

Commission the exclusive jurisdiction for regulation over all aspects of cable television systems; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN (for himself, Mr. KEITH, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. MALLARY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REES, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WARE, Mr. ZION, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. PRICE of Texas, and Mr. HILLIS):

H.R. 15758. A bill for the establishment of a Council on Energy Policy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.J. Res. 1238. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for disaster relief; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LEGGETT (for himself, Mr. DORN, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. McFALL, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. ROUSH, Mr. REES, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. WYMAN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. MANN, Mr. DON H. CLAYSEN, Mr. VEYSEY, and Mr. RHODES):

H.J. Res. 1239. Joint resolution authorizing the President to designate the calendar month of September 1972 as "National Voter Registration Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 1240. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the second full week in October each year as "National Legal Secretaries' Court Observance Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEGLE (for himself, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. MALLARY, Mr. GUDE, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. REID, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. ROY, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. HORTON, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, and Mr. DENHOLM):

H.J. Res. 1241. Joint resolution authorizing the President to designate the calendar month of September 1972 as "National Voter Registration Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEGLE (for himself, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. KEMP, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. MITCHELL, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. SCHWENGLER, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. GALIFIANAKIS, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. ROBINSON of New York, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. KEATING, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. ELBERG, and Mr. MCCORMACK):

H.J. Res. 1242. Joint resolution authorizing the President to designate the calendar month of September 1972 as "National Voter Registration Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida (for himself and Mr. KEMP):

H.J. Res. 1243. Joint resolution making certain urgent supplemental appropriations for disaster relief, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DOW:

H. Res. 1031. Resolution amending the

rules of the House by adding rule XLV on House-authorized Federal budget; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEMP:

H. Res. 1032. Resolution amending the rules of the House by adding rule XLV on House-authorized Federal budget; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. LINK introduced a bill (H.R. 15759) for the relief of Arthur O. Bilden, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

249. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the County Legislature of Suffolk County, N.Y., relative to the proposed Public Service Employment Act of 1972; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

250. Also, petition of Francisco Catalan, Tolosa, Leyte, Philippines, relative to the Philippines becoming one of the United States of America; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

251. Also, petition of the Federation of Citizens Associations of the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C., relative to restoration of the west front of the U.S. Capitol; to the Committee on Public Works.

252. Also, petition of the city council, Youngstown, Ohio, relative to welfare reform proposals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE ENERGY CRISIS—REAL OR MANUFACTURED?

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD today an excellent and provocative article by Robert Sherrill entitled "The Industry's Fright Campaign," which appeared in the June 26, 1972, edition of the Nation.

This interestingly written and obviously well-researched article directly challenges the conventional wisdom concerning the "energy crisis"—that is, whether there is one. Whether one agrees with what Mr. Sherrill has to say or not, I urge those of my colleagues concerned with the "energy crisis" issue to read this important article. It is good, tough journalism at its best.

That article follows:

"ENERGY CRISIS": THE INDUSTRY'S FRIGHT CAMPAIGN

(By Robert Sherrill)

"With the story we have to tell, it is nothing less than a tragedy that we are not better heard, understood, and recognized as the vital consumer and environmental improvement force that we, in fact, are."—G. J. Tankersley, chairman, American Gas Association, and president, East Ohio Gas Company, October 18, 1971.

WASHINGTON.—Where did the "energy crisis" come from? To a large extent, it came out of the hats of the oil and gas industry's

propagandists. Some are more candid than others in peddling their message, none more so than Wilbur Cross, senior editor on the publicity staff of Continental Oil Company. Cross recently sent to a select portion of the membership of the Society of Magazine Writers a packet containing "sample" articles and "suggested topics," and a letter in which Cross offered to help them write industry-oriented articles.

Conoco was willing to go all the way, wrote Cross. "We'll even do typing, editing and proofing for you, if you like! And in certain instances we'll arrange transportation" on Conoco planes that happen to be going in the right direction. This ingenious proposal was first disclosed by Morton Mintz in *The Washington Post*. When I called Cross to get more details, he spoke as one sorely puzzled. Mintz, he recalled, "asked me if I was ghosting pieces! Why, I thought he must be joking." What in the world gave Mintz such an idea? (Ten of the fifty writers he approached, Cross said, requested some of his material. I did, too.)

Among the "background texts, outlines and subject ideas that we have been developing," said Cross, was, you guessed it, the energy crisis. "There's been a lot of interest in that." Indeed there has been, but the interest is not usually pointed in the right direction. A crisis of sorts really does confront the country; it is not yet one of supply, however, but rather one of control. It is probably safe to say that within the next five years either the public will seize control of its own energy supplies and see that they are dispensed in a sane and thrifty fashion, or the controls will slip forever into the hands of the landlord industry itself.

To achieve the latter results, industry propagandists have suddenly "discovered" an energy shortage in the United States and,

like Cross, they keep telling us about it in press releases and in magazine articles and newspaper ads. Some of them are marvelous flights of imagination. For instance, General Electric recently placed a full-page ad in a number of national magazines (see p. 68 of the April 24th *Newsweek*), showing a lump of coal displayed in a museum case. The ad's headline: "THIS VITAL RESOURCE IS BECOMING EXTINCT. GENERAL ELECTRIC IS WORKING ON ITS SUCCESSOR." The opening paragraph: "Experts say all the economically recoverable coal in the U.S. may disappear in 80 to 150 years. The world's supply in 300 years. And gas and oil before then."

The ad was a smooth pitch for public and government support of the fast-breeder nuclear power reactor, which is in trouble with the environmentalists. Unfortunately, GE didn't identify its experts. They must not be the ones we talked with over at the Bureau of Mines, who said that, even based on projected consumption in the year 2000, and assuming also that only 50 per cent of the known coal reserves is recoverable, we would still have enough to last us well into the millennium. We've got so much bituminous coal," one Bureau spokesman said, "that it's really impossible to figure out how long it would last."

Always accompanying the ominous warnings one finds a commercial hand groping for the consumer's pocket. When the petroleum propagandists sound off, their object is quite obviously to panic us (and those feeble representatives of "us," Congress and the Federal Power Commission) into freeing the industry from any controls—production controls, environmental controls, price controls.

In that packet from Cross was a paper by Conoco's chief executive officer, John G. McLean, which counseled that the only way

to relieve the fuel shortages is to take "aggressive action to decontrol natural gas prices." He also urged that the Justice Department's antitrust office "encourage, rather than restrain" fuel monopolies—a term which McLean considers "sheer nonsense."

Another text sent along by Cross was headed with a theatricality that has become common these days: "Will Your Children Have Enough Fuel in the Decades to Come?" Even though the National Petroleum Council estimates that about 55 per cent of our discoverable oil and 66 per cent of our discoverable natural gas are still in the ground, the packaged answer from Cross was that your children will be poor shivering waifs, unless Congress quits cutting the oil depletion allowance and unless something is done about "the high cost of complying with recent environmental regulations."

Columbia Gas System took a full-page ad in the June 6th *New York Times* to warn that "disaster could strike as early as the winter of 1973-74. Industry could shut down because of lack of energy, resulting in great unemployment. Homes and commercial establishments could be without enough energy for their daily needs." What solution did Columbia propose? "The prices of all forms of energy must increase sharply."

