by the Nazis who suppressed all the activities of this free government and the government itself.

ANCIENT NATIONS

The Balts are proud people who have lived peacefully on the shores of the Baltic from time immemorial. For instance, this year marks the 721st anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian state. Mindaugas the Great unified Lithuanian principalities into one kingdom in 1251.

The Baltic peoples have suffered for centuries from the "accident of geography." From the West they were invaded by the Teutonic Knights, from the East by the Russians. It took remarkable spiritual and ethnic strength to survive the pressures from both sides. The Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians, it should be kept in mind, are ethnically related neither to the Germans nor the Russians.

RESISTANCE AGAINST THE INVADERS

Since the very beginning of Soviet Russian occupation, however, the Balts have waged an intensive fight for freedom. It is widely recognized that in the period between 1940 and 1952, some 30,000 Lithuanian freedom fighters lost their lives in an organized resistance movement against the Soviet conquerors.

The Baltic peoples have never experienced of their people in their long history through centuries as during the last three decades. Since June 15, 1940, the Baltic nations of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia have lost more than one-fourth of their combined populations to the ethnically genocidal deportation and resettlement programs of the Soviet Union. The genocidal operations and practices being carried out by the Soviets continue with no end in sight.

DESPERATE FLIGHT OF LITHUANIANS

Two events of the past several months indicate the desperate plight of Lithuanian's Roman Catholics, the primary target of the Soviet government repression among religious denominations. In March, 1972, a petition bearing 17,054 signatures was forwarded to Dr. Kurt Waldheim, Secretary General of the United Nations. The courageous signatories stated that they were appealing to the United Nations to relay their protest to Leonid Brezhnev, Secretary General of the Russian Communist Party, because three previous collective letters had gone unanswered.

The most recent known demonstrations against the Soviet occupation of Lithuania and persecution of religion took place in the city of Kaunas and in other cities during the second part of May, 1972. Several thousand youths battled police and Soviet soldiers in Kaunas after a young Roman Catholic, Romas Talanta, burned himself to death in a public park for political reasons. The rioting continued for several days after the funeral of Talanta and spread throughout the entire country suffering in the Soviet captivity. This immolation has brought international furor and attention to the problems besetting the captive Lithuanian nation.

CONFRONTING THE SOVIETS WITH THEIR ACTS OF AGGRESSION

The United States Government still refuses to recognize the forced incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union. But this lack of official recognition by our Government is not enough. Our diplomatic representatives at the United Nations and elsewhere should be prepared to confront the Soviet Union with its acts of aggression against Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia when

Soviet spokesmen raise the cry of "imperialism" against our own country.

The Soviet Union has signed the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights. This document describes the fundamental privileges which are due to every individual from a state in which he lives. These include the rights of assembly, of free elections and of freedom of worship. Most importantly, they include the right to move freely over the borders for emigration or temporary visiting.

The United States and other countries of the free world should urge the Kremlin leaders to make these rights described in the Declaration available to the Balts and other captive people. If the rulers of the Soviet Union had the courage to carry out such reforms there would be no need for self-immolation to demonstrate the plight of Lithuanians and other people in the Russian Communist captivity.

BRINGING THE BALTIC CASE IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Past experience indicates that the Soviet Government is sensitive to criticism of its actions by those in the free world. Hoping that such means may minimize the persecution of the Balts in the Soviet captivity, the Administration should go ahead and implement H. Con. Res. 416 (89th Congress). This legislation was unanimously passed by the House and the Senate and it calls for the freedom from Soviet domination of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. The President of the United States should bring the issue of the liberation of the Baltic States in the United Nations and demand the Soviets to withdraw from Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. We should have a single standard for freedom. Its denial in the whole or in part, in any place in the world, including the Soviet Union, is surely intolerable.

TREATIES THAT WERE NOT KEPT BY THE SOVIETS

ILLEGAL SEIZURE OF THE BALTIC STATES BY THE SOVIET UNION

The Communist regime did not come to power in the Baltic States by legal or democratic process. The Soviets invaded and occupied the Baltic States in June of 1940, and the Baltic peoples have been suffering in Russian-Communist captivity for 32 years.

The seizure and annexation of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia by the Soviet Union constituted an act of aggression and a flagrant violation of numerous international treaties and agreements, as well as the inalienable rights of the Baltic peoples.

The treaties and agreements violated by the Soviet Union are:

1. *Treaty of Peace between Russia and Estonia*, signed at Tartu (Estonia) on February 2, 1940;
2. *Peace Treaty between Lithuania and the Russian Socialist Federal Republic*, and Protocol, signed at Moscow on July 12, 1920;
3. *Treaty of Peace between Latvia and Russia*, done at Moscow, completed and signed at Riga (Latvia), August 11, 1920;
4. *Treaty of Non-Aggression between the Republic of Lithuania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, signed at Moscow on September 28, 1926;
5. *Treaty of Non-Aggression and Peaceful Settlement of Disputes between Estonia and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, signed at Moscow, May 4, 1932; extended in 1934 for a term to last until December 31, 1945;
6. *Convention for the Definition of Aggression*, signed at London, July 3, 1933, between Romania, Estonia, Latvia, Poland, Turkey, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Persia, and Afghanistan.
7. *Convention between Lithuania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for the Definition of Aggression*, signed at London, July 5, 1933; extended in 1933 for a term to last until April 4, 1943;
8. *Treaty of Non-Aggression between Lat-*

CXVIII—1396—Part 17

via and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, signed at Riga, February 5, 1932;

9. *General Treaty for Renunciation of War as an Instrument of National Policy*, signed at Paris, August 27, 1928, to which 63 states are parties among them the Soviet Union and the Republics of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia;

10. *Convention relating to the Establishment of the Conciliation Commission and Conciliation Procedure between Latvia and the U.S.S.R.*, signed on June 18, 1932;

11. *Mutual Assistance Pact between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Estonia*, signed on September 28, 1939;

12. *Mutual Assistance Pact between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Latvia*, signed on October 5, 1939;

13. *Mutual Assistance Pact between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Lithuania*, signed on October 10, 1939;

14. *The Covenant of the League of Nations*, came into force on January 10, 1920. Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia became Members of the League on September 22, 1921, and the Soviet Union on September 18, 1934.

As the forcible incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia by the Soviet Union constitutes a violation of international treaties and generally accepted and recognized principles of international law, the Soviet regime in the three Baltic States lacks any legal basis and should be regarded only as a temporary occupation.

H. CON. RES. 416

Whereas the subjugation of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation; and Whereas all peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, cultural, and religious development; and

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE FINAL FRONTIER

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Chicago Sun-

Times of April 29, 1972, discusses the epic flight of Apollo 16. This brief but significant editorial quotes Astronaut Capt. John W. Young following their return from space. His prophetic words not only describe the significance of the Apollo 16 flight, but of the entire manned lunar landing program. As the editorial so aptly points out, only one Apollo flight remains and our Nation must now embark on a program utilizing the vast knowledge and skills derived from our first decade in space. The editorial follows:

THE FINAL FRONTIER

Americans have grown accustomed to the moon and to the brave men who go there. The spectacle of men bobbing on the moon's surface still draws prime-time attention. The moments when trouble occurs and lives are in doubt still grab at the heart. Yet, after five successful moon missions in just three years, the pure perfection of the thing has led to a degree of boredom in Americans, and that is unfortunate and wrong.

The three heroes of the just-concluded Apollo 16 trip crept to the edge of man's knowledge. They returned in wonder and exuberance that underscores the earthly pettiness of a concern for moon exploration as entertainment, rather than pioneering discovery. One of the three, Navy Capt. John W. Young, said of the \$455-million voyage:

"You got your money's worth on this one. You saw an example of goal-oriented teamwork, the kind of thing that made this country great and is gonna keep it that way."

"There are secrets in that vehicle now. One of these days it's gonna benefit us all. That basic knowledge is pushing back the last real frontier, and, by golly, that's essential to the survival of humanity on this planet."

Only one more manned Apollo trip is on the schedule. That era of exploration will end, and there are many who will barely notice. But Young's comments were on target, for space travel is not commonplace. It has taken a fantastic effort, a pride in accomplishment from drawing board to moon surface, to carry science to the moon.

Astronauts Young, Lt. Comdr. Thomas K. Mattingly II and Lt. Col. Charles M. Duke Jr. have shown space exploration to be historic in both deed and value.

PROGRESSIVE BLUE CROSS MOVE

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I introduced H.R. 14109, National Cooley's Anemia Control Act, to provide \$7.1 million for research, treatment, and training programs to ease and eventually eliminate the agony of Cooley's anemia. I urge my colleagues to support this essential legislation.

Cooley's anemia, a generic disorder of the hemoglobin of the blood, afflicts about 200,000 persons in this country, and tragically most of them are children. In most instances death will occur before the 20th year. Little is known of the disease. There is no known cure. Treatment consists solely of frequent costly blood transfusions to alleviate the constantly recurring anemia.

I commend the recent decision of the Connecticut Blue Cross to offer outpatient blood transfusion benefits to the victims of Cooley's anemia. This progressive action will help to alleviate the tremendous financial burdens which the families of these victims must bear.

I commend the following editorial entitled "Progressive Blue Cross Move" which appeared in the June 15, 1972, edition of the New Haven, Conn., Register to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the New Haven (Conn.) Register, June 15, 1972]

PROGRESSIVE BLUE CROSS MOVE

Connecticut Blue Cross has made a decision that seems to be both humane and practical. It is a decision that answers the special needs of those who deserve all the help they can get—victims of Cooley's anemia. And in the long run, it could benefit all Blue Cross subscribers by eliminating unnecessary hospitalization.

In offering an outpatient blood transfusion benefit to victims of Cooley's anemia, Connecticut Blue Cross is embarking upon a pilot effort. It is providing transfusion coverage to those with this genetic blood disorder. The latter require blood transfusions every four to six weeks throughout their lives—an enormous burden the cost of which had not been previously covered by either Blue Cross or private insurance plans on an outpatient basis. Now it will not be necessary for victims of the disease to be admitted to hospitals so that they can be covered for the transfusions.

TAX RELIEF FOR VICTIMS OF CRIME

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, as you recall, the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER) and I introduced a comprehensive bill to provide compensation in the form of tax relief to the victims of crime and to provide tax deductions for the purchase and installation of antitheft devices.

I feel that a letter which I have just received from the Northwest Civic Association of Floral Park, N.Y., provides clear support for this type of legislation and I include it in the RECORD following my remarks so that our colleagues might be aware of their reasoning.

The letter follows:

THE NORTHWEST

CIVIC ASSOCIATION,

Floral Park, N.Y., June 18, 1972.

Congress of the United States,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D.C.

(Att: Honorable LESTER L. WOLFF).

DEAR CONGRESSMAN, at its last regularly scheduled meeting before the summer recess the membership of this association has directed the undersigned, its president to convey their support and unanimous approval of your bill H.R. 14805 which will provide tax relief of victims of crime and for crime prevention.

Several of our members have been the victims of burglary resulting in theft losses of personal effects as well as household items including heirlooms and family artifacts. In

most cases the resulting loss arising from this type of theft are not compensated for by insurance or otherwise. To the extent that the aggregate of these losses sometimes exceeds \$100, there should be an allowance for deductions on our individual income taxes during the taxable year in which the theft or burglary occurs.

In fact, we concur with the substance and provisions of this bill, which would also provide an allowance of deduction for the expense incurred for installing locks, burglar alarms or other warning devices in the private home in order to deter future invasion of privacy by burglars and thieves.

You have our whole-hearted support and encouragement in continuing your efforts in bringing this piece of legislation into enactment.

Respectfully yours,

ALFRED MICHALSKI.

SALUTE TO EDUCATION

HON. J. IRVING WHALLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, American education has much to be proud of. More than 63 million Americans are engaged full time as students, teachers or administrators in the Nation's educational enterprise. During the past decade, the number of students in our schools has increased by 13 million. It is, of course, true that the cost of education has increased tremendously in those 10 years; to be precise, by 160 percent to \$70 billion. But I think the case can easily be made that our educational system has grown and improved so that the added expenditure may be more than justified.

American education has expanded on a number of fronts. There is a growing concern with the education of the preschool child. Federal efforts such as the Headstart program demonstrate our commitment in that area. We are also seeing the growth of programs in our schools which attempt to prepare students more realistically for the world outside of school. This is witnessed not only in the growth of the vocational school, but also in the increase in classes within academic schools dealing with consumer education and career plans.

At the level of higher education, there is an expanding network of junior colleges which are making more varied educational opportunities available to larger numbers. And finally, there is an increasing commitment to the education of the older learner. This is seen in both the adult basic education courses, which attempt to aid adults who are educationally deficient, and in the general adult education programs which offer a large variety of courses in fields of interest to the adult learner.

I am proud of America's educational system, because through its growth and extension into different age groups and segments of the population, it is becoming a system of true lifelong learning. It is with this in mind that today I salute American education.

WHAT IS A "LOGOPHAG?"

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, every once in a while someone invents a new word that fits the times.

Clare Boothe Luce, on the floor of this House right after World War II, hit the nail on the head with the word "globaloney"—which was raising the question of whether or not the United States could carry the world on its back.

That well-known columnist for Newsweek, Stewart Alsop, has come up with a new beaut in which he designates politicians who eat their words as "logophags."

He has written a most thoughtful article in the June 10 issue of Newsweek which gives some indication of how politicians get into trouble with programs that are not well thought out and which sound quite appealing until they get caught up in the truth. It is at this point Mr. Alsop believes that the politician begins to eat his words.

It would appear that we are going to see a lot of word eating in the coming campaign if all that this article predicts comes true.

The article follows:

[From Newsweek, June 10, 1972]

McGOVERN AS WORD-EATER

(By Stewart Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—All major politicians have to be accomplished logophags, or word-eaters. This is partly because what the voters want to hear in one election they may not at all want to hear in the next. It is partly because a politician has to appeal to one constituency to win his party's nomination and quite a different constituency to win the general election.

It is already apparent that George McGovern has more word-eating to do than any major politician since Franklin Roosevelt was elected as a passionately committed budget-balancer.

To understand why McGovern is going to have to consume a veritable feast of words, consider a discovery his California financial angel, Max Palevsky, recently made about the McGovern welfare and tax programs. McGovern's \$1,000-for-everybody program was originally inspired by an episode now dim in everybody's mind—the entry of Sen. Fred Harris of Oklahoma in the Democratic sweepstakes.

It is hard to believe now, but the Harris entry gave the McGovern people sleepless nights. The whole McGovern strategy was based on co-opting the Democratic left. That was McGovern's only hope of capturing the nomination—and in those days it seemed a mighty slim hope to everybody but George McGovern. Yet, here was Fred Harris entering the race as a prairie populist and poor man's candidate.

BOLD PROGRAM

What was needed, the McGovern strategists agreed, was a bold, populist-sounding program that would leave no room for Harris on McGovern's left. Partly as a result of several telephone conversations with Yale's Prof. James Tobin, an advocate of the "negative income tax," McGovern countered the Harris candidacy with his \$1,000-for-everybody program.

Any dolt capable of doing simple arithmetic could figure out the gross cost to the

Treasury of paying every American from Nelson Rockefeller to the merest tot \$1,000 a year—\$209 billion. Aside from printing greenbacks, the only way to balance this vast sum would have been by a ferocious soak-the-rich tax program, plus heavy cuts in other government expenditures.

The major cut proposed by McGovern was the 40 per cent defense cut. As for the soak-the-rich program, in its original form, it was ferocious indeed. McGovern proposed 100 per cent taxes on all inheritances over \$500,000, which would in time have left the country with a capitalist system but no capitalists. He also proposed to collect \$6 billion in increased taxes on people with incomes over \$50,000. Since a 100 per cent tax on incomes over \$50,000 would yield only \$7.5 billion, this was soaking the rich with a vengeance.

\$40 BILLION SHORT

On paper, McGovern's spending cuts, plus his soak-the-rich tax program, were supposed to pay for his \$1,000-for-everybody welfare plan. But toward the end of the California primary, Max Palevsky, who owes his vast fortune to mastery of computer technology, put the McGovern figures into his computers and made his discovery. The discovery was that there was a shortfall of a cool \$42 billion between outgo for the welfare program and income from spending cuts and taxes. Palevsky made all the most favorable assumptions, and fed the figures into his computers front, rear and sideways. The result was always the same—a \$40 billion-plus shortfall.

Six distinguished liberal economists, including Yale's Tobin, have now been summoned to a meeting in Los Angeles to "rethink" the whole McGovern tax and welfare program. The result of the rethinking is sure to be a heaping dish of words for McGovern to eat.

McGovern has already quietly eaten a substantial meal of words. He has backed away from his 100 per cent tax on inheritances over \$500,000, lowering the proposed take to 77 per cent. He has also exempted family-owned businesses, notably including newspapers. There are a lot of family-owned papers left in the country, most of them worth many millions, and the thought may have occurred to McGovern that if he stuck to his original program his press support would be less enthusiastic than it has been.

In his recent full-page, \$21,000 Wall Street Journal ad, McGovern sought to portray himself as a moderate fellow where taxes and the like are concerned. There has been word-eating on other fronts as well. For example, McGovern originally proposed unconditional amnesty for "those who, on grounds of conscience, have refused to participate" in the Vietnam war. Now he excludes deserters, and wants to extend amnesty to draft dodgers only.

McGovern must be given credit for candor, since he has been remarkably detailed and explicit on the issues. George Wallace, by contrast, when asked for details, talks about those sandwiches in the briefcases of the pointy-headed bureaucrats. McGovern might have done better to stick with the sandwiches.

For the words he is going to have to eat are right there, in black and white, dating from the days when nobody—but nobody—was going to get to the left of George McGovern. For example, McGovern is flatly committed, not simply to withdrawal from Vietnam, but to meeting unilaterally the basic Communist condition. This is to force the South Vietnamese to surrender by cutting off all logistic support—this without any explicit promise by the Communists to return the American prisoners.

WILL VOTERS BUY?

This sort of thing gets loud cheers on the campuses. But is it a proposition that a

majority of the American voters will buy? For that matter, do a majority of voters really favor cutting American defenses by 40 per cent, at a time when the Soviets are clearly achieving their announced goal—to "overtake and surpass" American military power?

But the area in which McGovern is going to have to do most of his word-eating is the area in which he has been quietly eating his words already—tax and welfare reform. To those schooled in the arcane pseudo-science of economics, the negative income tax makes a sort of loony sense. Indeed, the basic notion is incorporated in President Nixon's Family Assistance Plan.

But to most ordinary Americans, the idea of handing out \$1,000 a year to everybody certainly smacks more of looniness than of sense. And that huge shortfall discovered by Max Palevsky and his computers will surely compound the looniness. Word-eating will not come easily to George McGovern, since it will tend to tarnish the image of the plain-spoken antipolitician. The fact remains that, if McGovern is to have a serious shot at the White House, he will have to embark on a really prodigious exercise in logophagacy.

SMITHSONIAN'S DRUGS: A SPECIAL EXHIBITION

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the Smithsonian Institution is presenting a most worthwhile exhibition on the subject of drugs. The exhibition places the drug problem of today in a historical and social context. Its message is that there are no such things as "good" or "bad" drugs, but that almost any drug can be misused. While not a "horror show," the exhibit puts into clear perspective the dangers inherent in drugs and how misuse affects the individual and society. Using new and imaginative techniques, the exhibit presents different points of view on drugs and a clear and accurate summary of present medical knowledge about drugs and society's method of dealing with their use and misuse.

The Washington Post of May 29 carried an editorial highly praising the exhibit which I believe will be of interest to my colleagues, and I include it in the RECORD at this point.

AT THE SMITHSONIAN: AN EXHIBIT

The word "Drugs" flashes in red, green, yellow and blue neon letters amidst the Wright Brothers' airplane, the Apollo 11 space capsule and other historic hardware in the Smithsonian's Art and Industries Building these days. It invites us to a special exhibition, a somewhat bewildering but thought-provoking and informative journey through the complexities of America's drug phenomenon.

The journey begins with displays of 19th century advertising of patent medicines, drugs, alcohol and tobacco—the "magic potion notion" of our fathers and grandfathers. Next we come to an array of vending machines, symbolizing our consumer culture and dramatizing the way technology has afforded easy access to drugs for a growing public. A quarter dropped into these automats buys you a harmless trinket—rum-flavored candy and such—some printed information and admission to an air-inflated

bubble dome. The plastic dome houses an array of superb photographs illustrating the drug scene, that alone is worth the admission fee. What really sent us, however, are life-size dummies of an American Indian, a Southeast Asian girl, an inner-city black, a suburban teenager and a housewife, each speaking his or her mind in an eerie sort of way. What makes it eerie is that these dummies really seem to talk in a feat of "talking pop art," created by means of rear-view projected motion pictures of an actor's face.

You go on through a more conventionally mounted but hardly less exciting maze of exhibits on the medical and social aspects of drugs that ends with a "trip-off cage," a pawnbroker's showcase of the goods stolen to support drug habits. The final section consists of a "rap theater," where various movies are shown and discussions are held.

What impressed us about this exhibition was not only its imaginative, pop-art manner of presentation, that is sure to appeal to young people. It was also the forthright way in which the Smithsonian covered this controversial subject.

SUPPORT FOR REVENUE SHARING

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we have heard support of revenue sharing from all quarters, especially from State and local officials. The mayors of our largest cities are counting on this bill to help ease their financial situations.

Revenue sharing will also help our rural counties and smaller cities. I include at this point in the RECORD, resolutions from the county boards of supervisors of Buffalo County and Vernon County, Wis., and the cities of Galesville, Osseo, and Blair, Wis., in the hope that these expressions of support for revenue sharing will help the Members of the House appreciate that the problems at which revenue sharing is aimed are problems shared by citizens and governmental units in both urban and rural areas:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, county government has badly needed federal revenue sharing to alleviate the high tax cost to local county taxpayers; and

Whereas, the federal House Ways and Means Committee has reported out of committee the \$26.5 billion, 5 year compromise federal revenue sharing bill, known as H.R. 14730 the "State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972", and the House of Representatives will vote on this bill during the week of May 8, 1972; and

Whereas, the passage of this bill is the most favorable vehicle for Wisconsin taxpayers to more equitably recoup some of their federal dollars from Washington, D.C.

Now therefore be it resolved, that the County Board of Buffalo County, State of Wisconsin, does hereby urge their federal legislators to act favorably for the passage of H.R. 14730 before both the House and Senate;

Further be it resolved, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to all U.S. Senators and Representatives from the State of Wisconsin.

VERNON COUNTY BOARD
OF SUPERVISORS,
Viroqua, Wis., May 2, 1972.

HON. VERNON THOMSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. THOMSON: In behalf of the County Board of Supervisors, Vernon County, I wish to urge you to support the "State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act 14370" for the Federal Revenue Sharing.

Sincerely yours,

CHESTER ERLANDSON,
Chairman, County Board of Supervisors,
Vernon County.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Common Council of the City of Galesville, in regular session assembled do resolve as follows:

Whereas, the Common Council has been requested to endorse and support through Resolution the concept of Federal Revenue Sharing.

Whereas, Federal Revenue Sharing will provide the citizens of Galesville with needed local property tax relief.

Whereas, in addition our local unit of government will benefit under a program of federal revenue sharing.

Now, therefore be it resolved, that the Common Council of the City of Galesville goes on record to support and endorse the concept of federal revenue sharing and urges the adoption of such a program in the United States Congress.

The above Resolution duly adopted this 8th day of July, 1971.

OFFICE OF CITY CLERK,
Osseo, Wis., August 2, 1971.

Be it hereby resolved, that the City Council of the City of Osseo, Trempealeau County, Wisconsin, does hereby endorse revenue sharing of federally collected funds to be used to help alleviate property tax burdens in various municipalities of the state.

RESOLUTION TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

Whereas, the operating costs of municipal government and public education continues to escalate, and,

Whereas, the property tax method of producing revenue has been stretched to the breaking point in both the business and private sector, especially as it affects the people of low income and the retired, and,

Whereas, the local municipal officials are in the best position to apply funds to the utmost advantage of the people under its jurisdiction,

Now, therefore be it resolved, that the Common Council of the City of Blair does endorse and urge the adoption of no strings attached Revenue Sharing Legislation.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 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?

GOULD LINCOLN'S COLUMN ON SENATOR MCCLELLAN

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, Gould Lincoln, of the Washington Star, the dean of the Nation's political columnists, had an excellent article Saturday entitled "McClellan the Rackets Buster." He was speaking of Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, who last week won the Democratic nomination for his sixth term in the Senate.

Senator McClellan had a difficult fight, but by hard work and ability was able to come out on top. He is an outstanding Senator.

I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From the Washington Evening Star,
June 17, 1972]

MCCLELLAN THE RACKETS BUSTER (By Gould Lincoln)

Sen. John L. McClellan, D-Ark., who won his party's nomination for re-election last Tuesday, has been a great and consistent fighter of crime during his long career, as a lawyer in private practice and in public office—including county prosecuting attorney, member of the House of Representatives and senator. This goal for illegal acts committed by individuals, by labor leaders, or by organized crime.

McClellan, 76, is seeking a sixth term in the Senate. He was challenged by Rep. David Pryor, 37. McClellan had failed to win re-nomination in the primary in a four-man race, although he led Pryor by 16,000 votes. In the run-off, his lead over Pryor was 20,000. McClellan was rated an underdog in the run-off. Few incumbent candidates forced into a run-off election, have won. In addition, McClellan checked the 1972 trend to nominate younger and more liberal candidates.

McClellan has had a brilliant career in the Senate as an investigator. As chairman of the Senate Government Operations Committee he turned the spotlight on labor racketeers in the 1950s. He was largely responsible for the convictions and jailing of two leaders of the powerful Teamsters Union, Dave Beck and Jimmy Hoffa. Hoffa was released in 1971 when President Nixon commuted his sentence.

The late Sen. Robert F. Kennedy served as committee counsel for McClellan during the investigation of Hoffa, and also when McClellan investigated the conduct of the late Sen. Joe McCarthy, R-Wis., who tangled with the Army and Secretary of War Robert T. B. Stevens, charging there were Communists in the U.S. armed forces. McClellan had again taken over the chairmanship of the investigating committee after the Democrats regained control of Congress in 1954. McClellan and his chief counsel in their turn charged that Republican McCarthy and his counsels, Roy M. Cohn and G. David Schine, had produced false testimony in the McCarthy inquiry into the Army.

When McClellan finished his tirade, Cohn and Schine—McCarthy, too—didn't have a word to say. This, indeed, was the beginning of the drive that eventually led to the public censure of McCarthy in the Senate.

McClellan's forthrightness brought him into conflict with two Presidents of the United States—Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman. While the senator from Arkansas had supported some of Roosevelt's "New Deal" measures, including the Wagner Labor Act which he regarded as needed to insure fair dealing with organized labor, he later felt that the Wagner law was working to give labor too much of an advantage. He voted for the Taft-Hartley Act and has supported it ever since. Indeed, he has in the past offered amendments to strengthen it.

Roosevelt was angered by McClellan's conservative record in the House and the Roosevelt administration turned against McClellan and brought about his defeat. He returned to the political arena in 1942 and won his Senate seat. He was defeated in 1936 in his first try for the Senate by Mrs. Hattie Caraway, widow of a senator. She was seeking a second term in 1942.

McClellan won re-election easily in 1948, although he was opposed by the liberal element of the Democratic party, particularly the Truman faction. He criticized Truman's measures, which he called "socialistic." He did not like Truman's Korean war policies, and later he sought to investigate the so-called "mess in Washington," attributed to Truman's permitting his cronies to accept gifts, some of them in cash, as well as furnishings for the White House or their offices.

McClellan was born in Sheridan, Ark. on Feb. 25, 1896. He attended public schools and was tutored in law by his father. At the age of 17, he was admitted to the Arkansas bar, after the state legislature passed a special act permitting the under-age young man to take the bar examination.

Always McClellan has been a terrific worker. His law practice was interrupted when he entered the Army at the start of World War I. He became a first lieutenant in the Infantry and Signal Corps.

During his recent campaign for renomination, McClellan charged his opponent, Pryor, with kowtowing to organized labor. He said that labor had always been against him and that labor had contributed \$65,000 to Pryor's campaign. He charged, too, that Pryor was a liberal and socialistic. Pryor vehemently denied these charges. And he criticized McClellan as always a friend and supporter of the rich and well-to-do, and said McClellan was no friend to the poor and to the blacks.

The only hurdle left for McClellan is the November election in which his Republican opponent will be Wayne Babbitt, who has resigned as the Little Rock area director of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. McClellan's victory is more or less taken for granted.

SALUTE TO EDUCATION

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, education is the most important foundation for human progress. However, as times change, so does the need for quality education change. Also, as times change, methods of financing education must also change.

In many respects, the necessary changes in the quality of education and kind of education as well as methods of

financing education have not kept up with the needs of our times.

As an example, studies show that in the next 10 years, four out of every five jobs that need to be filled in our Nation will not require a college education. Yet, most Federal programs are still stressing college education and neglecting technical education, which will be our most important need in the next 10 years.

Likewise, the horse-and-buggy policy of using property taxes as the main financial support for elementary and secondary education has not kept pace with the needs of our times.

We must realize, and the sooner the better, that elementary and secondary education is more of a national responsibility than is higher education. To get away from the horse and buggy of raising funds for elementary and secondary education, it is my judgment that the Federal Government must assume at least 33 percent of the cost of elementary and secondary education.

These are just a few of the challenges that face the Congress. Most unfortunately, Congress has been very slow in responding to the formulation of programs to meet their needs and to keep up with the changes that come along that must be met.

SALUTE TO EDUCATION

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to congratulate the National Education Association on their "Salute to Education" which is being held today here in Washington. It gives those of us from all our 50 States an opportunity to recognize the achievements of our great educational system which I feel is second to none.

Primary and secondary education is not only an invaluable tool to be used by the individual, but is also a system that directly provides for an informed and responsive society. Education builds a foundation for life that is essential in all occupational fields. My enthusiastic support for educational legislation has exemplified my feelings for effective and innovative educational systems. This enthusiasm and concern for education is not only generated by my position as a Congressman, but is also a result of personal and family contacts in the field of education.

As a child, I was fortunate to receive a quality education in the Malden elementary schools, Beebe Junior High School in Malden, and at the Medford High School. My father taught in several school systems including Malden and Everett, my two sisters teach in the Malden and Lawrence systems and I have several nieces and nephews teaching in local school systems. My exposure to the educational systems of these communities individually and through family contacts gives me an excellent insight

into the need for an even greater effort by this Nation in support of our educational system. It is my hope that our educational systems will continue to improve and will provide this type of quality education.

NEWS ON EQUAL EMPLOYMENT RIGHTS FOR WOMEN AND MINORITIES IN THE UNIVERSITY

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers yesterday reported that the Federal Office of Civil Rights has warned the City University of New York that it must provide employment information including data on the sex and race of all employees or face the loss of Government contracts and subcontracts.

It is reported that HEW said the university must give written assurances within 10 days that the information would be made available and provide the first installment of data within 30 days of the notice.

J. Stanley Pottinger, Director of the Federal Office of Civil Rights of HEW stated that the City University had created an impasse by refusing to provide information necessary to determine whether there was job discrimination against women and minority group members.

I have had correspondence with Belle Zeller, chairman of the Legislative Conference of CUNY, and with J. Stanley Pottinger on this subject which I believe would be of interest to our colleagues and part of which I am appending. Mr. Speaker, the balance of this correspondence will be inserted tomorrow.

LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE
CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK,
New York, N.Y., January 24, 1972.

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KOCH: The Legislative Conference, the collective bargaining agent for the more than 8,000 members of the full-time career faculty of the City University of New York, fully supports the efforts of the U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare to correct the extensive pattern and practice of discrimination which exists at the University.

It has come to our attention that the City University is at present exempt from compliance with the Executive Orders (11246 as amended by 11375) which authorizes HEW to insist on affirmative action programs. It is our opinion that the best interests of the University, the community, women and minorities are not served if such exemption is continued. In no way do we mean to question the sincerity of those members of the administration who desire to overcome discrimination in and by the University; we merely suggest that governmental directive will help speed achievement of equal opportunity.

In principle, we see no reason why the law should allow the state and local governments to discriminate against any group in our society. Declaring an institution exempt in effect condones discrimination.

We respectfully urge you to take what-

ever steps are necessary to eliminate the exempt status of the City and State Universities of New York.

Sincerely,

BELLE ZELLER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 8, 1972.
CONGRESSIONAL LIAISON,
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you about a matter brought to my attention by Belle Zeller, Chairman, The Legislative Conference of the CUNY, 11 West 42nd Street, Suite 554, New York, New York 10036.

I have received the enclosed letter from Miss Zeller. Subject to your existing procedures, I would appreciate your looking into this matter and informing me of your findings so that I might be advised of the situation.

Thank you for your interest in this inquiry.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., February 25, 1972.

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KOCH: Thank you for your letter of February 8 concerning the affirmative action requirements applicable to the City University of New York.

Under Executive Order 11246, as amended by Executive Order 11375, Federal contractors or subcontractors may not discriminate in employment on the basis of race, color, religion, sex or national origin, and they must take affirmative action to assure such non-discrimination.

The applicable regulations issued by the Department of Labor provide that instrumentalities of State or local governments are exempt from maintaining a written affirmative action program (41 CFR Chapter 60-1.5 (a) (4)). However, while such institutions are not required to follow this procedure, they are nevertheless subject to the standards set by the Executive Orders. Accordingly, all contractors and subcontractors must ensure that applicants for employment and employees are treated without regard to race, color, religion, sex or national origin. In addition, as the compliance agency for institutions of higher education, the Department's Office for Civil Rights conducts compliance reviews of public as well as private colleges and universities, and in both cases the institutions have an affirmative obligation to remedy any deficiencies identified in their employment practices. Public institutions, as well as private, are required to make written commitments to provide such remedies.

This Office has held discussions with the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, Department of Labor, concerning recommended changes to the regulations, such as the modification you have proposed. However, final decisions in this regard rest with the Secretary of Labor, and therefore you may want to take the matter up with him.

Sincerely yours,

J. STANLEY POTTINGER,
Director, Office for Civil Rights.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 29, 1972.
CONGRESSIONAL LIAISON,
Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you about a matter brought to my attention by Belle Zeller, Chairman, The Legislative Conference of the CUNY, 11 West 42nd Street, Suite 554, New York, New York 10036.

I have received the enclosed letter from Ms. Zeller. Subject to your existing procedures, I would appreciate receiving your comments on this matter so that I might advise her.

Thank you for your interest in this inquiry.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
Washington, D.C., March 12, 1972.

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KOCH: This is in response to your letter requesting information for your constituent Belle Zeller on the status of City University of New York under Executive Order 11246, as amended. We have answered a number of letters on this same subject for members of Congress, and there appears to be some misunderstanding concerning the matter.

City University is not exempt from the Executive Order. Our regulations do provide that the requirements of the equal opportunity clause in any contract or subcontract with a State or local Government (or any agency, instrumentality or subdivision thereof) shall not be applicable to any agency, instrumentality or subdivision of such Government which does not participate in work on or under the contract or subcontract. However, the converse of this is that a State or local Government agency which does participate in work on or under the contract or subcontract is subject to the requirements of the equal opportunity clause. Since City University does have Government contracts and is receiving Federal financial assistance for construction projects, it is subject to the Executive Order.