From every executive of every major energy company, the refrain is the same: If we want to prevent the lights from going out and the stoves from growing cold, we'd better turn loose the oil and gas explorers to find fossil fuel wherever they can find it and at whatever price to the consumer. And to hell with conserving the tundra and the surf.

The "energy shortage" as we know it today was detected in 1968. Something else interesting happened in that year: the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the petroleum industry did not deserve a higher profit than had been allowed by the Federal Power Commission in the famous Permian Basin area rate case. Industry had argued that it deserved more money because its gas reserves were declining sharply. But the Court rejected this argument, noting: "There is . . . substantial evidence that additions to reserves have not been unsatisfactorily low, and that recent variations in the ratio of reserves to production are of quite limited significance." The Court noted further that each year new reserves exceeded production.

There is excellent circumstantial evidence, put together by Charles F. Wheatley, Jr., general manager and general counsel of the American Public Gas Association (a pro-consumer organization), that this Court ruling was seen by the oil and gas industry as an invitation to a life-or-death struggle over controls.

Industry was apparently determined to rid itself, once and for all, of the kind of government control which set wellhead gas rates on the basis of production costs plus fair return. If industry could get rid of those controls, then the price of oil and coal would also be allowed to soar—for their price levels were held back by the cheapness of gas.

And if the Supreme Court demanded a showing of shortage before it would go along with industry, then industry was prepared to juggle the record to show just that. Beginning in 1968, and for the first time in history, the industry claimed that it found less gas than it sold. It has been claiming the same thing for every year since. The basis for these claims is in industry's file cabinets, secret, not available to Congress or to the public. You just have to take industry's word for it.

Along with the official drop in the findings/production ratio, industry also began its drive to frighten the public through the popular press. Is it actually conceivable that those respectable executives would stoop to trickery for a buck? No less responsible a

person than Hendrick S. Houthakker, professor of economics at Harvard and a former member of the Council of Economic Advisers, said, "I think frankly that the oil industry has been engaged in a scare campaign on this shortage question. I think they are making projections that are very debatable." And when George P. Shultz, now Secretary of the Treasury, testified before Congress in 1970 he exhibited such a rare degree of candor that oilmen have not forgiven him; he testified that in his opinion the oil and gas industry was perfectly capable of faking a crisis in order to manipulate government policy.

Industry's fright campaign can be easily documented by turning to that standard index of periodical literature, *Reader's Guide*. From March 1968 to February 1969, just three years ago, *Reader's Guide* lists not one magazine article on the topic of energy shortage. In fact, there are no magazine articles that point even obliquely in that direction.

But in the twelve months following the Supreme Court decision, articles on the topic exploded into print, and they all appeared in magazines that can be counted on to give industry a helping hand: *Business Week*, *Nation's Business*, *U.S. News*, *Fortune* and *Forbes*. "LOOMING CRISIS IN NATURAL GAS," says one headline; already the crepe was being hung.

In the next twelve months the publicists really got the press's range, with no less than twenty-five articles: "SCOURGING FOR FUEL," "IS THE CUPBOARD BARE?" etc. The barrage has continued during the last year and a half unabated, with something like three dozen "crisis" articles reaching print in the indexed magazines and no telling how many dozens in other periodicals. *The New York Times*, the *Washington Star*, *The Washington Post* and the *Los Angeles Times* are among the important newspapers that have given extended coverage of the topic, for the most part in a vein that would not in any way frustrate the oil and gas industry's objectives.

A scare campaign, however, is not easily conducted; the managers must walk a narrow line. On the one hand, they must convince the public that things are so bad it would be wise to leave matters with those who know best, Big Industry; but on the other hand, they must not frighten the public into advocating something radical.

In this episode, that public had to be convinced that, while fuel might not be immediately available, it could be produced if industry were encouraged to go get it. If the public became too alarmed, it might insist on trying what several pro-public experts, among them former Federal Power Commissioners Lee White and Charles Ross, have suggested: some public ownership of the exploratory and distribution machinery of the oil-gas industry. When the propaganda juggernaut began back in 1969-70, industry apparently feared that it might be pushing too far too fast. It wanted real fright, but not a stampede. So the American Gas Association bought full-page ads, such as the following in October 22, 1970 *Wall Street Journal*, to quiet the flustered herd:

WHAT'S BEING DONE ABOUT GAS SUPPLY

Recent reports of natural gas shortages in various parts of the country have apparently led to speculation that we are running out of natural gas. Now this is simply not true.

What's happening is this: In certain areas, the demand for additional natural gas has outrun the present [their italics] ability to supply. Consequently, a number of utilities which have received requests for new large industrial loads have had to turn them down. These shortages are due partly to increased demands for natural gas—such as in the effort to fight air pollution—and partly to the fact that gas is now being consumed faster than new reserves are being developed.

This does not mean the country is running

out of gas. (In fact, geologists estimate that proved and potential supplies are over 70 times our present annual consumption rate.)

Exactly one year later the American Gas Association was back again, placing ads in *Life* and other magazines, still with the obvious purpose of preventing outright hysteria. These ads assured Americans that there was no reason to lay in a supply of wood and peat, because, "There's no worry that your home will run short of gas. . . . We've been serving you for 100 years—and we don't intend to stop now." However, the gas patron was asked to bear one little burden: "It will take higher prices to keep the gas coming."

And higher prices the industry got. Within the past twelve months the Federal Power Commission has granted price increases that the American Public Gas Association estimates will cost the consumer as much as \$4 billion. But industry, unsatisfied, kept up its ominous chatter, reaching peak decibels this year in ten days of testimony before the House Interior Committee, chaired by that great friend of the special interests, Rep. Wayne Aspinall. Giving the problem unusual priority, Aspinall did not assign his investigation of the energy crisis to a subcommittee but trooped it across the footlights of the full committee. A star-studded cast performed: Treasury Secretary and permanent spokesman for one wing of the oil industry, John Connally; Admiral Rickover; Interior Secretary Rogers Morton; environmentalist Barry Commoner; Barry Shillito of the Pentagon's innermost war room; physicist Ralph Lapp; Frank Ikard, president of the American Petroleum Institute, and two dozen other eminent rhetoricians.

Their testimony was not identical, to say the least. There were the usual industry sermons about salvation through "price incentives"; but there were also some sporadic side trips into sanity, as when Commoner, urging fewer energy-wasting luxuries, pointed out that the manufacturing of flip-top cans consumes several times more energy than the manufacturing of solid steel tops.

But if these hearings proved anything, it was what the flurry of magazine and newspaper articles had already proven: that just because a man is expert in some other field does not mean that he can easily transfer his expertise to the exotic world of fossil fuels. The basic reason for this is that the industry keeps most of its data secret, releasing only what will buttress its position, and that in a form designed to confuse even bright readers. Prepackaged pap from Wilbur Cross of Conoco is a diet no more restrictive than that handed out by the American Gas Association, the American Petroleum Institute, the Federal Power Commission, the Interior Department's Oil and Gas Section—or any of the other industry-dominated sources of data. Where else is there to go?