As a Governmental agency, City University would ordinarily be exempt from the requirements of filing the annual compliance report and maintaining a written affirmative action compliance program. But, City University was found by the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW), the compliance agency in this case, not to be in compliance. When such a finding is made, the regulations provide that the compliance agency can require the contractor to develop a written corrective action program to correct the deficiencies.

According to the latest information we have been able to obtain from HEW, City University has still not filed an acceptable affirmative action plan. However, in order for your constituent to get the latest information on the status of City University, we recommend that she contact the Office for Civil Rights, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 26 Federal Plaza, Room 3838, New York, New York, 212/264-4633.

I hope we have been responsive to your request.

Sincerely,

FREDERICK L. WEBBER,
Special Assistant for Legislative Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 15, 1972.
DIRECTOR,
Office for Civil Rights, Department of Health,
Education and Welfare, New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you concerning the affirmative action requirements applicable to CUNY. I understand from the enclosed letter that the City University has not filed an acceptable affirmative action plan.

I would appreciate your informing me when the City University was asked to submit this plan and to what date they have to comply. I do appreciate your keeping me informed of the status of this matter.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
New York, N.Y., March 24, 1972.

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KOCH: I received your inquiry of March 13, 1972 concerning the Affirmative Action requirements under Executive Order 11246 which are applicable to City University of New York. I also received the copy of the letter addressed to you from the U.S. Department of Labor on the same subject.

The letter addressed to you by the U.S. Department of Labor contains some information which somewhat confused me. I therefore took the liberty of transmitting the correspondence from you and to you from the Department of Labor to my Headquarters Office in Washington in order that any points of confusion could be ironed out at that level. My Office in Washington, after having cleared this matter, will reply to your inquiry.

I am sorry for the slight delay in responding to you but I should prefer that the response to you be accurate.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM R. VALENTINE,
Regional Director, Office for Civil Rights.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., June 7, 1972.

HON. EDWARD KOCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KOCH: On March 24, 1972, Mr. William Valentine, Regional Director of our New York Office, wrote to you in response to your letter of March 15 concerning an affirmative action program at the City University of New York. Mr. Valentine referred your letter to this Office because it was implicit in a recent Labor Department letter to you that the investigation at CUNY, in which it was found in noncompliance, was a recent one.

Actually this finding was reported in a November 20, 1970, letter to Mr. Bernard Mintz, Vice-Chancellor for Administration at CUNY, in which our New York Office requested CUNY to submit an affirmative action plan. Since that time, numerous meetings have been held between members of both our New York and Washington staffs and CUNY officials for the purpose of establishing an understanding of the requirements of the Executive Order and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's basis of jurisdiction. CUNY has submitted some material. However, it does not fully satisfy the University's responsibilities under the Order.

At the present time, officials of CUNY are objecting to making available the records and data necessary to determine compliance. We are continuing to work with the University in developing a program which will comply with the Order.

Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely yours,

J. STANLEY POTTINGER,
Director, Office for Civil Rights.

A SALUTE TO EDUCATION

HON. MARK ANDREWS

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, an informed citizenry is a basic and essential ingredient if our form of government is to survive. That's why, each year as our society becomes more

complex, the role of our educators becomes more important.

That is why, as well, I am pleased to have this opportunity to join in this salute to our Nation's teachers.

Good citizenship is, of course, a small measure of the total responsibility of our teachers. Every industry and every profession, indeed the total fiber of our Nation, counts on the education profession to provide the young people with the knowledge, the desire and the inspiration for perpetuation.

In return, educators deserve more than our gratitude. They recognize more clearly than any of us perhaps, their desperate need of support from the Government of the people they serve so well.

They need this support particularly when dealing with the bureaucracy that has been spawned by the well meaning efforts of the Congress. Each of us has a real responsibility to make sure that this Government reacts responsively and responsibly to the needs of our educators.

There is no single group of constituents whose counsel and views I value more than the teachers in the district it is my privilege to serve in the Congress. I urge my colleagues similarly to pay heed to their teacher-constituents, respectfully submitting that none of us are too old to learn.

NEEDED: A FAIR SHAKE FOR STATE DEPARTMENT FOREIGN SERVICE EMPLOYEES

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on June 6, 1972, the Washington Star's veteran reporter on Federal employee affairs, Joseph Young, commented on an official position paper of the Civil Service Commission concerning a drastic shift in CSC policy concerning employee appeals. The position paper read in part:

Perhaps it would be better for a body other than the Civil Commission to hear and decide employee appeals and that another organization should be established by law for that purpose.

To Federal employees who are aware of the Commission's function, this is a radical departure as noted by Mr. Young in his column:

In the past the commission heatedly opposed any suggestion that it relinquish its appeals authority.

To one group of civil servants who are not covered by the Commission's appeal machinery, the Foreign Service officers of the State Department, this new thinking of the Commission must have carried an encouraging message. As I have indicated in the past, when FSO's are selected out of the Service their right of appeal within the State Department was a joke, to put it bluntly. Now, along comes the Civil Service Commission, with authority over the bulk of civil servants, stating that perhaps employee grievances can be best resolved outside the Commis-

sion. With regard to the Foreign Service this has been the thrust of legislation which I first introduced in 1968 calling for an appeals mechanism outside of the State Department for FSO's. The plight of the FSO's was, I believe, clearly stated by a 7-year veteran of the Office of the Legal Adviser in the State Department, Mr. Richard A. Frank, in a letter to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee chairman, Senator FULBRIGHT. One excerpt from the letter, which appears on page 20186 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 8, reads:

My experiences with the Department of State and its grievance procedures have, however, not been encouraging: they have led me to the conclusion that there is a pervasive lack of understanding of due process and fairness in connection with the grievance process, and, consequently, personnel are not accorded what are considered elsewhere to be minimal, basic rights.

Additional obstacles might well be in the offing for beleaguered FSO's if current fears in knowledgeable circles are realized. The American Foreign Service Association, which claims to be an employee organization independent of State Department management, is vying for the right to be the exclusive employee representative of FSO's in their negotiations with State. It is claimed that AFSA is too close to the State Department hierarchy to serve as a truly solicitous voice for the FSO's.

On June 19, 1972, John Hemenway, a former FSO who was selected out at State and who after a stiff battle finally was granted a grievance hearing still in process, addressed a letter to Leonard J. Lurie, Director, Labor-Management and Welfare Pension Reports, Department of Labor, protesting the recent elections of the Board of Directors of AFSA as "undemocratic." Mr. Hemenway asserted that for this reason AFSA was not qualified to speak for Foreign Service employees under EO 11636. In support of his position, Mr. Hemenway cited the following which I quote from his letter:

(1) There was no control to guarantee that the ballots counted were in fact cast by persons having the proper credentials to vote in the election.

(2) No controls were established whatsoever to insure that, if the ballots sent out were not actually received by the person for whom designated, they were not used by another.

(3) Nor was a register maintained, with control numbered outer envelopes of ballots received, to be opened in the presence of official ballot counters; similarly, there were no controls exercised over the printing or safeguarding of ballots (the only distinctiveness was the color, fairly easily counterfeited.)

(4) There is no register of persons who actually did vote or who did not vote by mail or in person. (I was told that the vote received by mail swung the election to the persons finally declared the victors. In Washington, where recent controversial events in which you played an active role were well known and understood, the vote was fairly evenly distributed among the candidates.)

(5) 2,438 valid ballots were said to have been received; several times that number of official ballots were distributed. There is no way of knowing who on earth returned those ballots that found their way into the ballot box.

(6) Not even the most primitive ballot security controls were attempted. I was told

that a padlocked box held returns received until counted. That, of course, is no safeguard—it merely gives the illusion of safeguards. No poll watchers were assigned by candidates or their slates to guard their interests during counting.

(7) It is not even a certainty who is responsible for the above events. The February *Journal* lists Stephen T. Johnson as Chairman of the AFSA Election Committee. I was under the impression that the election committee for the AFSA 1972 election was presided over by a Deputy Assistant Secretary of State named Martin Herz. Why should Johnson make the report on Herz' responsibilities?

(8) In any event, Herz was defacto chairman during the several preelection meetings held in Washington. I know this for a fact. I met him and we spoke. His was the critical role in setting policy and tone during this period. In my judgment, Herz was an odd choice for such a task in a year in which AFSA intends to apply for the privileges available under E.O. 11636. I refer, of course, to material on record in connection with the Mace confirmation hearings. See, for example, Martin Herz' own memorandum published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 117, part 28, page 37400, and my own letter to Senator Mace/Herz in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 117, part 29, page 38105.

On June 20, 1972, Foreign Service Officer John J. Harter sent a communication to Mr. Lurie, enclosing documents relating to his own independent candidacy for election to the board. Among these documents is Mr. Harter's November 11, 1971, memorandum to Martin P. Herz, chairman, AFSA Elections Committee, including the following passages:

For all practical purposes, the campaign appears to have been virtually cloaked in secrecy.

The incumbent Board of Directors may appreciate this approach, which is tantamount to packing the ballot box in its favor. I can assure you opposition candidates resent this apparent effort on the part of the AFSA Elections Committee to assure continuity on the Board.

Both Mr. Hemenway and Mr. Harter referred to Mr. Herz as the chairman of the AFSA Elections Committee. Mr. Herz is a powerful senior management official in the State Department, with important political and social contacts. Currently, he is the Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs. Previously, he was Minister-Counselor for Political Affairs in Saigon. A former AFSA Board member, he has been given special AFSA assignments. For example, the AFSA News of January 1970 stated the following:

Special Committee to consider role in political appointments. At the request of the AFSA Board of Directors, Martin F. Herz, former Board member and currently Minister-Counselor for Political Affairs in Saigon, has agreed to establish a special AFSA Committee in Saigon. This Committee will investigate and make recommendations to the AFSA Board on the feasibility of establishing a permanent AFSA Committee to advise the President on the qualifications of potential political appointees to diplomatic posts. The Herz Committee is the first important AFSA committee to be established outside of Washington. Its establishment follows a suggestion made by Professor Galbraith at a recent AFSA luncheon.

SELECTION BOARDS AND AFSA BOARDS

On June 7, I invited the attention of the House to the way in which the State

Department continued to manipulate the so-called independent selection boards which decide promotions and dismissals by "selection out" of Foreign Service officers. I cited the case of Deputy Under Secretary of State William J. Crockett who named his own brother-in-law to the 1963 Selection Board which promoted several Crockett proteges, including Idar Rimestad, Howard Mace and John H. Stutesman, Jr., who was then Special Assistant to the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration and who later in 1966 became the Chairman of the Board of the American Foreign Service Association.

THE FOREIGN SERVICE JOURNAL

Following a term in 1966 as Chairman of the Board of AFSA, Mr. Stutesman was named in 1967 as Chairman of the Board of the Foreign Service Journal, the official publication of AFSA.

During the years 1966 and 1967, the Stephen Kozak and Otto Otepka cases received wide distribution in the American press. Kozak charged that his efficiency record contained forged documents and he named E. Allen Lightner, Jr. as the principal officer who had permitted tampering with his records. Otto Otepka charged William Boswell with mishandling his efficiency records. Both Kozak and Otepka had complaints about Norris Haselton, who was then the Inspector General of the Foreign Service. Yet, the Stutesman-AFSA Board censored out every reference to these top officers whose names were appearing in other publications.

The silence of AFSA and its Foreign Service Journal during that period is explicable when one reviews the membership of previous AFSA Boards and the way they were dominated by management.

Let me begin with the Foreign Service personalities placed by Mr. Crockett on the 1963 William Figy Selection Board, promoting officers to class 1.

The chairman of that 1963 William Figy Selection Board was Ambassador Thomas Estes; the other FSO member was Findley Burns, then serving in Mr. Crockett's office together with Mr. Stutesman. Both Ambassador Estes and Mr. Burns knew then that Mr. Figy was Mr. Crockett's brother-in-law.

Estes and Burns were previously closely associated in several joint undertakings, not only in their official functions at the State Department but also within the American Foreign Service Association. For example, when E. Allen Lightner, Jr. was Chairman of the Board of the American Foreign Service Association, Estes was secretary-treasurer and Findley Burns was assistant secretary-treasurer. Subsequently, when Lightner became Chief of the U.S. Mission in Berlin, Findley Burns became his Deputy there, while Estes succeeded Lightner as Chairman of the Board of the American Foreign Service Association. Serving on the AFSA Board under Estes were Norris Haselton, the Inspector General of the Foreign Service, and William Boswell, then assigned to the Security Office.

It was during this period when some

of the worst personnel malpractices in the history of the State Department and the Foreign Service took place. These included the sex and spy scandals at Warsaw and Belgrade; the perjuries committed by State Department officials before Congress; the tapping of telephones of State Department personnel; and the tampering with personnel records. I shall not review these scandals again because the public record of the Stephen Koczak and Otto Otepka cases has been well documented.

IS AFSA FREE FROM MANAGEMENT?

Has AFSA improved? Is it now free from management? The Hemenway and Harter letters to Mr. Lurie cast doubt that much change has taken place. Moreover, the record shows that the current chairman of the AFSA Board, William Harrop, saw nothing improper about acting in both a managerial and an "independent employee" capacity in testifying as an AFSA spokesman on bills before Congress in precisely the same language which he had used as the official management coordinator for the Department of State. Nor did the vice chairman of the AFSA Board, Thomas D. Boyatt, and the Acting Secretary-Treasurer, Herman J. Cohen, see anything inappropriate about serving on the 1971 Selection Boards rating Foreign Service officers for promotion and for dismissal through "selection out" while running for the Board of AFSA. Nor did Messrs. Harrop and Boyatt see anything improper about accepting the assistance of State Department management in getting authorization cards and memberships for AFSA.

Has the Foreign Service Journal improved? Just recently, it ran an editorial opposing efforts of the Charles Thomas Legal Defense Fund to collect money and affidavits to file suits against the State Department for violations of due process in selection out. Then, following recommendations by grievance panels for the promotion to FSO-3 of Alison Palmer and John Harter, because of denial of their constitutional rights, the Journal urged that the right of grievance boards to make such recommendations be limited by the Secretary of State. Beyond, these actions, the Foreign Service Journal has been silent on the details of many grievance cases which have been filed and on the charges by many grievants that the Interim Grievance Panels are themselves denying due process.

I am pleased that the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on State Department Organization will begin hearings soon on Congressman HAMILTON's bill, H.R. 9188 and my own bill, H.R. 8523. I trust that during these hearings the subcommittee will have occasion to have both the State Department and the American Foreign Service Association comment on the charges which have been brought by John Hemenway and John Harter against both the State Department, in their own grievance hearings, and against the Board of Directors of AFSA in their communications to Mr. Lurie.

TOWN OF RUTLAND, MASS., CELEBRATES 250TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, June 18, 1972, marked the 250th anniversary of the town of Rutland.

Centrally located in Massachusetts, Rutland's scenery is picturesque and beautiful, abounding in hills and vales, brooks and natural lakes.

The territory embracing this town was purchased from the Indians in 1686 and was settled in 1713. It was on June 18, 1722, that the Great and General Court of Massachusetts incorporated the town of Rutland. In memory of, and as a tribute to those brave pioneers who settled the town of Rutland, June 18, 1972, has been declared Rutland Founders' Day.

Rutland is so situated that it has been protected from the encroachment of the more disquieting aspects of modern life, but its pure air and fine scenery have just recently given it wide celebrity as a health resort.

In the Revolutionary War, the town of Rutland took prompt action in furnishing many volunteers, who served with honor and distinction throughout the struggle for independence.

Rutland, however, owes its greatest distinction to having been for 8 years the home of Rufus Putnam, "Founder and Father of Ohio." It is because of General Putnam and his efforts to settle Ohio, that Rutland has earned the nickname "Cradle of Ohio."

In a message to the people of Rutland on this momentous occasion, I stated:

The citizens of Rutland are to be commended for this most propitious observation of Rutland's 250 year heritage and contributions to our Massachusetts history and traditions.

Your unveiling of Rutland's first town flag will coincide with the flying of an American flag over the United States Capitol at my request on Sunday, June 18, 1972. This American flag and appropriate certificate marking Rutland's Founders' Day celebration will be given to the town of Rutland for historic preservation.

The program for the historic celebration was as follows:

PROGRAM

State Representative Edward Harrington, Master of Ceremonies.

Invocation: Rev. Edgar Pelletier, St. Patrick's Church, Rutland.

Reading of Proclamation: Selectman James Wood.

Presentation of first official town flag: Albert Thomas, Chairman of 250th Celebration Committee to Selectman James Wood.

Raising of the flag and selections by the drum and bugle corps.

Introduction of guests: Senator Daniel Foley, Main Speaker.

Benediction: Rev. Richard S. Price, First Congregational Church, Rutland.

Here is the text of the proclamation establishing Rutland Founders' Day:

A PROCLAMATION, 1972—TOWN OF RUTLAND (By Authority of James L. Wood, Frank J. Brooks, George R. Griffin, Board of Selectmen)

Whereas, in the year of our Lord one thousand six hundred and eighty-six, an area known as Naquag was purchased from the Indian owners and later to become the site of the Town of Rutland;

Whereas, the General Court of Massachusetts acted favorably on the petition of the Proprietors On February 23, 1713 and that such new town be called Rutland;

Whereas, that the Town of Rutland on June 18, 1722 was Incorporated by the Great and General Court and that said Town of Rutland is celebrating its Two Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary the entire year of 1972; now, therefore,

We, the Board of Selectmen of the Town of Rutland, in the County of Worcester, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, do hereby proclaim as

RUTLAND FOUNDER'S DAY, JUNE 18, 1972

in memory of, and as tribute to, those brave pioneers who settled said Town of Rutland.

Be it further proclaimed that appropriate exercises, events, and celebrations be held throughout the year; and

Be it further proclaimed that we, this Board of Selectmen, dedicate ourselves to the task of incessant progress, aimed at building a better community for ourselves and our posterity.

Given in the Selectmen's Office in Rutland, this 31st day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and seventy-two, and of the Independence of the United States of America, the one hundred and ninety-sixth.

SALUTE TO EDUCATION

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, the quality of American education stands among the most crucial issues facing our great Nation. Concern over this issue is witnessed everywhere—in local communities, in State legislatures, in the Congress of the United States and in every home across the land. We know that the level of knowledge and skills required today and which will be required in the future far exceeds that of previous generations.

We have a good educational system. It is not without its flaws. The efforts required in the years ahead to insure quality education must be assigned a high national priority because what happens in our classrooms and in our schools affects the quality of our national life. We must make certain that the adults of tomorrow will be able to compete effectively in the job market, increase our national productivity, understand and exercise their rights and responsibilities as citizens, and provide the necessary leadership in government, industry, and in the arts and sciences.

We all share a responsibility in making certain that our schools provide the kinds of knowledge and skills which will insure that our youth have the tools to deal with the challenges with which they will be confronted when they leave the

classroom and move into the mainstream of our society.

As we salute education this week, we honor those who have contributed so much to our youth—their teachers and school administrators—and we reaffirm our commitment to the young. While the Congress has supported that commitment, it must rely on the judgments of many groups and governmental leaders in the quest for quality education. We cannot avoid the challenges, some of them painful. It is a simple fact that these decisions are made in the context of financial commitment. It is the responsibility of all of us—in education and in government—to make absolutely certain that the funds appropriated for educational purposes are used for educational purposes, to improve the quality of education. None can escape his share of this responsibility, and none can escape the consequences of an inadequate response. The success of our society depends upon acceptance of that responsibility, and I am willing to accept my share of this responsibility. May a divine providence lead us to wise decisions and good programs for our young.

I STAND FOR PEACE

HON. JOHN Y. McCOLLISTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. McCOLLISTER. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a copy of a statement by Charles Evans Hughes, which appeared in the October 25, 1916, issue of the Chicago Daily Drovers Journal as a paid political advertisement during his presidential campaign. It was sent to me by an Omaha constituent, Fred P. Curtis, who informed me it had been found in the wreckage of a building in Corning, Iowa, this spring.

Mr. Curtis feels, as I do, that it is very appropriate today, nearly 56 years later, as we find ourselves in the midst of another presidential campaign, in which peace is again an issue.

In order to share it with my colleagues in the House of Representatives and the Senate, I would like to insert it in the Record at this time:

I stand for peace, but I stand also for the dignity of American citizenship.

If America will stand firm for her known rights they will be recognized by every nation on earth.

If America keeps edging away in terror we shall invite contempt and insult, and the very thing these apostles of peace desire to prevent will be the thing their actions will invite.

You must stand somewhere and you had better begin collecting courage to stand at the very first attack.

I am for peace with honor and not at the sacrifice of rights.

We are together in this country to go up or down, but we won't go up unless we have the splendid spirit of the past which maintains the honor of the flag and maintains peace because the world respects our power to maintain it.

CHARLES EVANS HUGHES.

CXVIII—1397—Part 17

DEFENSIVE MEDICINE

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most disturbing consequences of the present method of litigation of medical malpractice suits, beyond the distressing rise in the cost of health care to the consumer, is the increasing practice of defensive medicine. For example, the physician, in order to protect himself, may order an extensive series of tests which are, in all likelihood, simply not needed. Or, he may refrain from certain complicated tests, for fear that something may go wrong. Indeed, a recent survey by the American College of Surgeons, to which over 15,000 responses were received, clearly confirms that the threat of malpractice has spurred the practice of defensive medicine of this nature. Over half the doctors indicated that they use X-rays and laboratory tests more frequently, consult with others more, and have amplified their records substantially. Approximately one out of five respondents have limited their practice as a response to the ever-present threat of malpractice suits.

I have recently introduced legislation to provide for a system of arbitration boards to hear medical malpractice suits in the District of Columbia. Arbitration of these cases can help to insure a higher quality of health care in Washington, and will assist in keeping a lid on the ever-increasing cost of that care.

In this connection, I would like to bring the results of the above survey, as reported in the American Medical News, to the attention of my colleagues at this time. Such information provides valuable evidence that we need reform, and need it now.

The article follows:

SURGEONS SEE INCREASE IN DEFENSIVE MEDICINE

More than half of the surgeons responding to a recent survey by the American College of Surgeons indicated that the threat of malpractice has spurred the practice of defensive medicine.

Twenty-one per cent of the respondents indicated they have reacted to the threat by limiting their practice through such methods as omitting certain procedures previously done, restricting the amount of procedures done, and by discontinuing attendance in emergency rooms.

Some 61% said they use X-rays more frequently; 53% indicated they use more laboratory tests; 51% reported they use consultants more frequently; and 55% said their records have been amplified substantially.

Two out of five of more than 15,000 surgeons who responded to the ACS survey have had a malpractice claim against them within the past 12 years. (A claim was considered as any indication from a patient to the physician that legal action was being planned or started.)

In a report on the survey findings in the *Bulletin of the American College of Surgeons*, the ACS said that if the present trend continues through 1974, the number of claims could easily reach one for every three surgeons.

Of the 15,219 responses to a two-page ques-

tionnaire, 6,492 reported claims experience. Some of the physicians had multiple claims that raised the total to slightly over 7,500, of which approximately 500 did not progress beyond the threat stage. One-eighth of the respondents had two to four claims in the 12-year period.

Ninety per cent of the settlements were under \$100,000, and 68% were less than \$10,000. Ninety per cent of the claims were settled either before trial or during the trial but before submission to the jury. Of the 8% of the claims that went to the jury, the results favored the defendant in four out of five cases. Panel and arbitration methods accounted for 2% of the settlements.

Twenty per cent of the respondents felt the suit had been stimulated by a poor result; another 20% considered the stimulus to be an attorney. Lack of patient rapport and indiscreet comments by various people were considered additional sources of origin of suits.

One-third felt that the claim arose as a result of the surgical procedure, while one-eighth believed the claim originated from events in the period after surgery.

Twenty per cent had been co-defendants with hospitals in litigation; 10% had been co-defendants with a partner or an associate; and 14% had been sole defendants.

DEFENSIVE MEDICINE

More X-rays, 61%.

More laboratory tests, 53%.

More consultants, 51%.

Amplified records, 55%.

Limit practice, 21%.

Sources: American College of Surgeons.

PHILIP J. PHILBIN

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, no man can serve his Nation in the Congress for 28 years without leaving a mark upon this Nation, and in the death of Philip J. Philbin the Nation has lost a man who certainly left such a mark. Through his career of a generation in the House of Representatives, Phil Philbin served on the Armed Services Committee. He came at the height of the Second World War, when the principal concern of America, the termination of that war, was the business of his committee. He was part of the team which built up the military safeguards in the difficult and complex world in which we have lived since that war. Yet, with so serious a responsibility, he was an easy and pleasant man.

There was about him the strength of the young Phil Philbin who had been center on the last Harvard football team to go to the Rose Bowl—where Harvard defeated Oregon.

There was the calm dedication of the farmer in him, as indeed he had been a farmer. And there was the very thoughtful prudence of the lawyer, as the law had also been his profession.

In his lifetime, he learned the meaning of service to his Nation, and through his life and work the Nation was well served. I extend my condolences to his daughters who survive him, but I know they are consoled by the thought of the meaning of his life.

THE GERMAN DAY IN TEXAS

HON. EARLE CABELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, each year in the month of October, the German Day in Texas is celebrated by Texans of German descent and by many others throughout our State who recognize the contributions the German people have made in the growth and culture of Texas. The history of German Day is well described by Dr. T. Herbert Etzler whose chronology of "The German Day in Texas" follows:

THE GERMAN DAY IN TEXAS

(By Dr. T. Herbert Etzler)

On the 6th of October, 1833, 289 years ago, the first German colony was established on American soil.

Through the endeavours of Prof. O. Seldenticker and G. Kellner, editors of the "Philadelphia Democrat" this historic landing on our shores was celebrated in the city of William Penn, founder of Pennsylvania on the 6th of October, 1833.

Commemorating the "German Day" at the St. Louis Exposition, the Hon. Carl Schurz said: "The German Day in the United States is the celebration of the friendship of the German and the American people. The German-Americans are the hyphen between Germany and America, presenting the living demonstration of the fact that a large population can be transplanted from one to another country, and be devoted to the new homeland for life or death, and yet preserve a reverent love for the old".

In the year 1839, it was the city of Houston in the State of Texas, which began to pay tribute to the heroic pioneers of German descent. Mr. August Mosell continued in 1890 to testify "To the everlasting, faithful work and achievements of the German element of Texas in Art, Literature, Education and in all Industrial branches". In 1891, Dr. Max Urwitz was the orator of the German Day in Houston. In 1892, a first German Day parade with four divisions and twenty marshals accompanied by eight floats moved through the streets.

Thus continuing year after year from 1889 to 1910 with pageants and dancing, the German Day became an annual festival in Texas.

The year 1963 marked the renewal of an old custom in Texas, however this time, the German Day, became an officially recognized state institution. Consul Gershon Canaan, who initiated "The Texas German Day Council", won the support of Dallas Mayor Earle Cabell and of Governor John B. Connally.

The latter issued on the 6th of October, the historic date, the first German Day Proclamation, in honor of Texas pioneers of German descent. Gershon Canaan was elected Chairman and has served as such continuously. Other Council officers elected in 1963 were: James Gerhard, Co-Chairman; Teddy J. Trept, Executive Secretary and Clarence Talley as Treasurer. Heri B. Bartscht served as Co-Chairman from 1964 to 1970, when Eugene De Kieffer joined the Committee and took this position over.

The Texas German Day Council has its seat in the city of Dallas, and the German Day is annually celebrated at "The State Fair of Texas". It acts as a parent organization for all German American societies, which have representation on the Council.

During the first ten years of its existence, the German Day honored distinguished personalities such as: Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Sec. of the Treasury John B. Connally. Ambassa-

dor Frhr. von Stackelberg, Composer Franz Van der Stucken, Jacob Brodbeck and General Bernard Schriever. Also Dr. Wernher von Braun and Sen. Horst Grabert, Minister-president Dr. Alfons Goppel and Dr. Rainer Kessler, Consul Generals Dr. Richard Louis, Dr. William O. Denzer and Dr. Frederick M. Lange, Consul a.D. Dr. Ludwig Fabel, Gen. W. O. Ruggles, Profs. Heri B. Bartscht and Rudolf Kruger. Also State Repr. Walter Richter, Joe M. Dealey, E. O. Cartwright and James Ling.

The German Day salutes annually cities and states of Germany and of Texas, thus building bridges of understanding and friendship between our peoples. Major cities and communities throughout the State of Texas are represented by Out-Of-Town Co-Chairmen, who co-ordinate the program activities for this statewide celebration, which is proclaimed by the Governor of Texas.

The German Day in Texas has come a long way since its inception in 1963 and has been recognized nationally and internationally. October the 15th, 1972 marks the tenth anniversary. It owes its existence and successes to the voluntary and dedicated services of the officers and members of "The Texas German Day Council" and to the Texas community at large.

IOWA WESLEYAN COLLEGE—A GREAT SCHOOL

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the country's oldest and most historic colleges—Iowa Wesleyan College in Mount Pleasant, Iowa—is breaking interesting new ground in contemporary educational developments.

Founded in 1842, before Iowa became a State, Iowa Wesleyan has always pioneered in educating Americans for the future.

The college's Pioneer Hall, now housing the English, speech and drama department, is the oldest college building still in use west of the Mississippi River.

Wesleyan was one of the first colleges to welcome women and black students—in the mid-1860's. It was also the first college to teach sciences by using laboratory methods instead of just lectures. America's first woman lawyer, Belle Babb Mansfield, was graduated from here in 1866 and space scientist, James Van Allen, in 1935. Van Allen helped plan Wesleyan's Adam Trieschmann Hall of Science and the space-age curriculum taught there.

Wesleyan was one of the first colleges to include students in most levels of the administrative and policymaking machinery of the campus. A student is a voting member of the board of trustees.

Today's Wesleyan plan curriculum continues to keep the college on the forward edge of leadership in higher education. The small, southeastern Iowa institution, with 680 students from 35 States and nine foreign countries, last year established a baccalaureate nursing program when it discovered a need for such a program in that part of the State. Only four other Iowa colleges and universities—all larger schools than IWC—have degree-granting nursing schools.

Wesleyan's requirement that each student do a project of service to society before graduation is unique in American higher education. Many college students today are working for community betterment, but only Iowa Wesleyan makes social service a requirement for graduation through its responsible social involvement—RSI—program.

Each student picks his own project, spends as many hours on it as the project demands, doing all the research and coordination himself. Finally, he documents his project in the form of a paper, film, slide lectures, photographs, and so forth, for scrutiny by a faculty committee.

Says Jerry Richards, director of the RSI program:

We feel an obligation to involve our students in the social problems facing our nation today. It is so easy for students today to criticize the shortcomings of community life, but American citizens have an obligation to help improve the life of their fellow men so we have made social service an important part of their education.

Each student receives 6 hours' credit for completion of his RSI project, most of which average at least 100 hours' work.

Students can choose to do this work during summer vacations, or during regular semesters, in addition to their normal course work. But the majority use the January interim, a short, 5-week term between the regular fall and spring semesters. Over 140 Iowa Wesleyan students performed community services in 15 States during this year's interim term.

Now in its third year of operation, the unique program's success is now bringing in hundreds of requests for student help from as many cities and agencies.

Says the head of one school for severely retarded children:

So many volunteers are on-again, off-again affairs; these IWC students, however, are not only dependable but well-educated and highly motivated. They have done a lot of good for the children.

Says Richards:

Part of a college's responsibility should be directed toward bringing its students into all adult affairs, not just into the job market. Many of our students continue their RSI project work, even after they've completed credit requirements. And many of their individual projects grow into long-term community services involving large numbers of other volunteers.

Dr. Louis A. Haselmayer, Iowa Wesleyan president, says:

RSI has added the community as a new learning resource to the traditional academic experiences of classroom, laboratory and library. It has provided a special bridging of the generation gap between students in college and adults in the world. We regard RSI as more than just volunteer help from students in community needs. It is an important part of our entire educational philosophy of knowledge-in-action.

The Christian Science Monitor recently featured Iowa Wesleyan as one of 15 small colleges across the country having outstanding, innovative programs worthy of national attention. That article and four others help describe Wesleyan's unique RSI program of service to society, and I insert them

in the RECORD for the informational benefit of my colleagues:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 14, 1970]

WHILE GAINING CREDITS, STUDENTS "DO SOMETHING FOR SOCIETY"

(By Bill Baxter)

MOUNT PLEASANT, IOWA.—Miss Jodi Stevenson organized a community library in an abandoned city-hall building in her hometown of Drakesville, Iowa, starting with donated books and magazines.

The project earned her credit in Responsible Social Involvement (RSI) at Iowa Wesleyan College, where Miss Stevenson majored in English.

"I didn't think much of the RSI program when it was announced," the Wesleyan senior commented. "But now, after actually working on a project of my own and for the community, I think it's wonderful."

"It gives everyone a chance to do something for society, and that's the whole idea of today's youth."

A Methodist-affiliated, liberal-arts college founded in 1842, Wesleyan is said to be the first academic institution in the United States to make community service a graduation requirement for every student.

Every department emphasizes experience as a teacher:

Each French major is encouraged to spend some time in France.

Computer students run one of their own programs at the Argonne National Laboratory, Chicago, and all students are urged to use the college's computer facilities to assist in their studies, including art and music.

Students in the international-studies program spent a month in Japan with their professor last spring, getting insights from several Japanese who are alumni.

Wesleyan biology students spent eight weeks in Alaska last summer, living in their professor's mobile home, while studying the state's flora and fauna. Among them was sophomore Bill Freil.

How was this superior to studying on campus?

Mr. Freil explains:

"Well, you can't climb mountains or camp out in the Yukon in a classroom, can you? It's just a great experience, being on location to identify and study animals and plant life."

Each student tailors a program to meet his specific needs—whether it be early specialization in one of 32 majors offered or in a broad, interdisciplinary approach—for almost one-third the required 120 semester credit hours are personal options.

The 4-1-4 calendar provides a five-week "minimester" between Christmas vacation and the start of the second semester when the whole campus community breaks routine for an intensive look into contemporary American problems.

This year 800 students from 36 states and 11 other countries are enrolled. But housing and education facilities could accommodate 1,000.

About 40 percent of the students work part-time, and 45 percent receive a total of \$500,000 annually in grants, scholarships, and loans from the college.

Most unmarried students live in campus dorms, which operate under an open-hours policy for all residents.

Because the college feels strongly that education is a full-time affair and that students must learn to share the responsibilities of living in a republic, students have a voice in almost all college concerns, including rank and tenure of professors.

There are 56 faculty members, 25 percent with Ph.D.s, for a 14-to-1 student-teacher ratio.

Accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and

by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, Iowa-Wesleyan offers three degrees—B.A., B.S., and B.M.E. (music education).

In keeping with Wesleyan philosophy, admission requirements are flexible and individualized.

Though seeking students from the upper half of their class with above-average scores on College Boards or American College Tests, and those who show evidence of profiting from the freedom and personal responsibilities of the Wesleyan plan, the college will consider students from the lower half of their class who show creative or academic promise.