So one finds such normally canny fellows as Ralph Lapp sometimes following the industrial crumbs into a trap, as he did in the recent *New York Times Magazine* article, "We're Running Out of Gas," an expanded version of what he had previously written for *The New Republic*. As a plea for conservation, it was eloquent, but as a practical appraisal of the energy future in this country it was almost farcically pessimistic: not only will we be beggars in the world gas market by 1990, wrote Lapp, but within the foreseeable future there is no substitute fuel. Oil is also in short supply; coal is too dirty; imported liquefied gas is too expensive; the production of synthetic gas is too far in the future to offer hope; nuclear power is still beset with crippling problems. By the time he had completed his tale of woe, one felt the Arctic icecap descending upon us. "We have," he cried with his parting breath, "overcome nature."

Well, he's right: we are running out of gas, just as we are running out of all finite

fuel materials—gas faster than most because it is more useful and popular than most. But beyond that, the only indisputable fact in the matter seems to be that, lacking objective data from sources other than industry, we cannot say how fast we are running out. And lacking more aggressive attempts to develop substitute fuels, we cannot say what could be made available. Meanwhile, the battle over controls and prices comes down to a war of nerves; and consumer advocates must have regretted that this prestigious scientist hadn't restrained himself until better data were available (he was invited to do a second chorus of his sad song at the House hearings).

Although Lapp acknowledged that "huge amounts of undiscovered gas are thought to exist more than 15,000 feet below the earth's surface," he adds that "drilling that deep is prohibitively expensive."

Nonsense. Edward Leach, editor of *Pipeline & Gas Journal*, writing in the issue of October 1971, lays out what most gas producers know: drilling at the deeper levels, or offshore, is three to ten times more expensive than shallow onshore drilling, but the chance of finding gas at those levels and in those areas is nearly three times higher; the deep zones usually have "exceptionally large" volumes of gas, and deep-zone gas can be produced more cheaply because it is under greater pressure. All of which, wrote Leach, adds up to the fact that by drilling deeper "you are actually reducing the basic unit cost."

If we accept this man's know-how (which I could support from other industrial sources that are not often quoted in lay articles), then there is no reason to discount—as Lapp does—the Potential Gas Committee's estimate that this part of the globe contains 1,178 trillion cubic feet of "potential" gas, or nearly four times the current known reserves. And inasmuch as deeper onshore drilling as well as offshore drilling returns a better cost-price ratio, there is no reason to accept higher prices, or at least much higher prices, without a fight.

I don't want to pick on physicist Lapp, for he has a right to his own confusions in this complex field, but it will be useful to point out one more goof he has perpetrated in his presentation of the "crisis."

"Cheap, clean energy—best exemplified by natural gas—has been the prime fuel of the U.S. economy, and its running out," he says; but in his sorrow he fails to mention that one reason we're running out of gas is that the industrial part of our economy has been slopping it up like hogs.

"Roughly two-thirds of the gas sold since 1945 has been sold for industrial purposes and at prices designed to undercut the prices for coal and residual fuel oil," former FPC Commissioner Lawrence O'Connor pointed out recently. FPC Commissioner Rush Moody also pointed out recently that while residential and small consumers use only 21 percent of the gas, they pay 46 percent of the cost. Gas distributors have for a generation charged the housewife more per unit for the gas she uses to cook a pot roast than they charge Bethlehem Steel to cook an ingot, with the very predictable result that industry has fallen in love with this cheap fuel and has used it like mad wastrels.

"Simply switching to some other fuel is not an adequate answer," says Lapp. The hell it isn't. Getting the gas-gulping industries to return to coal would be not only an adequate answer but a sane answer. "Environmentalists will object," he says, "to any move toward a substitution of coal or oil, with their high sulfur content and resultant air-pollution potential, for relatively clean-burning gas." There's no reason to talk that way. Why the assumption that coal must result in filth? Lapp is doubtless familiar with a generating process called MHD, used in

West Germany, Japan and Russia; it reportedly results in far better combustion and thereby about one-third less stack effluents and two-thirds more power per pound of fuel than we are accustomed to getting from the ordinary method of burning coal. Built into the typical MHD power plant, also, is a recovery system that keeps just about all particulate matter out of the air. Two years ago the Office of Science and Technology estimated that development of MHD would save \$11 billion in coal costs between 1985 and 2000.

So why don't we have MHD in this country? Why did the government this year budget a puny \$3 million for developing MHD? One answer might be that the coal companies—which, since the inter-ties are almost total, means the oil and gas industry—do not want power plants that use \$11 billion less of their product in a fifteen-year period.

And inasmuch as the American Gas Association acknowledges that "known minable reserves of coal in the United States could be converted to some 11,000,000,000,000 cubic feet of gas—enough to supply the nation's gas energy needs at current consumption rates for a full 500 years," one might also ask why it is that the most profitable industry in the world is spending only a measly \$10 million annually out of its own pocket to develop that technique.

One might also wonder why, since our fuel supply is supposedly so precarious, the energy industry sells \$1 billion worth of coal to other countries every year. And one can only marvel at the logic of the major U.S. oil companies, now engaged in despoiling other countries as they have their own, which pretend to be so concerned about our "crisis," when at the same time, in producing oil in Canada and Central and South America and Africa and the Middle East, they flare right in the field—burn as waste—a gas supply that totals a tenth of the world's annual production. But instead of addressing themselves straightforwardly to correcting such mistakes, the oil and gas industry continues its old buccaneering ways while the consumer is distracted by fright.

And the strategy is working well. Aside from the \$4 billion gas price hike it got last year for "exploration incentives," the industry in recent months has used the shortage scare to: (1) obtain Interior Department approval for the cross-Alaska pipeline, so we (and Japan) will get that "desperately needed" oil, and despite the fact that the Interior crowd has conceded a pipeline across Canada would be less ecologically dangerous; (2) win approval for El Paso Natural Gas Company to import liquefied natural gas from Algeria at a cost that is bound to shove domestic prices much higher (the LNG, by the way, will be produced in Algeria with \$350 million in loans directly from or guaranteed by the U.S. Government; and the construction and operation of El Paso's tankers will also be subsidized by the U.S. taxpayers); (3) get President Nixon and the State Department to help industry manipulate a deal for the purchase of Russian natural gas. Prior to Nixon's junket to Russia, a study of the proposal, prepared by Brown & Root of Texas, was quietly circulated in Washington for approval at top levels. Backstopping Nixon, and urging him to do industry's job with Russia, were the White House's petroleum adviser, Peter Flanigan, and Secretary of Commerce Peterson.

It shall not be supposed, however, that the Russian liquefied natural gas is all coming to this "energy-short" country. El Paso Natural Gas is cooking up its own deal with Russia to ship LNG to Japan as well as to U.S. West Coast ports.

Of course the public will also pay for all this. Flanigan has acknowledged that, as with El Paso in Algeria, "substantial government financial assistance would be appropriate."

As for the tankers to carry the gas, Flanigan said that "gas consumers would pay for the U.S.-built ships over the life of the gas contract."

And the industry has accomplished another little thing while we were trembling: it convinced the FPC, which never takes too much convincing when industry talks, to set up a new mechanism by which gas prices can continue to go higher and higher on an *ad hoc* basis. This ruling would destroy the cost basis for pricing, established in 1954. The new proposal came out on April 6; it is politically so flammable that it probably won't go into effect until after the election. Putting their heads together, the Consumer Federation of America, the American Public Gas Association and the American Public Power Association figured that the new rate-making procedure will add "\$500 billion or even as much as \$1 trillion to consumers' bills over the life of the nation's gas reserves."