IW's RSI

In this era of social action and volunteerism, it has become almost commonplace for young people to turn up in helping roles in hospitals, schools, political campaign headquarters, recreation centers, and the like. Nonetheless, it is noteworthy when an entire college student body turns its collective hand to projects of a social service nature. Note then Iowa Wesleyan, where the Responsible Social Involvement (RSI) program calls for every last one of the 700 undergraduates to create and carry out a project that "contributes directly to some area of social need." The chosen undertaking is worth six academic credits, its progress must be fully documented and submitted for scrutiny by a faculty committee, and its successful completion is a requirement for graduation. In pursuit of fulfilling this requirement during the four years of RSI's existence, Wesleyans have worked at mental health facilities and family planning agencies, have helped teach ecology to prison inmates and black studies to fifth graders, have coached youngsters' sports teams, and have campaigned to get a school bond issue passed. While most students choose to write papers as documentation, some have been encouraged to venture into multimedia production or to use sculpture and other art forms in their efforts at reporting and self-evaluation.

[From the Mount Pleasant (Iowa) News, Feb. 5, 1972]

RSI PROJECT PROVIDES BRIEF HUMAN SERVICE
A Responsible Social Involvement (RSI) project underway in Mount Pleasant by Iowa Wesleyan College senior Marty Goodwin has pointed up a continuing need in the community as well as provided a brief human service, the main goal of IWC's unique RSI program.

Mrs. Goodwin, an elementary education major whose husband, Richard, is Mount Pleasant Superintendent of Schools, arranges entertainment every Saturday afternoon for the five local nursing homes, the Henry County Home, and the P.E.O. Residential Home. She is a familiar figure in all these places, because she goes along each Saturday, visiting and helping the residents, driving the entertainers, and promoting her drive to make the visitations a permanent arrangement through cooperation of area clubs and organizations which will take over for her when—and if—she ever gives it up.

"Giving up" is not in Mrs. Goodwin's vocabulary. Her program directed to the elderly has its origins in a personal experience, and she's determined that the aged shall not be neglected.

To this end, she has organized weekly Saturday afternoon entertainment and visitations, relying on volunteer aid from local church groups, vocal groups, 4-H'ers, dancers, area school choirs and vocal groups and many other individuals and groups who have cooperated to help Mrs. Goodwin toward her goal.

Because she is not willing to quit when her RSI project is over, Mrs. Goodwin is looking for more individuals and groups who will

give of their time on Saturday afternoons to continue the program indefinitely. "Entertainment" doesn't necessarily require performances by dancers and singers. Visitation, sponsoring birthday parties, driving residents to see Christmas lights (one of Mrs. Goodwin's projects during the season) or exhibits—any help from any quarter will be greatly appreciated by Mrs. Goodwin and even more grateful will be the many friends she has found living in quarters set aside for the elderly.

Mrs. Goodwin's RSI project is one of 48 such student projects of community service underway in 11 states. Each student must complete a service project sometime during his or her four years at IWC. Wesleyan is the country's only college or university with such a requirement.

[From the Des Moines Register, Feb. 14, 1971]

TWO COLLEGE MEN TEACHING WEEKLY CLASS IN PRISON

MOUNT PLEASANT, IOWA.—Two Iowa Wesleyan College men go to prison once a week and they couldn't be happier about it.

And neither can the dozen or so inmates at the Iowa State Penitentiary at Fort Madison who spend two hours on Monday nights discussing ecology and conservation with biology students Fredric Rahn, Mount Pleasant, and Robert Cox, Keosauqua, who are fulfilling the Wesleyan graduation requirement that each student do a project that benefits society.

The students are spending the College's January-February Interim Term working on the prison project as part of Wesleyan's unique Responsible Social Involvement (RSI) program.

"Bob and I went down there the first night with a structured, lecture-type lesson plan, but it only took about 15 minutes to tell that the five or six men attending the class that first night just wanted to talk informally," says Rahn, a senior.

"We could see that they wanted to isolate problems of the day and hash them out. They wanted to argue and debate topics. The men had something to contribute and they wanted the opportunity to just talk about these things with someone," he says.

"So, that was the way we directed the class from then on, and now about a dozen or more of the men look forward to the weekly sessions, which are held in the honoring dormitory of the maximum security institution," Rahn says.

With many inmates eventually assigned to work on the prison's honor farms and because of a general interest in the subject among many of the inmates, the ecology-conservation topic was chosen as the most worthwhile subject for the IWC students' project.

"We've also talked about many other things these men have on their minds," says Rahn, "and they're interested in the things that all of us are concerned about—the war, campus unrest, the economy and the future."

"Most of them, no matter how long their sentences, look to the future and talk about someday getting out. They want to keep up with things going on outside the walls," he says.

One inmate, who has been following unrest on the nation's campuses through television and newspaper accounts, told the Wesleyan students, "You know it would probably be surprising to people outside to know that nearly all of us in here abhor blowing up campus buildings for no apparent reason."

"These guys really look forward to us coming down," says Cox, a junior, "but I think the class and the ecology-conservation subject are really secondary."

"The important thing is that we've cultivated a friendship and a trust with them. Their biggest need is someone who cares,

someone they can trust, confide in and talk with frankly," he feels.

"And most of them we've come in contact with are articulate, intelligent individuals," Cox says.

"After a couple of sessions, the men wanted us to come down twice a week but we couldn't because of other classes and the need for study time," says Cox.

"They've mentioned a couple times how good it would be if other students majoring in different fields could come down to talk about sociology, psychology, business, economics and other fields," Cox points out.

"Our project will soon be over," says Rahn, "but we hope other students will want to pick up where we left off and will be allowed by prison officials to continue what we feel is a most worthwhile endeavor in human understanding, development and friendship."

[From the Burlington (Iowa)

Hawkeye-Gazette, Jan. 3, 1972]

SHE FINDS HOPE HAVEN'S CHILDREN LOVE ONE ANOTHER

MOUNT PLEASANT.—Two Iowa Wesleyan College coeds are assisting the staff at Burlington's Hope Haven school for retarded and handicapped children to fulfill a graduation requirement calling for students to do a project of human service.

Whether giving individual study assistance in class or helping in recreation, the students—Karen Gieselman, Burlington, and Kathryn Veith, Mt. Pleasant—are quick to agree that there is something very special and lovable about these children, and that their own lives have been enlarged by working with them as part of Wesleyan's Responsible Social Involvement (RSI program.)

On a typical morning this week, Miss Veith was working with a group of 10-12-year-olds—helping them to develop manual skills and word recognition. Miss Gieselman was working with two nine-year-olds—helping them learn numbers.

"I have come to love these children very much, and it amazes me how they love one another. I only hope they can find that love as they grow up and eventually leave Hope Haven," said Miss Gieselman.

In describing one of her new little friends, Miss Gieselman said, "I enjoy little Paula. She has had some kind of fever as an infant which has paralyzed her legs and damaged her brain. She walks on little crutches, but never seems discouraged. She can't talk, so she makes little signs which you come to recognize. Whenever she rubs her hands together as if she were warming them, you know she's happy. She's such a gentle little mother to her tiny toy doll, and points to things she wants others to share. It's easy to love a girl like her, and I pray and hope for the best for her."

"CAPABLE AND DEPENDENT"

Paul Eisenmann, director of Hope Haven, declared that as a rule he has found volunteer help not sufficiently responsible or regular to carry out absolutely necessary functions. "But these students are different," said Eisenmann. "They are very capable and dependable. The four students who have worked here as part of the RSI program have done a lot of good things for the children," he said. Wesleyan students Sharon Avery and Gary Beelman, both from Burlington, worked at Hope Haven for RSI credit last winter.

Over 100 IWC students are working on RSI projects in 11 states, including 66 in Iowa. Seven students are working on Indian reservations in New Mexico and Arizona. Wesleyan is the country's only college or university requiring such a project for graduation.

TOP CORPORATE EXECUTIVES ESCAPE THE PAY BOARD CEILING

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the Pay Board has established a 5.5-percent ceiling for any pay increases in order to hold the line on the economy. The wages of the workingman have been held in tight to that 5.5-percent ceiling—regardless of the size of his family—or the dimension of his financial obligations. The average family has been forced to a new level of frugality to comply with the law.

During this same period top management and executive salaries—including bonuses and incentives payments—jumped an average of 7 percent—some jumping as high as 219 percent. During 1970 when corporate profits were down 12 percent the big company executives took an average salary hike of 3.5 percent.

The top executives in the auto industry snapped some of the biggest increases, as industry profits climbed by 126 percent. James M. Roche, who retired in December as chairman of General Motors Corp., was boosted from \$262,500 to \$838,750—a "mind boggling" increase of 219.5 percent. Most of this boost was due to restoration of GM's traditionally handsome bonus, unpaid in 1970, because of a lengthy strike and sagging profits. The workers of GM received no compensation for the strike—and it seems to me that this is an act of "banditry" on corporate coffers by their own executives.

Henry Ford II, chairman of the Ford Motor Co. took on a \$190,200 pay increase—from \$512,000 to \$702,000.

At Bendix Corp., Chairman Paul Fontaine's pay rose by 130.4 percent.

The transportation industry pay increases for top executives were led by increases of 77.6 percent for Eastern Air Lines' Floyd D. Hall and Trans World Airlines' Charles C. Tillinghast, Jr.

It appears the whole airlines industry paid no Federal income tax at all for fiscal year 1971—not one penny. It was apparently a very bad year for the airlines industry, but the top executives seemed to effectively line their own pockets.

Both Eastern Airlines and Trans World Airlines paid no Federal income taxes. How do I explain to the people of my community who constantly ask me about their pay increases being deferred or dropped altogether when corporate executives of these corporations take incredible pay increases even in bad years?

It must also be pointed out that 10 percent increases for a man earning \$10,000 is \$1,000. The same percentage increase of a man earning \$100,000 is \$10,000—not quite equitable.

These outlandish pay increases were not limited to isolated industries. In the food industry, pay of Pepsi Corp. Chairman Donald M. Kendall was boosted by almost 50 percent to \$298,000 while Nabisco's Chairman Lee S. Bickmore had a

pay gain of almost \$60,000, to put his compensation at over \$300,000.

Harold Geneen, chairman of ITT, drew \$812,494 in 1971 with stock options over \$7½ million. With this rather hefty salary for ITT's chief it must also be noted that the effective tax rate for ITT in 1971 was only 4.9 percent. If you are the head of a household and earning \$10,000 annually you are paying an effective tax rate of 27 percent. It seems to me that the bigger they are the less they pay in taxes, and the more they pay their executives.

Written between the lines are other fringe benefits that consist of special stock options, loans, insurance, and financial counseling, special services not available to other employees.

Executive compensation must be brought under the same control as that of the average citizen. Executives should not be permitted a choice of the highest income of the past 3 years as the base for calculating increases. Why should any citizen receive these special privileges?

It is unconscionable and unfair that the Pay Board allows this situation to continue. The Pay Board is defeating the very purpose of its creation if it does not take some action to control these "end runs" by corporate executives. The credibility of Phase I to II is being highly undermined by these "salary shenanigans" by corporate chiefs.

THE LATE HONORABLE PHILIP J. PHILBIN

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to learn of the passing of Hon. Philip J. Philbin, our distinguished former colleague from Massachusetts. Phil Philbin was a dear friend of mine for many, many years and one of the finest Americans I have ever known. It was truly a privilege to serve here in the House of Representatives with such a warm and considerate human being. He was an outstanding legislator whose career was keynoted by dedication and devotion not only to his constituency but the entire Nation. Phil was an extremely versatile man—classic scholar, musician, and athlete. He was one of the key members of the House Committee on Armed Services for many years and at one time chairman of that committee. He was an expert in the ponderous field of national security and had an abiding interest in military justice and the living and working conditions of our military personnel. But Phil Philbin was above all a wonderful man and a close friend to so many of us. He will be truly missed by all of us who were privileged to know him and to be his friends. To his daughters and family I offer my deepest sympathy and prayers upon their great loss.

"PETE" DU PONT DESERVES HIGH MARKS**HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I think all of us who have had the privilege to serve in the House for some time now, have been quite impressed indeed with the group of new Members who joined us in the 92d Congress. And in my view, our new colleague and friend from Delaware, PETE DU PONT, must rate as one of the most competent, dedicated and thoughtful Members of that promising class of 1970. In his quiet but steady and intelligent efforts to further measures like welfare reform, revenue sharing, fiscal and budgetary reform, environmental restoration, campaign finance reform, and a host of others, as well as in his extremely effective work in behalf of his constituents in the State of Delaware; PETE has developed a record that is most admirable, and one which is certainly a tremendous credit to this great institution in which all of us serve.

I just want to take this opportunity to publicly express my own personal high regard and respect for PETE DU PONT, and to call to the attention of my colleagues a recent editorial from the Wilmington Morning News which perhaps expresses better than could I a well-deserved tribute to one of the most able freshmen Members of this body:

[From the Wilmington, Del., Morning News, May 26, 1972]

REPRESENTATIVE DU PONT HAS LOOKED GOOD AS A FRESHMAN

Pierre S. du Pont IV has been the ideal freshman Congressman, from a Delaware viewpoint and from that of Washington.

The clubby houses of Congress expect their junior members to be seen but not heard, helpful but not boisterous. Even the talkative senators expect their freshmen, for at least one session, to make a maiden speech and then keep their mouths shut. In the House, new members take the low spots on committees, do party chores, and tend the interests of their constituencies. Rep. du Pont performed well at that standard.

What Delaware expected of its youngish new congressman is less clear. In some quarters, given his family background, personal estate, political affiliation and full membership in the Greenville Gang, he may have been expected to be quite conservative.

Actually, Pete du Pont has turned out to be a reasonable, articulate moderate. His interests, as he recently expressed them, are in fiscal and budgetary reform, revenue sharing for the cities and states, welfare reform and more help for the elderly. His style is very much that of the New Politics, Republican brand. And he has been very much his own man: The Roman numeral appended to his name is just a genealogical distinction.

Rep. Du Pont made the formal and not expected announcement this week that he will be a candidate to succeed himself, and one piece of evidence that he can be expected to be a hard man to beat is the fact there is, at this late date on the political calendar, no announced candidate in either party to oppose him. There almost certainly will be no opposition to nomination by his own Republican Party, and the Democratic nomination may turn out to be a consolation prize

for one of the party's several candidates for governor.

It is noteworthy now that this scenario may have been far different. Had Sen. J. Caleb Boggs retired, as there was some feeling that he would, Rep. Du Pont could at this point be locked in a sizzling battle with Wilmington Mayor Harry G. Haskell Jr. for the Republican senatorial nomination. Mayor Haskell recently commented that it was just as well that had not happened. It's just as well from Rep. Du Pont's standpoint, too. On the basis of his first House term, he can have a long and promising future in Delaware and national politics.

SALUTE TO EDUCATION**HON. DON H. CLAUSEN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to professional educators in this formal salute to education. As we approach our Nation's 200th birthday it is fitting to recall the tremendous role that education has played in a society that has made us the most industrially sophisticated nation in the world. From the cotton gin to the harvesters, from the discovery of electricity to the construction of great dams, from the Wright Brothers' first flight to the landing of man on the moon, from dynamite to nuclear fission and from Morse code to television and telephones, education has, indeed, served us well.

All that makes America great can be directly or indirectly attributed to one commodity, education. Other than the home environment, education is second to none in guiding and influencing our children. All of our children have the opportunity to become President, or a millionaire, or go to college and our free society is able to nurture these dreams and prepare our children for their future, whatever course they may choose.

Education also plays a major role in contributing to the betterment of our society. More medical students are entering general practice and donating their knowledge to those who are unable to afford proper health care. Lawyers are representing the indigent and safeguarding the rights of the poor; and men and women are entering the field of social work in an effort to help those less fortunate than they. Armed with education, compassion and a willingness to give, they are making our great country greater and giving their lives a more special meaning.

In short, our education system has created a society which leads the world in offering life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. While it has contributed greatly to the growth of this Nation, new problems have arisen and we must be prepared to meet these new challenges. The fact that the Federal budget provides outlays of \$13.5 billion for aid to education for fiscal year 1972—an increase from \$2.8 billion in 1962—shows that we are preparing for the future.

Recently it was my pleasure to form a First Congressional District education

review and advisory committee to provide a two-way channel of communication and continuing dialog on matters relating to education at the Federal level with a broad cross section of professional educators in my district. In addition to providing current information and reports on proposed legislation related to education, I intend to meet periodically with the committee as we work together to enhance the quality of education throughout the Redwood Empire of California.

The challenge is here and we must never commit the error of resting on our laurels. I am confident that the sincere dedication of men and women as teachers and Congress' foresight will insure that every child will have the proper direction to become a valuable asset to our society in whatever capacity he or she may choose.

THE GREEKS HAD TWO WORDS FOR IT**HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to include in the RECORD excerpts of the commencement address given by the former Under Secretary of the Interior, James K. Carr, now director of Airports for the City and County of San Francisco. Mr. Carr, a professional engineer, has served as general manager of public utilities for the city of San Francisco; as assistant general manager of the Sacramento Municipal District; as chairman of the California Water Commission. Some of my colleagues will remember him as the water and power consultant from 1951 to 1953 on the staff of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Carr makes some cogent remarks about the great benefits of water and power projects, particularly in the Western part of the United States. He takes issue with ecologists that preach a "no-change, no-growth" policy. Excerpts from his remarks follow:

REMARKS BY JAMES K. CARR

When Santa Clara College had already been granting degrees in higher education for more than twenty years, the English language did not have a word for my topic today—Ecology-Human Ecology—a subject requested of Father President (Thomas D. Terry, S.J.) by some of the graduates.

The word "Ecology" apparently came into English usage about 1873. A German zoologist, Haeckel, used it in 1869.

We are certainly making up for lost time. Now, everyone is talking about ecology and the environment. Millions of words are being spoken and written about it.

The Greeks had two words for it: "Oikos" (household) and "logos" (the word—or study of). Ecology, therefore, means essentially "the study of the household—the household we call earth."

Human ecology is the total relationship of men and women to their resources, both material and spiritual—since they consist of body and soul—and to the consequent social, cultural and economic institutions re-

sulting from that relationship. It involves the cities as well as the wilderness.

Environment is a part of Human Ecology, but only a part.

Environ means to surround, enclose or encircle.

To those individuals, corporations and government agencies who have "had it their way" so long in the use of natural resources, I would suppose they now think with all this upsurge of concern that the word "environ" means to entrap, exasperate or frustrate.

Let's face it: Ecological Judgment Day has arrived. Increasing Human Ecological concern, world-wide, is here to stay. The recently convened United Nations Environmental Conference in Stockholm is further evidence of that fact.

The Stockholm Conference is not a meeting to praise "motherhood", as some have erroneously assumed. Headlines such as: "Industrial Nations Fight Ecology Plan" and "Rich Nations Called on to Rethink for Environment", are indications that the Stockholm Conference won't be a scientific or political "Tea Party".

One headline: "Love for One Another Theme at Stockholm Environment Meet," even indicates some may be getting warm in the search for answers to the problems.

Make no mistake as to how long it takes and what effort is required to make progress. It will be an uphill fight all the way for those who have the audacity to challenge "The Establishment". As one of the "older conservation revolutionaries", I can cite chapter and verse.

The selfish, ruthless, dollar-hungry exploiters; the individual and corporate air, land and water polluters; the single-minded freeway builders; and even aircraft builders don't like to have so-called "posey pickers" and "butterfly catchers" stand in the way of what they define as progress.

You can save "the Ecological Crusade" if you are practical, don't bite off too much at once, don't expect Utopia overnight, and most of all, "don't quit".

The late Rachel Carson, author of "Silent Spring," a former Interior Department colleague, asked me about ten years ago to sit with her at a meeting of the Women's National Press Club. She was there to defend her views against the onslaught of the hirelings of the chemical industry—the group she had dared to offend by opposing the use of DDT and certain other pesticides that were destructive of ecological balance.

On that occasion, she bravely fended off the charges which were repeated by the correspondents.

For all her effort, she had little reward except knowing she was right and that she had the courage to speak out about it.

The book, "Since Silent Spring" is a tribute to this valiant, competent scientist who was vindicated in her environmental "call to arms". She also gave us that delightful, provocative book, "The Sea Around Us."

There are and will be intemperate speeches on both sides, overstated positions and one-sided books. Don't be "taken in" by the "Environmental Con-Men" on the one side, or "the anguished screams" of the vested interests on the other.

Practically, Perseverance and consideration of the other person's viewpoint can eventually accomplish a great deal. It doesn't hurt any of us to give up some of "our infallibility" once in a while.

Have but a goal and a purpose, and opportunities to reach your goal will burst forth like the buds in spring.

There must be personal commitment. Ecological problems both great and small can be solved more easily if you are organized. I wish there were more time to talk about that field.

Recent issues of the Sunday supplement, *California Living*, and other news media channels, can supply many references on groups you can join.

One would be remiss if you were left with the impression that environmental protection, desirable ecological policy or true conservation means no growth and no change.

Ecologists who advocate this no-growth approach do a disservice to the Ecology Crusade.

The relatively thin layer of the surface of the earth in which we are able to survive is evolving—changing every second. So are the people who live here. It's how we effect change that counts.

A college graduate without a job is just as unemployed as a "high school dropout" without a job. There must be a continuing development as long as the population and level of living increase.

Man must live off the products of the earth as well as on it.

The issue is, therefore, *how* to cope with the changing environment, not *how* to stop growth.

Change and growth are not necessarily bad.

Shasta Dam and Shasta Lake are examples of environmental change for the better.

Before the dam was built, the beautiful spots along the rivers were mostly privately-owned. In summer the rivers ran low. Drinking water from the river at Redding was tepid in summer and often turbid in winter. For most of the season a few suckers and carp constituted the fishing resource.

Today, there is a beautiful lake with 365 miles of shoreline. Water supplies have improved for every community downstream. Agriculture flourishes in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys because the devastating winter floods are controlled for use during the dry months.

Huge amounts of electric energy are produced without pollution. Boating, fishing and outdoor recreation are available for millions of users on the lake and along miles and miles of free-flowing stream.

Ecologists who oppose construction of all dams are wrong. That doesn't mean we approve every dam anyone proposes. Years ago we won the battle against the huge Table Mountain Dam near Red Bluff that would have flooded the Anderson Valley.

Now, smaller lakes on tributary streams like Whiskeytown Lake are sensibly furnishing water control and stream flow maintenance, resulting in diversified recreation areas operated by ecology-minded men of the National Park Service.

Re-use of purified waste water is rapidly gaining favor. Desalting of sea water is already feasible in many areas of the world.

Yes—the world can be changed for the better.

Nations have arrived at this present "Ecological Crisis" because of the most rapid acceleration of science and technology civilization has ever known.

We find ourselves so quickly in the "ecological mire" because of technology. With the aid of technology and environmental engineering—we can get out.

Rescuing the Ecosphere (I prefer the older term, Creation.) requires choices equally important in economic, social, political and cultural fields.

The policy decision-making process cannot be accomplished by technologists alone because the problems are far from being purely technical.

Policy depends upon one's philosophy. If man consists of body and soul—if he is destined for a life hereafter—then solutions geared only to the "Now Generation" will not work.

There is no shortage of information. However, merely accumulating information isn't education in the true sense. There is always the problem of what we do with it.

Scientists have said that with our present state of the art, satellites and sensors, we could saturate the computer systems of the world with facts about the earth's environment; and the rapidity with which we can get answers is incredible.

When it was my privilege to first attend Santa Clara in 1930, Father Ricard, the internationally famous "sun spot astronomer", was spending his last months on earth. I still remember him sitting in the rose garden near the Observatory.

It is difficult to realize that since those beautiful autumn days some forty years ago, more advances in the knowledge of the science of Astronomy have been made than during all the preceding history of the world.

Accurate information is basic, but we must establish values and adhere to priorities based upon it. We must preserve in some cases and develop in others.

We must stop building monuments to ugliness.

Let me mention some examples.

When the Junipero Serra Freeway (Interstate 280) was opened south of Daly City, a very short time ago, it was beautiful. Natural-sloping, flower-covered, tree-studded hills greeted the traveler. Take a look at some stretches of it today. Monotonous look-a-like, architecturally unattractive houses are beginning to suffocate it. Warehouses are protruding to block the view of the Bay. Soon the freeway will have lost its beauty except where publicly-owned land protects it. Must "making a fast buck" at the expense of livability of the community really be so necessary?

On the highway approach to San Francisco from Marin, it is a setting of incomparable beauty.

From the Peninsula approach on the Bay-shore, one enters the City past the desecration of a garbage dump and bulldozer-scarred hillside, forever mutilated—forever maimed.

This evidence of warped values would have prompted Wordsworth to repeat:

"The world is too much with us: late and soon

Getting and spending we lay waste our powers

Little we see in Nature that is ours;
We have given our hearts away, a sordid boon!"

There is a "bright side". We can use technology as a tool to improve environment.

At the nearby Lockheed Missile and Space Company in Sunnyvale, there are encouraging developments. Lockheed engineers are demonstrating the potential of a parabolic-shaped flywheel called the Kinetic Energy Wheel. Under a contract with the Environmental Protection Agency, Lockheed is proving that automobile engines and bus engines do not need to be so noisy and air-polluting.

The Kinetic Energy Wheel "spins up" to meet acceleration. Putting on the brakes puts energy back into the wheel. The "heat engine", therefore, can be much smaller, less noisy, and operate with a minimum of polluting emissions.

The U.S. Department of Transportation has been asked to approve a program test of the Kinetic Energy Wheel on trolley coaches in San Francisco.

According to Lockheed's calculations, "revving up" to 20,000 revolutions per minute in five minutes can provide enough energy in the wheel to take a trolley coach from the Ferry Building to the western end of Market Street without overhead wires, with very little noise and without air pollution.

What a boon this could mean to people living and working along crowded city streets. How we would miss those noisy, stinking, "belch-fire" buses.

Another major environmental possibility is modern, safe nuclear-energy power plants. They can be constructed to reduce polluting coal, gas and oil-fired power plants. If nuclear plants should be more remotely located, extra high voltage direct-current transmission lines can bring electrical energy to metropolitan areas.

East to west electrical power plants of this type, interfaced to recognize time zones and peak electrical demands across the United States, can reduce the total power plant capacity needed in our Nation. Similar north-south installations could bring presently wasted water power from the streams of Canada and Alaska pollution free.

As for aircraft noise—we are on the "down-hill pull". The new "747", "DC-10", and "Lockheed 1011" are all quieter and less air polluting than existing operational aircraft fleets. We are on the way to abating the maddening decibels at and around airports.

Offensive black smoke has been eliminated by two California airlines: P.S.A. and Air California, on all the aircraft in their fleets. The other airlines are following suit to meet an imposed deadline.

But all this possible progress, and all the information available won't permit us to attain a more livable earth unless people possess the right attitude. We can never employ enough law enforcement officers to guarantee complete compliance with environmental legislation.

The encouraging "Ecological Crusade" can be successful only insofar as people and communities develop sound ecological policies which are dependent upon sound individual philosophy regarding man's destiny and place in Creation and his relationship to other creatures.

The community will be a reflection of individual commitment.

The ecology questions facing the world today are essentially ethical questions. This Nation's "environmental sickness" is the consequence of sustained, unfortunate, unethical abuse. Most of it happened so the more fortunate could glory in abundance of material things. We call less materialistic cultures "backward" and "underdeveloped," without much real effort to provide the essentials of food, clothing and shelter, or alleviate the poverty and malnutrition of the people who live there.

Now, some Americans are lamenting their ecological sins, their lack of compassion, and asking what changes we should make.

Longfellow, over a hundred years ago, put the situation so poetically in his, "The Birds of Killingsworth." Referring to the greedy farmers who slaughtered the birds to save a little grain, and who then suffered the defoliation and the devastation of the locust hordes, he said:

"That year in Killingsworth the
Autumn came without the
Light of his majestic look,
The wonder of the falling
Tongues of flame,
The illuminated pages of his
Dooms-Day book,
A few lost leaves turned
Crimson with their shame,
And drowned themselves
Despairing in the brook."

Despair is never the answer. A healthy recognition of our failures is the first step toward success. After all, the principle difference between St. Peter and Judas was a good confession.

There once lived a man in the 13th Century we should not overlook. He established an order of religious men and women. The men of that order built the Mission which is the focal point of this Campus. The City for which I work honors him—his name is St. Francis of Assisi—San Francisco.

St. Francis took an ontological approach to life. It is based on a wide-spread belief in a Creator.

When he rebelled against "The Establishment of the 1200's," it was because he thought "the powerful" had lost a sense of true values and true priorities. How familiar it sounds.

St. Francis believed that if you leave out

the Creator in your groping for answers, you will get the wrong answer—or no answer at all.

In his beautiful, "Canticle of the Sun", this never-to-be-forgotten "Troubadour of Christianity" was singing about the interdependence of Creatures—of Creation. He is the Patron Saint of Ecologists.

He understood well for his day the obligation we have of "stewardship", as we enjoy this brief and delicate tenancy on a thin layer of "spaceship earth", where there, only we can survive.

He contemplated nothingness and infinity. He appreciated the shortness of time and the length of everlasting life—as we so often thoughtlessly refer to it. We, with our "space-age knowledge" should appreciate it so much more fully. Doubtless, he often pondered the question so beautifully expressed by the Eighth Psalm:

"What is man O Lord that you have created
him
Made him a little less than the angels
Crowned him with honor and glory
And set him over the works of your hands."

St. Francis knew that "dominion" doesn't authorize man's tyranny over, or ruthless exploitation of, the rest of creation. Man was given no charter of abuse. Instead, man should consider the "parable of the talents"—each person's inescapable obligation to make use of his or her talents in whatever days we may be given on earth.

Remember, it is not the years in your life that count, but the life in your years.

The humble corroborator in his revolt against false values in the 1200's, his "Women's Lib" compatriot of that day, truly liberated in her saintliness, was the person who has the beloved, beautiful name of Santa Clara—St. Clare.

Three hundred years later another religious man—a "hawk" turned "dove"—imitated the poverty of St. Francis in a cave at Manresa, in the beautiful "hill country" above Barcelona. That same man lived with the Franciscans for a short while when he went to the Holy Land. He established a religious order that has made this University possible—the Society of Jesus, the Jesuits.

His name was St. Ignatius of Loyola—(San Inigo).

His motto was "Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam—For the Greater Glory of God."

The "spiritual exercises" of St. Ignatius form the basis of Jesuit education. Those exercises echo St. Francis in the reference to "The Right Use of Creatures".

In his First Principle and Foundation, he spelled out clearly what it's all about:

"Man is created to praise, reverence, and serve God our Lord, and by this means to save his soul. All other things on the face of the earth are created for man to help him fulfill the end for which he is created.

"From this follows that man is to use these things to the extent that they will help him..."

You were not given this educational opportunity at Santa Clara merely so you could live more prosperously than your fellow man. Your education and talents are a gift. You must someday account for their use.

In closing, I should like to paraphrase a quotation that is engraved in marble in the Nation's Capitol. Keep it in mind when you realize how relatively soon all of us will stand before God in judgment.

May you, the members of the Class of 1972, in the tradition of San Francisco, Santa Clara and San Inigo of Loyola, use your individual gifts and talents to develop the human and material resources of this earth, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests—so that you, in your day and generation, may perform something worthy to be remembered—"Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam".

PRICE COMMENTS ON PROPOSED DES BAN

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned over an imminent announcement by the Federal Food and Drug Administration proposing a complete ban on the use of diethylstilbestrol—DES—in cattle and sheep feed. The proposal to ban DES in animal feed is based upon numerous recent cases where DES residues have been found in livers of animals at time of slaughter.

In a telephonic inquiry with Food and Drug Administration officials, I have been assured that the proposed ban has been suggested, not for the purpose of removing DES from the market, but to allow a complete public investigation and hearing whereby all options affecting the use of DES might be explored.

In taking this action, the FDA has emphasized that it is presently staying an earlier proposal to ban the use of liquid DES, since it has been concluded that this would not effectively eliminate the problem of DES residues in animal carcasses and would only severely injure liquid DES feed producers without affecting dry DES feed manufacturers.

Charles Edwards, M.D., Commissioner of Food and Drugs, was quoted as having explained the reason for the proposed ban on DES as follows:

Diethylstilbestrol (DES) is widely used in beef cattle and sheep to stimulate more rapid weight gain with less feed.

A beef animal, for example, will reach market weight of 1,000 pounds 35 days sooner using 500 pounds less feed than a comparable animal not fed DES. Also, DES increased the ratio of protein to fat, resulting in more nutritious meat.

DES clearly is a useful and effective product. Furthermore, we are convinced that it is safe when used as directed. In spite of these advantages, studies have shown DES to be a carcinogen, and the law does not allow residues of a carcinogen in meat.

Six months ago, the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Food and Drug Administration instituted new controls to assure elimination of DES residues. This was done after USDA's monitoring program disclosed illegal residues in approximately one-half of animal livers sampled. In response to those 1 percent of animal livers sampled. In response to those findings, FDA extended the withdrawal period for DES from 48 hours to 7 day before slaughter and USDA required producers to provide written certification of withdrawal. In addition, a more sensitive method for detecting DES was put into use by USDA. Finally, in the most recent action, FDA initiated criminal prosecution against a producer for alleged misuse of the drug.

Dr. Edwards further stated:

Nevertheless, in spite of these actions, the reports of illegal residues have not declined. They have, in fact, increased.

We have been informed by USDA that their monitoring program since January 8, 1972, has found illegal residues in 39 livers, or 1.9% of 2,081 samples analyzed.

This in our judgment does not indicate that the product cannot be used safely and effectively. It does suggest that, for whatever reasons, it is not being used in conformance with existing regulations.

It is apparent that additional action must

be taken. It is equally apparent that any action with such major consumer impact must be taken only after the most careful consideration of all scientific information and regulatory alternatives. We recognize that competent scientists and concerned consumers have strong feelings on both sides of this issue.

Before making further regulatory decisions affecting DES, the FDA must make absolutely certain it has all the facts. We have concluded that the most appropriate forum for accumulating additional facts is a public hearing. This will give everyone—scientists as well as consumers, industry as well as Government—an opportunity to participate in the development, on the public record, of full information essential to balanced and reasonable judgment by the FDA.

Within the statutory framework of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, the only mechanism for proceeding to such a hearing is for FDA to propose a formal action to withdraw approval of the drug. Such a proposal automatically provides an opportunity for an official hearing before an FDA appointed hearing examiner. Therefore, the necessary proposal for withdrawal will be published in the Federal Register next week. It will provide a procedure for us to carefully consider whether it is appropriate to withdraw approval of DES, to institute new and more effective restrictions to reduce the illegal residues or to take other appropriate action.

Such a hearing would be open to the public. It is our intention to give everyone interested the opportunity to present evidence. We seek facts, and we are particularly interested in data on these subjects:

Additional controls to eliminate the current rate of illegal residues.

The consequences of withholding or discarding all livers, the only organ in which DES has been found by USDA.

The feasibility of limiting use of the product to those producers who can demonstrate an adequate quality control program.

The effect on the environment of withdrawing DES.

The availability of alternative growth-promotant drugs.

Differences or similarities in the potential for residues if DES is used in feed or as an implant.

The likely result of the future availability of more sensitive detection methods.