In an extraordinary letter to the FPC, Sen. Philip Hart intervened with his own extensive protest, in predicting: "If the rule were adopted, the FPC would be abolishing regulation of wellhead prices for new gas. It would do so at a cost of billions of dollars to consumers from this year forward. . . . It does not provide for a rebate if later we learn that the natural gas shortage used as a defense of higher prices is more imagination than reality. . . . Worse, this rule binds all future Commissions to uphold the prices."

That is the crisis consumers had better pay attention to right now. The supply shortage of the future may be very real, but the crisis of controls and prices is immediate. The reason why industry is whipping the consumer at will is that it isn't distracted by such questions as whether strip mining will be allowed in Wyoming in 1975; it is concerned only with today's profits. When industry men get together, they make no bones about this. As Tankersley told the American Gas Association last year: "Consumers must understand that natural gas . . . is in fact a premium fuel whose price has been artificially kept below that of other fuels. This is the crisis." They've already begun taking care of gas prices, which will drive up the cost of oil and coal. That really is the crisis, though not in the way Tankersley means.

EXCITING TIMES FOR FORESTERS

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, one of the real professionals in forestry science is Hardy Glascock, Jr. At the present time, he is the executive vice president of the Society of American Foresters. He has a very broad spectrum of qualifications as a true professional, ranging the gamut from education through experience.

Earlier this year, he delivered the keynote address at the winter meeting of the New York section of his society. Some people may not agree with all that he says. He has, however, successfully articulated the gap between knowledge and emotion existent today on some of the forestry questions which confront the Congress and all of us as Americans. I commend his forceful comments to my colleagues:

EXCITING TIMES FOR FORESTERS

(By Hardy R. Glascock, Jr.)

As the nation approaches its 200th year, it is inevitable and much to be desired that

Americans once again turn to the forest. Not as an enemy this time, or even for fuel or shelter as our forefathers did. But as relief from the concrete canyons and the strains of city living; for outdoor recreation using newfound leisure, affluence and mobility. It seems that man's appreciation of nature increases as the development of civilization removes him from contact with nature and places him in an increasingly hostile, unnatural environment. With severe overcrowding and befouling of his city habitat, man's age of environmental concern has arrived; his war on pollution has been declared; and public concern for natural resources management has set in to stay.

INSULATION FROM LAND

Thus by our 200th year as a nation, the largely rural economy, which made early America great, has changed to an urban economy. Migration to the cities has progressed to the point that some 80 percent of the people—and voters—live on 2 percent of the land. More than 60 percent of New England's old hilly farms have been abandoned and become woods again; and the early, high-ground homesteads in the Northwest have largely been reclaimed by the forest.

Insulated from the land—the farm and forest—the city dweller may conceptualize the forest as the last remaining island of peace and quiet in a raging storm of industrialization. Even if he never intends to visit the forest, the city man would like it somehow to remain forever just as he has come to conceive of it through romantic impressions from books, movies and television. He is not apt to view the forest as the dynamic, ever-changing community of plants and animals which it is, and as the reliable source of replenishable raw materials which his living standard demands. Having no evidence to the contrary, the city dweller can easily be convinced that commodity uses of the forest, which he himself makes necessary, destroy aesthetic values, which may now seem more important to him.

This is a generalized account of changes in America which are having a profound impact upon the nation's natural resources and the professionals who manage them. As Yale Professor of Silviculture David Smith writes in the February *Journal*, "... We aim to manage the forests of a continent which has natural conditions as diverse as those of all temperate Eurasia—to meet social demands that seem to become more bewilderingly varied with each passing year ..."

PUBLIC INTEREST THROUGH LAW

One of the biggest problems foresters have today is determining where the public interest really lies in natural resources use and management. How can forest lands be managed to meet all of the valid demands upon it? This determination has never been easy or precise, especially in deciding between preservation and use. But mounting and varied social demands, together with the new wave of eco-politics and eco-journalism, have made the task even more difficult—not only for foresters, but for the public itself and especially its elected representatives.

Presumably the laws of the land are in the public interest; so that is a good place to start in determining what the public wants and needs. Federal legislation such as the Multiple Use and Sustained Yield Act of 1960, the Wilderness Act of 1964 and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, for example, presumably represent the will of the American people. Yet the interpretations of the intent of Congress by federal land agencies are being challenged increasingly in the press and in the courts by preservation groups and their political representatives. Definitions, provisions and performance under these acts are being twisted and banded about as though no legislative history existed and the legislation were up for grabs through

interpretation. And "anti" journalism will surely be countered with "pro" journalism; the lawsuits, with countersuits. Confusing? Yes. Conducive to determination of the public interest in resources management? No.

A prime example of this tailor-made confusion surrounds the Wilderness Act, which was painstakingly hammered out by Congress through difficult compromises over the better part of a decade. In the long deliberations, there was no question that certain lands should be zoned for roadless wilderness as contrasted to roadside wilderness. But zoning for one use in the public interest cannot be done in a vacuum. So the real question always was: *how much* land of what kind, where located and how administered, should be legislatively zoned for roadless wilderness in denial of other uses? All the plethora of verbiage concerning the Wilderness Act not addressed to this central question was and is, in my mind, so much sound and fury. But now we are told that the National Wilderness Preservation System was meant to include national forest roadless areas over 5,000 acres in addition to the "Wilderness," "Wild" and "Canoe" areas and the expandable "Primitive" areas specified in the Act. These other roadless areas, which Congress did not see fit to include in the System, are dubbed "*de facto* wilderness" by spokesmen of the Sierra Club and The Wilderness Society.

A GRAND DESIGN TO MAXIMIZE WILDERNESS

And, in what appears to be a grand design to stretch the Wilderness System—and the intent of Congress—to maximize the acreage in the System even at the expense of quality and certainly at the expense of other public needs, these and other preservation organizations have heaped scorn, insult and abuse on the U.S. Forest Service, which, though not perfect, is a model agency of public land management. The preservation groups have successfully motivated skillful, sensation-prone writers in such prominent periodicals as the *New York Times*, *Des Moines Register*, *Field and Stream*, *Atlantic* and *Reader's Digest* to join in the fun. Close reading reveals a formula which is repeated in articles and editorials often enough to be identified as a trademark: a brand of hit-and-run journalism studded with misinformation and erroneous conclusions or implications. Such journalism, which appears to violate the Canons of Journalism adopted by both the American Society of Newspaper Editors and Sigma Delta Chi in the mid 1920's, is a disservice to the American public and should not be excused because those professional journalistic organizations admittedly lack the authority to enforce their Canons.

The U.S. Forest Service is excoriated in the press for high offenses against nature as illustrated by the most glaring misapplications or non-applications of forest practices which can be found on 187 million acres of national forest land. These misapplications are held to be typical and are not. Usually it is terracing and oversize clearcuts on the Bitterroot (Montana), alleged overcutting on the Shoshone (Wyoming), oversize clearcuts on the Monongahela (West Virginia) a fallacious interpretation of soil nutrient losses in a herbicide-treated, experimental clearcut at Hubbard Brook on the White Mountain (New Hampshire), the infamous lag of 5 million acres in reforestation on the national forests and the erroneous equating of clear-cutting with overcutting.