We will continue, as we have in the past, to share information with authorities in Canada, where DES is also used. FDA and Canadian authorities agreed at a meeting this week that additional action is required.

Let me assure you that FDA is committed to eliminating DES residues from the meat supply in this country. At the same time, we have not yet concluded that withdrawal of approval for DES is the appropriate course of action. We believe that a full public hearing can help provide us with the information we need to make the correct decisions and take all appropriate action. The withdrawal proposal being announced today is designed to bring about such a hearing.

Persons interested in requesting a hearing or presenting data should inform the Hearing Clerk, DHEW, Room 6-88, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, Maryland 20852.

Mr. Speaker, my reaction to the above statement by Dr. Edwards is that this proposed action by the FDA could have far-reaching importance to both cattle raisers and the meat-consuming public. I shall continue to urge that this matter be explored carefully and that we not be driven by emotion into making decisions which will be unsound or unwarranted.

LITHUANIAN RESISTANCE TO FOREIGN DOMINATION

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the tiny Balkan State of Lithuania has been subjected to foreign invasion and domination for centuries. In 1253, Mindaugas was crowned by Pope Innocent III as king of a united Lithuania. This unification laid the groundwork for an eventual political union with Poland and the general political and cultural extension of the Lithuanian State. This union lasted until 1795, then Lithuania was annexed by imperial Russia. The courageous Lithuanians continually revolted against repressive czarist rule and finally forced the Russians to abandon their policy of assimilation and acculturation of the Lithuanian people in 1905.

Lithuania has had little freedom in the 20th century. After Russian colonization, the German aggrandizement during the First World War sought to eliminate the sovereignty and identity of this determined Balkan State. During World War II, Lithuania was one of the few countries to experience the brutality of both Hitler and the Soviet Union.

On June 22, 1941, Nazi forces overran Lithuania. The peoples of this nation have never seen real freedom and tranquility since that day. A victory by the Allies during the war wrested control from the Germans, but ultimate authority went to the Soviets. Rule by the Communists for a quarter of a century has stifled this once vigorous, proud nation, into part of the Soviet orbit in Eastern Europe. Moreover, Soviet-sponsored dictatorship has vitiated all forms of political expression and liberty. But, the Lithuanian people have steadfastly refused to submit to alien rule. They have steered an independent course of action, wherever their energies could be exerted. For example, thousands of Catholic Lithuanians have consciously and vociferously kept their faith, despite the unrelenting hostility and disbelief of the Communists.

Many in the West do not realize the magnitude of the struggle waged by the Lithuanian loyalists for 8 years—1944–52—against the Soviets. The losses incurred by the Lithuanian guerrillas reached 40,000 dead in military actions alone during this period.

On this day more than 30 years ago, the most dehumanizing and persistent oppression began by the Nazis, and more recently by the Soviets. The proud heritage of the Lithuanian people is filled with examples of resistance and determination, regardless of the odds or obstacles in their path. It is because of this courage of conviction and resistance to alien rule, that I wish to commemorate this day and ask all peoples to pause and take account of the great achievements of the Lithuanian people as symbols of independence and freedom throughout the world.

DOMESTIC SUMMIT

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, some historians theorize that the true worth of a President will be measured by his achievements in the realm of foreign affairs; that the leader of a nation must make some form of peace with its neighbors if that nation is to survive and flourish as a great power.

The recent travels to Peking and to Moscow, by President Nixon, indicate the importance he ascribes to this aspect of the Presidency. In contrast, is the tragic lack of action in the critical area of domestic needs; so also, however, will history judge a President, for a nation at war within itself cannot long prevail.

A recent editorial in the St. Louis Sentinel poses the idea of a Presidential summit with domestic leaders, to confront the pressing problems facing millions of our citizens. For the benefit of my colleagues, I request permission to include this editorial in the RECORD of today's proceedings.

The editorial follows:

DOMESTIC SUMMIT

President Nixon has carried out within the past few months some of the more spectacular moments of his Presidential career. True to the predictions of some top Republicans upon the inauguration of Mr. Nixon, he has left the dramatic acts of his administration to its closing moments.

The admission of the People's Republic of China into the United Nations started a string of events that is bound to have its impact on the American populace. As we have indicated here before, Mr. Nixon has become a master at what we chose to call "push-pull Policies."

As Vice President Agnew denounces the caution that must be exhibited in dealing with Red China, the administration changes its policy on its admission to the U.N.

Two summits are announced in the midst of a wholesale withdrawing of troops from Vietnam. The individuals who want the boys home gain a sense of achieving in this action from the doves while stepped up bombing of the north satisfies the hawks in the country.

The President journeys to China and returns with two pandas and before he visits Moscow, he announces the mining of Haiphong harbor. In each instance he has deftly given all segments of the electorate a portion of what it has desired.

The followers of Gov. Wallace saw the President join him in his position on busing of public school children. Mr. Nixon seemed to be fully aware of the sophistication of this issue; of its widespread appeal among fear laden parents. He has not misread the pulse of this section of the nation.

True he has a soft economy on his hand and the unemployment rate has not shifted in any appreciable manner. Such things as securing jobs are much more difficult to orchestrate than, say, a dramatic appearance before a joint session of Congress immediately upon his return from Russia. He returned not empty handed, but with a culmination of the SALT talks that have been in progress and structuring stage through two Democratic Presidents. In this instance he fell heir to groundwork carefully laid by administrations before him. The promise of the

joint effort in space is another agenda item the President has added to his portfolio, and now he has sent Texas Democrat John Connally off on a world tour. Does this mean that, depending upon whom the Democrats nominate in July, Mr. Nixon may find it necessary to reach for Mr. Connally rather than Mr. Agnew?

There is one area the president has not touched and we fervently wish that he would. He has had two summits, both on foreign soil. With the problems of the cities and the poor coupled with the bogging down of health and welfare programs, the President could add some Brownie points if he called together some of the concerned people of America. Former President Johnson was accused of "staging" events, but his events more than often turned out to constructive good.

Secretary Romney has spelled out the failings of HUD in critical areas. There is a move toward consolidation of HEW, OEO, HUD, etc. This is being brought about because of what many feel is a need for a restructuring of urban affairs in government.

All of this would seem to point to a great opportunity for Mr. Nixon to come to grips with ailing America. He need not gather a mass audience in Washington. There are, however, some pivotal individuals, conversant with this nation's problems. A meeting of these individuals with the highest officer in the land should lead to a better understanding of these problems or set in motion some formula to deal with them.

MR. W. BROM REESE

HON. RICHARD H. FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 13, 1972 I was saddened to learn of the untimely death of my close friend, Mr. W. Brom Reese, of Nashville, Tenn.

Mr. Reese was one of the most kind and generous men with whom I have had the privilege of being acquainted. He was a man who gave fully of himself to help others, particularly our American veterans.

He was a veteran of World War I and Veterans Barrack 3214 of World War I. He also was a member of the American Legion for 53 years and a member of the Vulture 702 of 40 and 8.

Throughout his adult life he devoted a great deal of his time to veterans and veteran organizations. He was very active even after his retirement in 1965. He made weekly visits to our veterans hospital to meet and talk with patients there, giving them a word of encouragement and a bit of personal attention which is so important to those who are so confined.

One of his big annual projects was participating in and planning the Christmas programs at the veterans hospital in order that those patients who would not be able to be at home with their families and loved ones on that very special occasion would have a pleasant holiday.

Mr. Reese left a legion of friends who can all testify to the fact that the world had been a pleasanter place for his having been here.

I extend my personal sympathy and condolences to his widow, Margaret Ellen Criswell Reese.

BALTS REFLECT UPON THREE DECADES OF OCCUPATION

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, during the latter part of this month, the Baltic people will commemorate some sad and glorious events. The Soviet Union has long intimidated the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and now it is time once again for this Congress to call attention to these horrendous injustices.

The Baltic peoples are deprived of their very basic human rights and freedom. They are unable to speak for themselves. Based on the experiences of the people of Hungary and Czechoslovakia, we are well aware that the Soviets stand ready to suppress any overt attempts of the Baltic people to secure their freedom. I believe it is the responsibility of all the people of the free world to be spokesmen for this enslaved group of people.

The Communist regime did not come to power in the Baltic States by a legal or democratic process. The Soviets invaded the Baltic States and grabbed them by force of arms. Since then, the Baltic people have been suffering from Russian-Communist activity and captivity for more than 30 years.

The month of June is a very memorable one for the Balts in all parts of the world. Thirty-two years ago this month—in June of 1940—the Soviet Union invaded the grand old Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and took over these peace-loving republics by vicious force. One year later—in June of 1941—the Russian Communists started mass deportations of these people, and over 150,000 Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians were swallowed up in Siberian slave and labor camps. Several days before the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941, the people of Lithuania succeeded in getting rid of the Communist regime in the country; freedom and independence were restored and a free government was reestablished. This free, provisional government of Lithuania was overrun by the Nazis only 6 weeks after it was established.

The Balts are a proud people who have lived peacefully on the shores of the Baltic for time immemorial. This year marks the 721st anniversary of the formation of the State of Lithuania. Mindaugas the Great unified the Lithuanian principalities into one kingdom in 1251.

Since the very beginning of Soviet Russian occupation, however, the Balts have waged intense battles for freedom. It is widely recognized that in the period between 1940 and 1952, some 30,000 Lithuanian freedom fighters lost their lives in an organized resistance movement against the Soviet conquerors.

The Baltic peoples have never before

experienced such an extermination and annihilation of their people in their long history through the centuries as during the last three decades. Since June 15, 1940, the Baltic nations have lost more than one-fourth of their combined population to ethnically genocidal deportation and resettlement programs of the Soviet Union. The genocidal operations and practices being carried out by the Soviets continue with no end in sight.

Two events of the past several months indicate the desperate plight of Lithuania's Roman Catholics, the primary target of the Soviet Government repression among religious denominations. In March, 1972, a petition bearing 17,054 signatures was forwarded to Dr. Kurt Waldheim, Secretary General of the United Nations. The petition was an appeal through Dr. Waldheim to Leonid Brezhnev, Secretary General of the Russian Communist Party, because all other channels to get to the Russian leader had failed.

The forced incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union is readily evident and we should recognize it for what it is. Ironically, the Soviet Union has signed the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights. This document describes the fundamental privileges due to every individual from a state in which he lives. These include the rights of assembly, of free elections, and of freedom of worship. Most importantly, they include the right to move freely over the borders for emigration and temporary visiting.

Mr. Speaker, the administration should go ahead and implement House Concurrent Resolution 416—89th Congress—which would give life to the hope of freedom for the Soviet-dominated Baltic States. The United States and the other free countries of the world should urge the Kremlin leaders to make the rights described in the Declaration of reality for these oppressed people.

The seizure and annexation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Soviet Union constituted an act of aggression and a flagrant violation of numerous international treaties and agreements, as well as the inalienable rights of the Baltic peoples.

Mr. Speaker, the text of House Concurrent Resolution 416 is identical to the resolution I am sponsoring in the current Congress, House Concurrent Resolution 169, which follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 169

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 cooperation; and

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

H.R. 9502, A BILL TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL SYSTEM OF SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, as the solid waste problem at the local level becomes more difficult, citizens are increasingly looking to the Federal Government for assistance.

Last year I introduced H.R. 9502, a bill to establish a National System of Solid Waste Management. If enacted this bill would help alleviate the local problem by incorporating the cost of disposal in the price of the product. The funds raised would go to a trust fund designed to aid communities in devising regional approaches to the problem.

I would urge the Ways and Means Committee to hold hearings on this bill and I insert H.R. 9502 in the Record at this point for the information of my colleagues:

H.R. 9502

A bill to establish a national system of solid waste management

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE AND DEFINITIONS

SECTION 1. (a) This Act may be cited as the "Solid Waste Management Act of 1971".

(b) For purposes of this Act—

(1) The term "Commission" means the Solid Waste Management Commission established by section 2.

(2) The term "Corporation" means the Federal Solid Waste Management Corporation established by section 5.

(3) The term "Board" means the Board of Directors of the Corporation.

(4) The term "trust fund" means the Solid Waste Management Trust Fund established by section 4.

(5) The term "solid waste" shall have the same meaning as such term has under section 203(4) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION

SEC. 2. (a) There is established within the executive branch of the Federal Government a commission to be known as the Solid Waste Management Commission.

(b) The Commission, in accordance with

section 3 of this Act, shall recommend to the Congress disposal tax plans and disposal bond systems for products or materials.

(c) The Commission shall be composed of five members appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Members of the Commission shall be broadly representative of industry and of the technical and scientific disciplines involved in solid waste management. Members shall be appointed for terms of five years. Members of the Commission shall be compensated at the rate provided for level 1 of the Executive Schedule. The Chairman of the Commission shall be designated by the President.

(d) The Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable.

DISPOSAL TAXES AND DISPOSAL BONDS

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall conduct such studies and hold such hearings as may be necessary or appropriate to make recommendations to the Congress with respect to disposal taxes for purposes of chapter 43 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and disposal bond systems under subsection (d) of this section.

(b) (1) (A) The Commission shall recommend to the Congress which products or materials require disposal taxes, at what stage in the process of manufacturing or processing of the product or material the tax shall be levied, the unit on which the tax is based, and the amount of tax per unit. The Commission shall recommend a disposal tax plan which shall specify for purposes of chapter 43 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954—

(i) the product or material to which it applies (the taxable article),

(ii) the taxable person,

(iii) the taxable unit, and

(iv) the applicable rate of tax.

(B) Any determination under subparagraph (A) on which a disposal tax plan is based shall be made on the record after notice and opportunity for hearing. No disposal tax plan may take effect until after the plan has been approved by the Congress.

(2) Disposal taxes shall reflect as closely as possible the actual cost of disposal or processing each material or product, taking into account its physical and chemical properties, its salvage value, if any, and any special problems or hazards involved in its handling. A disposal tax on any material or product shall be uniform throughout the United States.

(c) (1) Subtitle D of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to miscellaneous excise taxes) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 43—DISPOSAL TAXES

"Sec. 4961. Imposition of tax.

"Sec. 4962. Definitions.

"SEC. 4961. IMPOSITION OF TAX

"(a) IN GENERAL.—There is hereby imposed on the sale by the taxable person of any taxable article a tax at the applicable rate per taxable unit determined under the disposal tax plan applicable to such article.

"(b) BY WHOM PAYABLE.—The tax imposed by this section shall be paid by the taxable person.

"SEC. 4962. DEFINITIONS.

"For purposes of this chapter—

"(1) DISPOSAL TAX PLAN.—The term 'disposal tax plan' means a disposal tax plan adopted under section 3(b) (1) of the Solid Waste Management Act.

"(2) TAXABLE ARTICLE.—The term 'taxable article' means a product or material to which a disposal tax plan applies.

"(3) TAXABLE PERSON.—The term 'taxable person' means a person who conducts an operation of manufacturing or processing an article which (under the disposal tax plan for such article) subjects him to tax upon the sale of the article.

"(4) TAXABLE UNIT.—The term 'taxable unit' means a unit of measure or quantity prescribed in a disposal tax plan with respect to a taxable article.

"(5) APPLICABLE RATE.—The term 'applicable rate' means the rate of tax per taxable unit specified in a disposal tax plan applicable to a taxable article."

(2) The table of chapters for such subtitle is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Chapter 43. Disposal taxes."

(d) (1) If the Commission makes a determination on the record, after notice and opportunity for hearing, that a disposal bond system for a product of a particular kind is necessary in order to insure the proper disposal of such product after use, it may by regulation require the manufacturers, processors, and suppliers of all products of such kind to establish a system under which (A) a deposit is required to be made by any person who purchases the product (other than for purposes of resale) and (B) such deposit is refunded to such purchaser (or any subsequent purchaser) upon delivery of the product to a manufacturer, processor, distributor, or disposal center, as may be specified in such regulation. Any disposal bond system so prescribed shall provide adequate protection of the financial interest of consumers in any deposits made by them. No regulation prescribed under this paragraph shall take effect until ninety days after it is published in the Federal Register.

(2) (A) No product of a kind to which a regulation in effect under paragraph (1) applies may be transported or sold in commerce unless the transportation or sale is in accordance with such regulation. For purposes of this subparagraph, transportation or sale is in commerce if such transportation or sale affects commerce between a State and a place outside such State, or affects commerce within the District of Columbia, or a Commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States.

(B) Whoever violates subparagraph (A) shall be fined not more than twice the value of the product so transported or sold.

(c) The Commission shall require that the amount of any disposal tax or disposal bond shall be separately stated at the time the product or material to which it applies is sold to the consumer.

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT TRUST FUND

SEC. 4. (a) There is established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the Solid Waste Management Trust Fund, consisting of such amounts as may be appropriated or credited to the trust fund as provided in this section.

(b) There are hereby appropriated to the trust fund—

(1) amounts equivalent to the taxes received in the Treasury under section 4961 (relating to disposal taxes) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; and

(2) amounts received in the course of the Solid Waste Management Corporation's operations under section 6 of this Act.

The amounts appropriated by paragraph (1) shall be transferred at least quarterly from the general fund of the Treasury to the trust fund on the basis of estimates made by the Secretary of the Treasury of the amounts referred to in paragraph (1) received in the Treasury. Proper adjustments shall be made in the amounts subsequently transferred to the extent prior estimates were in excess of or less than the amounts required to be transferred.

(c) (1) It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to hold the trust fund, and to report to the Congress each year on the financial condition and the results of the operations of the trust fund during the preceding fiscal year and on its expected condition and operations during the next five fiscal years. Such report shall be printed as a

House document of the session of the Congress to which the report is made.

(2) (A) It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to invest such portion of the trust fund as is not, in his judgment, required to meet current withdrawals. Such investments may be made only in interest-bearing obligations of the United States or in obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States. For such purpose, such obligations may be acquired (i) on original issue at the issue price, or (ii) by purchase of outstanding obligations at the market price. The purposes for which obligations of the United States may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, are hereby extended to authorize the issuance at par of special obligations exclusively to the trust fund. Such special obligations shall bear interest at a rate equal to the average rate of interest, computed as to the end of the calendar month next preceding the date of such issue, borne by all marketable interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt; except that where such average rate is not a multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum, the rate of interest of such special obligations shall be the multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum next lower than such average rate. Such special obligations shall be issued only if the Secretary of the Treasury determines that the purchase of other interest-bearing obligations of the United States, or of obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States on original issue or at the market price, is not in the public interest.

(B) Any obligation acquired by the trust fund (except special obligations issued exclusively to the trust fund) may be sold by the Secretary of the Treasury at the market price, and such special obligations may be redeemed at par plus accrued interest.

(C) The interest on, and the proceeds from the sale or redemption of, any obligation held in the trust fund shall be credited to and form a part of the trust fund.

(d) One-third of the receipts of the trust fund shall be available, as provided by appropriation Acts, for making expenditures after June 30, 1970, to the Corporation to carry out the program authorized by section 6. Two-thirds of such receipts shall be available, as provided in appropriation Acts for making expenditures after such date, to carry out sections 206 and 207 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CORPORATION

SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby created within the executive branch of the Federal Government a body corporate to be known as the Federal Solid Waste Disposal Corporation.

(b) (1) The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a Board of Directors which shall be composed of three Directors appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, Directors shall be appointed for terms of six years. Of the members first appointed—

(A) one shall be appointed for a term of two years,

(B) one shall be appointed for a term of four years, and

(C) one shall be appointed for a term of six years,

as designated by the President at the time of appointments. Any Director appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term. A Director may serve after the expiration of his term until his successor has taken office. Two Directors shall constitute a quorum.

(2) The Chairman of the Board shall be designated by the President, and shall be an ex officio member of the Environmental Quality Council.

(3) The Chairman shall be compensated at the rate provided for level 1 of the Executive Schedule. The other Directors shall be compensated at the rate provided for level 2 of the Executive Schedule.

(c) For the purpose of carrying out its functions under this Act the Corporation—

(1) shall have succession in its corporate name;

(2) may adopt and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed;

(3) may sue and be sued in its corporate name;

(4) may adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its business may be conducted and the powers vested in it may be exercised;

(5) may make and carry out such contracts or agreements as are necessary or advisable in the conduct of its business;

(6) shall be held to be an inhabitant and resident of the District of Columbia within the meaning of the laws of the United States relating to venue of civil suits;

(7) may appoint and fix the compensation of such officers, attorneys, and employees as may be necessary for the conduct of its business, define their authority and duties, delegate to them such powers vested in the Corporation as the Board may determine, require bonds of such of them as the Board may designate, and fix the penalties and pay the premiums on such bonds;

(8) may acquire by purchase, lease, condemnation, or donation such real and personal property and any interest therein, and may sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of such real and personal property, as the Board deems necessary for the conduct of its business; and

(9) shall determine the character of and the necessity for its obligations and expenditures, and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid, subject to provisions of law specifically applicable to Government corporations.

(d) Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act is amended by inserting after the words "Tennessee Valley Authority;" the following: "Federal Solid Waste Management Corporation;"

(e) The Corporation shall submit to the President for transmission to the Congress at the beginning of each regular session an annual report of its operations under this Act.

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

SEC. 6. (a) The Corporation shall carry out a program of research and development with respect to improved waste disposal techniques and equipment, and a program of construction and operation of facilities utilizing such techniques and equipment.

(b) The Corporation is authorized to enter into contracts with State, interstate, regional, or municipal governmental bodies, or with private industry, for the construction or operation of facilities financed by the Corporation.

(c) The Corporation is further authorized to buy, sell, lease, or exchange land and other property, including existing waste disposal facilities; and to enter into contracts with private persons or corporations for the sale of salvaged materials or other products generated at its facilities.

(d) (1) The Corporation shall develop, in cooperation with the State and local governments, a coordinated, nationwide system of solid waste processing centers. Such centers shall be located on large sites, separated from populated areas and otherwise appropriate for the location of a heavy industrial complex. The location of each such center shall be selected with due regard for the impact of solid waste processing operations on natural resources and ecological systems.

(2) Such centers shall be designed to replace all local sanitary landfills, dumps, incinerators, and similar operations now carried on by municipalities or private disposal concerns. Each center shall be equipped to receive all solid waste generated in the region it serves and to process that waste to—

(A) reclaim all potentially reusable materials,

(B) reduce the nonreclaimable waste to minimum bulk by incineration or compacting, and

(C) provide for the ultimate disposal of the reduced residue either by shipping it to remote disposal areas or, if possible, by forming it into blocks or granular materials that can be used in construction and paving.

(3) The Corporation shall undertake a program of research and development with respect to equipment designed to reclaim salvageable material generated by regional solid waste processing centers. The Corporation shall, if practicable, carry on research and development with respect to the salvage process for each community only to the point where it would become economically attractive to private enterprise to conduct salvage operations. Private industries shall be given the opportunity to contract to utilize the salvaged material under a long-term contract, to construct processing or fabricating plants within the regional processing center, and to utilize all the material of a given type generated by the center's operations.

(4) The facilities of a regional solid waste processing center shall be available to a State or local government in the region if—

(A) such State or local government continues to be responsible for the collection of waste at the local level, either directly or through the proper supervision of private collection services, and

(B) each State or local government is responsible for the cost of transporting its waste to the regional processing center up to a distance of twenty-five miles.

The transportation costs beyond twenty-five miles would be paid by the Corporation.

(5) Subject to paragraph (4), the Corporation may construct and operate (or provide by grant or contract for the construction or operation of) facilities for transporting solid waste to regional solid waste processing centers.

(e) On or before July 1, 1976, the Corporation shall report to Congress on the state of solid waste management technology as of that time, on the effectiveness of facilities so far constructed, and on its plans for the development and construction of additional facilities.

THE RIGHT TO VOTE

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, next week I am sending a limited number of "Dear Friends" letters in my district urging residents to register to vote. The letter states:

The right to vote is a great responsibility. We should all exercise this privilege, for it is our best way of participating in, and influencing, the political process of our city, county, state and nation.

All too often we get caught up in our daily activities and lose this precious right by forgetting to register to vote. If any of your family, friends or neighbors haven't registered, won't you ask them to do so. I will appreciate it if you would.

Sincerely,

JAMES H. QUILLEN,
Member of Congress.

MUSCATINE AND LOUISA 4-H CLUBS LEAD

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity to lead a group of 4-H members on a tour of the Capitol, and speak to them about the Federal Government. These young people were visiting Washington as participants in a citizenship short course sponsored by 4-H Clubs in Muscatine and Louisa Counties in the First District.

The citizenship course is only one example of 4-H activities which develop an understanding of America. Other projects cross national boundaries, opening the way for exchanges between peoples with diverse backgrounds.

The following remarks were prepared by Sue Siebke and Julie Schlapkohl, members of the 4-H group which met with me in Washington on June 21. Their paper points out the many types of projects which make 4-H a very worthwhile experience for young people in America. It was a privilege to meet with members from my district in Washington; I commend the organization for its continuing service to the Nation.

THE 4-H IN OUR COUNTY

(By Sue Siebke and Julie Schlapkohl)

The 4-H is an expanding organization to help both urban and rural youths between ages nine-twenty.

All races of people may be members. 4-H helps people to discover themselves and the world they live in.

Many new clubs are being founded and projects are being added to interest more people.

Project trainings are provided to help members learn about their various projects. The number of training sessions varies with the different types of projects.

Judging Workshops are held to inform members on selecting the desirable characteristics of their projects.

Various camps are held during the year. Day Camp is held at Wild Cat Den State Park for the nine-twelve year olds. It was developed to give these members a chance to see what camp was like and get them acquainted with different 4-H'ers in the county. Co-Ed Camp is for anyone fourteen or older. This camp is to let members find out about other activities in the state. Conservation camp is held for older members who are enrolled in Conservation related projects. Dairy Camp is held for older members who carry a dairy project.

Leadership camp is for older members to learn to become better leaders in 4-H. These camps are all held at the Iowa 4-H Camping Center in Madrid. 4-H Conference is held at the Iowa State University campus at Ames. This is for members to learn to become better citizens. Area 4-H Retreat was held for selected members of each county. At this retreat many decisions were made for improvement of the other counties. An area camp is being developed by area 4-H'ers.

Awards Night has been held to recognize outstanding achievements by individuals in their respective projects. Approximately 100 awards are presented each year. These awards are donated by various companies.

Last year 40 Muscatine County 4-H'ers went to Tioga County, Pennsylvania, for a week to learn how people in other areas of

the United States live. The previous year they came to Iowa.

Sports is an active part of 4-H in our county. In the winter the boys participate in a basketball tournament. In the summer months both boys and girls participate in softball. This provides entertainment and teaches sportsmanship.

In previous years Muscatine County 4-H'ers have participated in the Citizenship Short Course. This has helped many 4-H'ers become better citizens by learning more about their government. It has been expressed by many "We left as Iowans and came home as Americans."

International Farm Youth Exchange is partially funded by 4-H. Muscatine County hosted Miss Rosalba Mora from Venezuela who is a Professional Home Demonstrator. Mr. Ronald Bolanos from Nicaragua who is a 4-H Foundation Leader, was also hosted in Muscatine County.

Muscatine County participated in an expanding nutrition program for the low income people. 4-H members volunteered their help to encourage them to plan and use nutritious foods more wisely for their families.

Teen-Builders is a club for older members who have been active in both local and county activities. As a service project they participated in the Iowa Heart Association Fund Drive. \$1,082 was collected for the Heart Fund. The Teen-Builders also constructed road signs welcoming people into the County.

4-H may be a very rewarding experience for all who participate.

We have learned that 4-H can help a person develop their ability, skills, and personality. All members in 4-H live by the motto: "To Make the Best Better."

BAD NEWS AT THE GROCERY

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, on Monday I held a special order to condemn the lack of controls on raw agricultural products and to call for a consumer action of "meatless Tuesdays" to help cut the skyrocketing price of beef.

On Tuesday, Newsday carried an editorial on this same subject which I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues. I include in the RECORD the editorial entitled "Bad News at the Grocery."

The editorial follows:

BAD NEWS AT THE GROCERY

Housewives take note: After three months of relative stability, wholesale prices for beef, pork and many other food staples are moving up again—and sharply. Soon these increases will flow through to the retail level. But don't put all the blame on your grocer.

Supermarkets are not getting rich off the consumer's food dollar. Supermarket profit margins are less than one per cent of sales, compared to the four per cent profit that all other industries average. In other words, if the check-out clerk forgets to ring up a 20-cent package of Tasty Cakes, he has cost his boss his entire profit on a \$20 order.

Then who is pushing up food costs? The continuing boom in convenience foods is partly responsible. Food processors claim they are simply meeting the housewife's demand for foods that require little home prep-

aration; some critics claim they are not only meeting a demand but creating it. Either way, elaborate processing adds substantially to the price of a basket of groceries. The protective attitude of the Nixon administration toward the farmer also is a major contributor to higher food prices. Raw agricultural products—meats, vegetables, fruits—never have been subject to the price controls imposed on the rest of the economy.

The Nixon administration argues that farm price controls just won't work because of the seasonal nature of farming. But the argument also could be made that the absence of controls at the farm level hasn't worked either. Since November 15, the start of Phase II, food prices have risen more than three times as fast as other, controlled consumer prices, and meat prices have risen even more rapidly.

The old law of supply and demand has been responsible for the sharp rise in meat prices, says the Price Commission; they would come down again if Americans wouldn't buy so much. But another method of balancing out supply-demand pressures would be to make more meat available by importing more. The Nixon administration, however, has resisted efforts to relax or eliminate the quota system that limits imports. The quotas are necessary, says Secretary of Agriculture Butz, because U.S. farmers "need some protection."

But do farmers really need the degree of "protection" that is being lavished on them in this election year? Net farm income will climb by as much as \$2 billion to an all-time record this year, according to Butz's own estimate. At the same time, farm price supports and other federal subsidies will rise to over \$5 billion, up sharply from last year's \$3.8 billion.

The Nixon administration makes no apologies for the security blanket it has draped over the shoulders of the farmers who form the bulk of the President's political support in the important western and midwestern states. "Farmers respond to a secretary of agriculture who understands them, who says they deserve higher incomes, who says that meat prices aren't too high," Butz said recently. "Now, if as a result of all that, farmers are happier and this is reflected in a more favorable attitude toward the Nixon administration, then the secretary of agriculture will be happy."

Butz contends that farmers have not shared fully in the nation's prosperity over the last 20 years, and there is more than an element of truth in that contention. But the nation is now engaged in a battle against inflation. Food prices are a major contributor to inflation. Steps must be taken to stabilize them.

Price controls, adjusted to take into account the seasonal nature of agriculture, would be one important step in that direction. A relaxation of meat import quotas would be another.

FORMER REPRESENTATIVE PHILIP J. PHILBIN BROUGHT HONOR TO THIS HOUSE

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, a longtime member of the House of Representatives, former Representative Philip J. Philbin, passed on recently after a long and exemplary life of service to the State of Massachusetts and to the Nation.

Mr. Philbin exemplified the kind of thoughtful, dignified qualities which produce respect and prestige for the Congress of the United States.

In my personal contacts with Mr. Philbin, as well as with my official contacts with him as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I found him both knowledgeable and straightforward. He defended the position of the House of Representatives and supported faithfully the interests of the Nation in the course of his long service in this body.

Mr. Speaker, it was with a sense of personal loss that I read of his recent passing, and I express to Congressman Philbin's two daughters my affection and respect for their father, and extend to them my deepest sympathy.

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

HON. DAVID W. DENNIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, I have now served almost two terms in this body with our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. POFF). During that period I have been privileged to be a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which the gentleman from Virginia is one of the senior members.

It has not been my good fortune to serve as long in this body with our colleague from Virginia as some of you have been privileged to do; but during those years it was my privilege to practice actively at the bar and, while a junior in service in this honorable body, I claim, by reason of that experience, the ability to quickly recognize an able lawyer when I see one.

I was not here many days, Mr. Speaker, before I recognized such a lawyer in the person of our friend and colleague Mr. POFF. It was my privilege, indeed, during the 91st Congress, to gain my legislative initiation in this body—largely under his tutelage and leadership—in the debate regarding amendment of the Constitution of the United States in respect to the matter of electoral reform—a subject on which Mr. POFF and I held similar constitutional views.

Such was, and is, my respect for the gentleman from Virginia, that I was pleased to recommend to the President his appointment to the Supreme Court of the United States. Mr. POFF elected, to my personal regret, to withdraw himself from consideration for that appointment; but I am most happy and pleased that he has now received a most appropriate appointment—for which he is eminently qualified—as a member of the supreme court of his native State.

The bar and bench of Virginia, from the days of George Wythe, Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, and John Marshall to the present time of Mr. Justice Lewis F. Powell has been, and is, a distinguished one; and our colleague Mr. POFF belongs in, and will measure up to, that proud tradition.

We shall miss him—and the Nation will miss him—in this House where he has exerted a distinguished leadership over many years; but it is my sincere pleasure, as colleague, coworker, and friend, to bid him an affectionate farewell, and to wish him many years of fruitful and distinguished service as a member of the high court of the proud Commonwealth of Virginia.

A SALUTE TO EDUCATION

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, June has long been the traditional month during which we honor the graduates of our educational system. As many of our young people reach this important crossroads it behooves us to pause and reflect on the importance of our great educational system to the future of America.

Our most pressing responsibility to the continued strength of free society rests in the field of education. As our national insurance policy, we are committed to maintaining the high standards of education that in the past have made this country great. Every effort should be made to make the best use of the Nation's tremendous pool of resources in

this field. The achievement of this goal is an end toward which all in Government must be dedicated.

In reaffirming our commitment to education, the role that the teacher plays must not be overlooked. The Nation as a whole owes these selfless men and women a heartfelt sense of gratitude for the inestimable contribution they make in shaping a better America. Whatever rewards the classroom holds out to these dedicated people, they are richly deserved. Pride in America reflects the degree of pride we place in education.

SALUTE TO EDUCATION

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, today marks the national salute to education observance and I wish to join with my colleagues in commending the teachers throughout our country for their dedication and proficiency.

I am sure that all of us can recall particular teachers during our school years who have made a significant impact upon us in terms of career choice and character development. Often their influence has dramatically changed the course of our lives. Other than caring for one's own children, there can be no more solemn and fulfilling responsibility than challenging and nurturing the minds of our youth in the classroom.

For their patience and perseverance, our Nation's teachers deserve our undying respect and gratitude. For too many years, this noble profession has labored for long hours under adverse working conditions without the recognition and recompense that it so rightly deserves. Fortunately this situation has improved somewhat over the last decade. But much remains to be done.

As a member of the Labor-HEW Appropriations Subcommittee and as one who has championed the cause of education throughout his entire public life, I pledge my continuing support for our country's educators and for their noble endeavors.

SENATE—Friday, June 23, 1972

The Senate met at 9 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose providential care has been over this Nation and its people from generation unto generation, we beseech Thee to guide us through the un-

certainties and perils of this age. While we work step by step and day by day on the vexing problems of the present, keep ever before us the distant scene when men study war no more and all men are drawn together in a fraternity of peace and goodwill in Thy kingdom.

Come near to those who suffer from storm and flood, from sickness and hunger, and strengthen those who serve them in the ministries of rescue and healing.

We pray in His name, who went about doing good. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The second assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., June 23, 1972.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, on official duties, I appoint Hon. JAMES B.