Seldom is it pointed out that the Forest Service has long ago admitted and discontinued its isolated misapplications of clear-cutting and terracing; that the reason those 5 million acres haven't been reforested is that Congress hasn't appropriated the money to do the job; that the Administration's severe manpower ceilings and failure to spend what Congress has appropriated have prevented the badly needed buildup of trained personnel to

supervise properly the huge management responsibility of the national forests; that clearcutting, properly applied, maintains tree species intolerant of shade, is not excessive cutting, does not cause floods or accelerate erosion, but does improve wildlife habitat and can improve the quantity and timing of water yield.

ABUSIVE CRITICISM

To further illustrate my point, the following quotation is from the *Congressional Record* of February 9:

The performance of the Forest Service under these statutes . . . (the Multiple Use and Wilderness Acts) has been so dismal as to lead a growing number of people to the conclusion that the Forest Service is a wholly owned subsidiary of the timber industry. . . . The Forest Service has paid only lip service to the very real pressures . . . recreational use creates. . . . If the Service's disregard for the principles of multiple use is conspicuous, its indifference toward the Wilderness Act has been notorious. . . . Although the Forest Service established wilderness areas back in the thirties, it has continually reduced the size of these areas to let the loggers in.

You may not buy this ungrateful, untrue and abusive criticism which a Sierra Club speaker made at the winter meeting of the New York Section, Society of American Foresters, on February 24. These remarks appeared in the *Congressional Record* three weeks before the meeting. The end is apparently thought to justify the means. Those of us who are devoting our working lives to the science, technology, education and practice of professional forestry certainly cannot accept such unfounded statements. But will members of Congress?

Will Congressmen know that, in addition to timber to meet national wood demands, the national forests provide more public recreation use, measured in man-days and greater variety, than any other of the federal lands? That the Forest Service not only invented and set aside vast primitive areas in the 1920's and 1930's, decades before Congress acted, but protected them from commercial development until Congress did act? Will they know that 9.9 of the 10.2 million acres in the National Wilderness Preservation System today are in the national forests? Will they know that specially dedicated areas set aside in the national forests as restricted from commercial development constitute 23,400 square miles in aggregate, an expanse larger than the states of Vermont, New Hampshire and Massachusetts combined? And will they know that the Forest Service is the only federal agency on schedule in wilderness reviews under the Wilderness Act and that it will meet the 1974 deadline?

I trust that Congress will recognize these truths and others. The question of how much roadless wilderness is enough was answered by Congress in the hard-fought Act of 1964. Let us hope that Congress, in the absence of demonstrated public need, will stand strong against alterations or misinterpretations of this public policy, which is based on consideration of all uses. Let us also hope that Congress will not buy current proposals to include "recycled" wilderness in the Wilderness System, a renewable form of wilderness which thrives under less restrictive management. And Congressmen may well recall the wisdom of the Greek philosopher Epicurus that "nothing is enough for the man to whom enough is too little."

SEEKING BEYOND THE SPECIAL INTERESTS

I have used the Wilderness Act as only one example of how the public interest as expressed in law may become confused. There are many more examples, including the National Park Act of 1916 and the Multiple Use and Sustained Yield Act of 1960. The public interest can be obscured by special interests, all of which claim to repre-

sent the public interest. Foresters must be alert in seeking out and understanding the real and changing needs of people. The squeaky wheel may not always be the most in need of grease.

Can we not say, in general, that as of today the American people demand, expect and need from the forested third of the nation a gamut of uses which is expanding, which is emphasizing amenity uses as never before, and which necessitates a sophisticated application of the multiple-use concept not so far achieved? The American people are looking to foresters and other resource professionals to make multiple use work.

Don't we also know that people now want clean air, and water, and landscapes—enough to afford the cost? That people want, and don't always get, inexpensive housing and paper products; clean and dependable water; quality fishing and hunting; accessible skiing; places for snowmobiles, dune buggies, trail bikes and motor boats; roadside wilderness; hiking trails and "pure" wilderness; picnic spots; campsites, trailer and camper sites, and all the rest? Actually, these uses can all be fitted in—up to a point—in our fixed land base. But it is the land manager's responsibility to know and announce when demands are excessive in terms of sustaining a balance of uses.

THE PUBLIC'S NEED FOR BIOLOGICAL FACTS

These are exciting, difficult times for the forestry profession. The very weakness of the profession's identity, it seems, has prompted attacks upon it and attempts to label it with employer orientation. Of course, such attacks are also symptomatic of our times. The danger is that refutable charges may blind the profession to its real shortcomings: its need for more effective dissemination and application of research, for a comprehensive program of continuous education, for communicative skills.

The growing public interest in natural resources management offers an unprecedented opportunity for service. In my view, if forestry professionals will deliberately make known to the public the biological facts and capabilities of forest lands under alternate management programs, the public can be counted on to set clear and realistic policies in its overall interest, which foresters can then carry out.

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION IN SOUTH CAROLINA

HON. TOM S. GETTYS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. GETTYS. Mr. Speaker, my State of South Carolina numbers as one of its progressive accomplishments its pioneering efforts in applying television to solving some of its educational problems. Its success in this area might well serve as an example for others throughout the country.

In 1957 the South Carolina General Assembly made the decision to utilize television in teaching, a decision which now dramatically brings educational benefits to many thousands of South Carolinians. This decision to employ television in education was broad and far reaching. It involved plans for providing quality instruction in all subject areas on all grade levels to every public school, something that had not been achieved anywhere else in the country or, for that matter, in the world.

This major challenge required new ideas and new technology, and both were forthcoming. The South Carolina ETV Network utilizes a combination of closed circuit and broadcast television to provide for communication to the State. The closed circuit transmits from the ETV Center in Columbia to 275 schools, hospitals, colleges, and other institutions. This coaxial cable reaches every county in the State and has a potential of telecasting six different programs simultaneously and can be in operation 24 hours a day.

During school hours ETV reserves its multichannel system to meet the needs of the secondary schools, which require many different courses. But the system also is available for broadcasts for special interest groups, among them doctors, law enforcement officials, State agency personnel, and business and industrial training units.

The South Carolina ETV in cooperation with the University of South Carolina offers for the first time anywhere the opportunity for college graduates throughout the State to enroll in a special closed circuit program leading to a masters degree in business administration. Similar programs of advanced study are now planned for nursing, engineering, education and other professional areas.

The network has five broadcast stations and one translator. This translator at Rock Hill, S.C. will be replaced by a major open circuit television broadcast station capable of serving some 95 schools and 85,000 students. The present system serves over 900 elementary schools where there are a smaller number of courses and where this open circuit system is sufficiently flexible to supply the need.

Current instructional programming in the public schools now reaches over half a million children, with 65 phases, more than in any other State, used from the kindergarten to the 12th grade. Over 125,000 South Carolinians have this year participated in professional training programs for adults. Special needs are serviced by such programs as "Job Man Caravan," which brings job and job training information to the disadvantaged, and "Hearing Defects in Children," which points up the need for early diagnosis and treatment of hard-of-hearing children. Last year the network produced 953 programs and 1,644 inserts and segments.

Thus has my State of South Carolina, a State of low economic rank, harnessed the economies of television to uplift and strengthen its educational programs at all levels. I am pleased to support this endeavor and to commend those responsible for its successful operation.

RESEARCH FOR NEW JOBS

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, an area of accomplishment which has received little

credit is the growth in nondefense research and development. Historically, the U.S. economy's growth has come from the introduction of new products and services, and, magnificent efforts have and are being made to stimulate research and development aimed at new products, new markets, and new jobs.

I want to bring to your attention an interview appearing in the May 1972, issue of Nation's Business with my good friend, Bill Magruder, special consultant to the President.

Bill is coordinator of the administration's new technology opportunities program—a program of remarkable scope which promises to have a profound influence on job opportunity, business growth, and the quality of American life in the year's ahead.

I include the Nation's Business interview in the RECORD:

YOUR PARTNER IN THE HUNT FOR NEW PRODUCTS

The U.S. economy, much of whose growth comes from new products and services, has been getting a lot of seed money from the federal government, and the seed money supply itself is growing.

In the past three years, government investment in nondefense research and development work—done either in government laboratories, universities, or in industry—has risen 65 per cent. The government finances more than half the nation's civilian-sector R&D.

Now, President Nixon has told Congress he hopes to make government and industry better partners "in a strong new effort to marshal science and technology in the work of strengthening our economy and improving the quality of life."

For the coming fiscal year, he has asked a \$1.5 billion increase in the R&D budget, bringing it to \$18.6 billion. Of this, \$5.4 billion would be invested in the civilian sector—up from \$3.3 billion in 1969.

William M. Magruder, 48, the aerospace engineer who headed the supersonic transport development program in the Department of Transportation, was named a special consultant to the President last summer, after Congressional ack-ack sent SST plans down in flames. He was tabbed for another challenging job—coordinating a massive reappraisal of the nation's research and development effort.

In an interview with Nation's Business, the onetime Air Force test pilot discusses the result—the New Technology Opportunities Program.

What is the New Technology Opportunities Program?

That's the umbrella name we've given to a number of new programs that represent increased investments in research and development in the civilian sector of the economy.

In general, these are additional steps on existing programs, plus new beginnings and new approaches to research and development aimed at increasing our ability to deal with a wide range of civilian problems, such as the environment and the energy shortage. If they develop as we anticipate, the result will be creation of new products, markets and jobs. Naturally, the Congress must first approve the programs.

The President requested \$18.6 billion in his budget for R&D in the coming fiscal year—are these new programs included?

Yes, a total of \$890 million of that request is for programs that offer promise for new technology opportunities. In the civilian R&D budget slice are \$700 million for these new programs and \$40 million for incentives through matching grants. In the

Defense Department's request there is \$150 million for new programs that have civilian applications.

What will be the economic impact of this \$890 million?

It's estimated that this investment, as it stimulates the various areas of technology, will result in 65,000 direct jobs. At the end of five years we estimate a total of 650,000 jobs will be created. The \$890 million is a first year figure. This isn't a one shot deal. To sustain this type of growth and create these jobs, we're going to have to invest between \$1 billion and \$1.5 billion annually on these programs.

How does the R&D effort this coming year differ from previous years?

Since 1969 funds for civilian R&D have increased 65 per cent. This year's budget, in addition to the new programs I've mentioned, accelerates the ongoing efforts, and we have added other new programs designed to enlarge the partnership between government and industry through cost sharing.

What prompted this added emphasis on research and development?

By last summer the President and his advisers had become increasingly concerned that we were getting less competitive in the international market, and that we had vast domestic areas of opportunity to which technology could be applied. And there was the feeling that our industrial productivity was not improving fast enough to handle our growth.

This was the situation when the President named you a special consultant last July?

Yes. The President was deeply concerned. He said he wanted program management techniques applied to bring all resources in government and the private sector together. I was assigned to the Domestic Council for this purpose.

Was there activity in this area when you arrived?

Quite a bit, and it picked up. The Domestic Council had completed a study on the subject. It formalized all of the concern in the top levels into one package.

We formed some teams and started looking at the technical problems. Another team was formed to study the antitrust aspects. There was also a team in the Treasury working on the problem of technology transfer.

Along with this, the Domestic Council asked the various Departments and agencies for their ideas on the programs they thought were technically feasible, would help solve domestic problems and improve our competitive position in world markets.

How did you get a public input?

I wrote hundreds of groups, institutions and businesses and asked them for their ideas. We've more than a thousand responses.

What was the fallout from this survey?

We came up with 10 areas where the need was most immediate and where technology could be best applied at this time: Health care, education and communications, law enforcement, conservation of natural resources, protection from natural disasters, urban development, environmental control, transportation, aviation and industrial productivity.

Within those 10 areas are many programs worthy of attention. To scrub them down we formed 10 teams of government people and added 126 advisers from outside government, experts who represented all the disciplines. Efforts of all those people are reflected in the new budget request.

Will your office manage these programs falling in the category of New Technology Opportunities?

These programs are treated like the other R&D programs, which means that the Departments and agencies have the job of seeing them through Congress and managing them once they are authorized and the money appropriated.

As far as my office is concerned, I'm going to maintain liaison with the program managers in each Department and agency and

with the Office of Management and Budget to keep current on progress. But as far as managing these programs—No. My office consists of myself and a secretary.

Could you give us an example of some of the new programs?

One that comes immediately to mind is a program that could save 30,000 lives annually. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare is going to set up demonstrations of emergency health care in five special centers. These will be manned by highly trained personnel, who will have special aids such as helicopters and the latest communications and medical equipment.

Another project involves environmental controls. We're going to instrument two major cities for weather and emission detection. This information will be fed into a computer. Officials in those areas will be able to predict with confidence when emissions will become critical and to plan for future industrial development.

An important part of this project will be examination of the 38 known kinds of pollution in the atmosphere, singly and in combination with respect to their impact on health. So when we write pollution laws in the future, they'll be based on very firm scientific knowledge.

One of the 10 fields of interest is industrial productivity. Could you tell us what will be happening here?

We've included an additional \$40 million for the Bureau of Standards and the National Science Foundation in yet-to-be-defined areas of research on how to stimulate innovation, productivity and technology transfer.

What's the new thrust in solving the energy crisis?

In this area of clean energy resources we're requesting \$392 million, an increase of 22 per cent. High among the programs is the fast breeder reactor for the nuclear plants of the future.

We'll also be looking at ways to apply laser technology to fusion power, and at a magneto-hydrodynamic power program—an absolutely clean system that will generate power by passing a conducting gas through an electrical field.

We're doing research on cryogenic power transmission and generation so we can transmit direct current power with almost no losses. We're going to be looking at solar power.

Also we're going to do R&D on producing gas from low-B.T.U. coal. We have a 400-year supply of coal but we don't use as much of it as we'd like to because it produces too much sulphur dioxide, a prime air pollutant, when it is burned. By using catalytic filters, we're confident we can economically produce absolutely clean gas and cut down our growing need to import oil and gas to meet future demands.

What other programs involving natural resources are being accelerated?

We are going to be doing a major exploration of the continental shelf of the northeast part of the U.S. and Alaska. This will provide information needed by private industry to explore for and mine the resources in those areas with full knowledge of how to minimize environmental impact.

Today we import \$6 billion more in raw materials than we export. By the end of 1990 that's predicted to be up to around \$45-\$60 billion, so you can understand our interest in this.

What is on the horizon in other areas?

Take aviation. As I mentioned, there is \$150 million in the Defense Department budget for new beginnings that have civilian applications.

One is a program to develop a short takeoff and landing transport for the Air Force. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which also has an STOL program, is concentrating on developing a research vehicle with an advanced technology airframe,

using an existing engine. The Air Force will develop a new engine and use existing technology for the airframe.

These programs will complement each other.

Looking at some other areas, transportation R&D is being increased 46 per cent. These programs not only involve new transportation systems—such as high-speed 300 m.p.h. trains and ground effect vehicles—but we're going to be working also on new tunneling techniques which could reduce construction costs by one third.

In the housing area we are working on an integrated modular utility system, a research effort aimed at combining water, sewerage and power systems to lower costs in new communities.

Another big item is research on damage limitation of natural disasters, such as floods and earthquakes. One facet investigated is the possibility of lubricating earthquake faults with water to reduce friction.

Still another exciting area is electronic mail transmission. Strictly a hands-off system, it's a program to develop a means of coast to coast mail delivery in less than an hour for priority service.

Of course there are many more programs; those are just some examples.

Do you see the review process conducted last year as an annual chore?

I would say that it's desirable. We learned a lot about efficient procedures during the first one and there's no doubt of the need to pull everything together for a critical review at the highest policy level.

It's a way to get a full interlock between domestic economic policy and international economic policy, and between government and industry, which have to mesh to meet the technological challenges from other countries and at the same time try to solve our domestic challenges.

THE ALASKA PIPELINE

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, those of my colleagues concerned with the trans-Alaska pipeline issue may be interested in the three recent newspaper articles I would like to include in the RECORD today. The first article is one from the Christian Science Monitor of June 15, 1972, entitled "Canada, United States at Odds Over Oil-Gas Future." The second article is from the Wall Street Journal of June 14, 1972, and its title is "Emulsifying of Oil Urged To Save Ecology Along Alaska Pipeline." The third article, entitled "Economists Rap Interior," is from the June 13, 1972, issue of the Oil Daily.

The three articles follow:

ARCTIC PIPELINE, SHORE POLLUTION—A STEW OF ISSUES: CANADA, UNITED STATES, AT ODDS OVER OIL-GAS FUTURE

(By Bruce Hutchison)

VICTORIA, B.C.—Canada is asking the United States to pay full compensation for an oil spill which recently spread from Washington state to the coast of British Columbia.

But this accident at Atlantic Richfield's Cherry Point refinery is only one temporary factor in a deepening continental argument on the future of Arctic oil and gas, both American and Canadian.

As External Affairs Minister Mitchell Sharp told Parliament in an emergency debate, Canada still hopes that the United States

will cancel its trans-Alaska oil pipeline scheme because it endangers the whole Pacific shore.

The relatively small Cherry Point spill, Mr. Sharp said, is a "stark reminder of what we stated on many occasions, that far-more-serious spills will inevitably take place if oil is moved [from Alaska] by tanker through Juan de Fuca Strait.

"We have made repeated representations to the U.S. Government about the proposed increase in oil tanker traffic in this area," he added, "and indeed we raised this matter with President Nixon when he visited Canada in mid-April."

All opposition parties supported the government in its protest, but they said it had delayed far too long in warning the United States and urging strict marine traffic controls if the Alaska pipeline is built.

Canada was gratified by similar warnings from U.S. Sens. Henry M. Jackson and Warren G. Magnuson and Rep. Lloyd Meeds of Washington, who recommended that Canada and the United States call an oil-spill conference to discuss coordinated safety measures.

LOCAL PLANS IN PROCESS

Their statement that spilled oil could have "international consequences because of the importance of the problem and the implications for U.S.-Canada relations" encouraged Ottawa to believe that its message was getting through to American lawmakers.

Meanwhile the governments of British Columbia and Washington State are conferring directly on plans to safeguard their joint environment.

Appearing before a congressional committee, David Anderson, member of Parliament and new leader of the Liberal Party in British Columbia, said that Atlantic Richfield had located its refinery near the border because spilled oil drifting northward would cause minimum damage to the United States.

This charge was flatly denied by the oil company and has not been made by the Canadian Government, whose main purpose is to stop the Alaska pipeline if it can and minimize the resulting risks if it cannot.

All Canadian plans for Arctic development are suspended while the government studies the economic and ecological consequences of three huge separate projects—an oil pipeline from Alaska along the Mackenzie River to the central states, a pipeline to carry northern Canadian and perhaps Alaskan gas southward, and a road from Alberta to the Arctic Ocean.

The unanswered question facing Ottawa is whether the United States Government will reconsider the Alaska line, already approved in principle but held up by the American courts.

Whatever government and courts finally decide, Canada intends to build the gas pipeline and the road at enormous, unknown cost over a period of at least several years.

Donald MacDonald, Minister of Energy, started the nation by estimating that it must spend a minimum of \$50 billion during the present decade to exploit its oil, gas, uranium, electrical, and coal resources, or more than half its current annual gross product.

A necessary inflow of foreign capital for these purposes, the government fears, would further raise the value of the Canadian dollar, now high enough to alarm the nation's export industries.

"EMULSIFYING" OF OIL URGED TO SAVE ECOLOGY ALONG ALASKA PIPELINE

NEW YORK.—Could all the potential environmental problems of transporting Alaska's Prudhoe Bay crude oil to market be solved by transforming the oil into a mayonnaise-like mixture of oil and salt water?

Sullivan S. Marsden Jr., professor of petroleum engineering at Stanford University, contends that his research indicates that "emulsifying" Prudhoe oil would permit

pipelining it at a temperature below freezing to prevent any damage to permanently frozen Arctic terrain. Such a line, of course, could be completely buried, eliminating potential surface barrier problems to Arctic wildlife.

What's more, Mr. Marsden says, transporting the oil to the West Coast by tanker in emulsified form would eliminate the danger of oil spills, because the emulsion would simply disperse in the ocean instead of forming a surface slick.

But the seven-company consortium planning to build the oil pipeline across Alaska reports its engineering staff has studied Mr. Marsden's proposals and finds they would involve unacceptable costs and technical problems. Alyeska Pipeline Service Co. says it's convinced that its own plans for a hot-oil pipeline won't damage the Arctic environment.

An emulsion is a permanent mixture of two liquids in which one is suspended within the other. The mixture is stabilized by adding a third substance called an emulsifier. Milk and mayonnaise are common emulsions. In the case of an oil-water emulsion, chemicals serve as the emulsifiers.

Mr. Marsden contends that chemicals for the proposed North Slope operation would cost only one cent to two cents a barrel, and emulsifying equipment would entail a capital investment equivalent to only another one cent to two cents a barrel.

He concedes, however, that the greatest cost would involve chilling Prudhoe's 130-degree to 150-degree Fahrenheit oil to below freezing before emulsifying it, and he says he hasn't calculated the cost of that.

Alyeska's engineers have, however, and they assert that treating the oil could cost 43 cents a barrel. They also say Beaufort Sea water isn't salty enough for the proposed emulsion, and that 2,000 barrels of emulsifying chemicals a day would have to be transported to the North Slope. And they assert the salt water would rust the pipeline and pumping equipment.

Mr. Marsden says a 50% oil, 50% salt water emulsion at 20 degrees to 30 degrees would flow as easily as 130-degree oil alone. But Alyeska says this would about cut the line's oil capacity in half and require a doubling of the system at enormous cost. Mr. Marsden says he's working on emulsions of up to 70% oil.

[From Oil Daily, June 13, 1972]

SOUR NOTE FOR TAPS—ECONOMIST RAPS INTERIOR

WASHINGTON.—An economist with Resources for the Future, supported by the Ford Foundation, told the Joint Economic Committee of Congress Friday that the Interior Department's final impact statement on the trans-Alaska oil pipeline was "biased."

Charles J. Cicchetti, who said he was testifying for himself, said the earlier draft statement by Interior on TAPS was "totally unobjective and wholly inadequate." The final statement was not much better, he implied.

Most of his testimony, however, dealt with the comparative economics of TAPS and alternative routes for North Slope oil to move south.

His primary conclusions were:

1) Assuming foreign oil would be used on the West Coast as an alternative to North Slope oil, and all slope oil would be used on the West Coast, then the present economic value of TAPS to the nation, at a 10 percent discount rate, would be between \$3 and \$6 billion.

2) The proposed TAPS route—including tankers from Valdez—is "apparently" inferior to a completely overland route to the Midwest and East Coast of the U.S.

3) But a trans-Canada line would "probably" cost more than TAPS. If costs of port and terminal facilities and tankers to move oil south from Valdez are considered, how-

ever, "it is not clear that a Canadian oil line would cost more."

4) The total difference in the two routes is "much less than \$1 billion."

5) The Canadian route would actually be "economically superior in terms of net economic efficiency or benefits to the nation" and would be superior economically for the state of Alaska, as well as for the oil companies.

6) It would cost more to supply the Midwest with foreign oil than the West Coast. The Canadian route would be superior even if delayed two or three years and even if the Canadian government imposed as much as a 20 percent tax on the costs of transporting oil across Canada.

7) The price of oil in Chicago is at least 40 cents and perhaps 60 cents per barrel more than the price of oil similar in quality to North Slope crude in Los Angeles. These price differences "far exceed any additional cost estimates" of a trans-Canadian route.

8) If the companies sell the slope oil exclusively on the West Coast, it will cost them about \$3 to \$5 billion in profits by foregoing the Canadian alternative.

9) There is likely to be an excess of oil on the West Coast if TAPS is built, perhaps as much as 1,000,000 b/d as late as 1985-1990 if import restrictions similar to the rest of the nation are imposed on the West Coast, thus raising costs, both environmental and economic, to haul the oil into other districts in the Lower 48 in new pipelines.

10) TAPS may also reduce competition on the West Coast.

KEATING ANNOUNCES POLL RESULTS

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, a special poll conducted in the First Congressional District in Hamilton County shows that up to 84 percent of those who answered, are against granting amnesty to draft evaders.

The survey was taken by me and was sent to every residence in the congressional district which is comprised of the eastern part of the county.

The poll was sent to 149,179 households.

The results of the poll are as follows:

1. Do you approve of the way the Nixon Administration is handling the Vietnam conflict?

Man: Yes, 78%; no, 22%.

Woman: Yes, 74%; no, 26%.

2. Are you in favor of expanding contacts with the People's Republic of China?

Man: Yes, 82%; no, 18%.

Woman: Yes, 78%; no, 22%.

3. Would you favor the use of a "value added tax" (a national sales tax) as a means of providing Federal revenue?

Man: Yes, 32%; no, 68%.

Woman: Yes, 28%; no, 72%.

4. Would you support such a tax if it would lower your property taxes?

Man: Yes, 47%; no, 53%.

Woman: Yes, 46%; no, 54%.

5. Do you favor forced busing of school children to achieve racial balance in public schools?

Man: Yes, 9%; no, 91%.

Woman: Yes, 7%; no, 93%.

6. Should the Federal Government expand its involvement in: (a) Child Development; (b) Headstart programs; (c) Free and reduced lunch programs?

Man: a. Yes, 40%; no, 60%.

- b. Yes, 40%; no, 60%.
 c. Yes, 45%; no, 55%.
 Woman: a. Yes, 42%; no, 58%.
 b. Yes, 44%; no, 56%.
 c. Yes, 50.3%; no, 49.7%.
 7. Do you support the Administration's position on wage and price control?
 Man: Yes, 69%; no, 31%.
 Woman: Yes, 70%; no, 30%.
 8. Do you think the death penalty should be abolished?
 Man: Yes, 20%; no, 80%.
 Woman: Yes, 24%; no, 76%.
 9. Do you favor a program of national health insurance which would: (a) Provide health coverage for all health care? (b) Cover only major illness or long hospital treatment?
 Man: a. Yes, 36%; no, 64%.
 b. Yes, 49.9%; no, 50%.
 Woman: a. Yes, 38%; no, 62%.
 b. Yes, 50.8%; no, 49.2%.
 10. Do you favor increased Federal programs to curb pollution?
 Man: Yes, 80%; no, 20%.
 Woman: Yes, 78%; no, 22%.
 11. Do you favor legalizing the possession of marijuana for personal and private use?
 Man: Yes, 22%; no, 78%.
 Woman: Yes, 19%; no, 81%.
 12. With the completion of the Apollo Space Program, would you favor: (a) Development of a space shuttle as proposed over the next six years; (b) Termination of the entire space program?
 Man: a. Yes, 64%; no, 36%.
 b. Yes, 29%; no, 71%.
 Woman: a. Yes, 56%; no, 44%.
 b. Yes, 35%; no, 65%.
 13. Instead of using property taxes to finance public education should: (a) Congress increase federal funds for schools? (b) Congress let the States work out a new system of financing public education?
 Man: a. Yes, 40%; no, 60%.
 b. Yes, 77%; no, 23%.
 Woman: a. Yes, 43%; no, 57%.
 b. Yes, 77%; no, 23%.
 14. Should Congress allow some tax credit to parents who send their children to non-public elementary and secondary schools?
 Man: Yes, 49%; no, 51%.
 Woman: Yes, 48%; no, 52%.
 15. Would you favor amnesty for draft evaders?
 Man: Yes, 16%; no, 84%.
 Woman: Yes, 20%; no, 80%.
 16. Do you favor the changing of laws to permit abortion?
 Man: Yes, 56%; no, 44%.
 Woman: Yes, 51%; no, 49%.

FOURTH ANNUAL HIGH SCHOOL SCHOLARSHIP TRIP

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most rewarding experiences I have had in my career as a Member of Congress has been my involvement each year in the collective effort to develop within the student community of my district a sense of identity with our governmental institutions and leaders. This week it is my great honor to host the fourth annual high school scholarship trip to Washington from my Fourth Congressional District of South Carolina.

Annually since I came to the Congress, local businesses, service organizations and civic clubs of Greenville County, Laurens County, and Spartanburg

County have made it possible for me to bring outstanding high school seniors to Washington for a study tour. This year's scholars bring to 52 the total number of young people to benefit from this plan. Chosen by their own high schools for academic achievement and leadership potential, they are spending a few days seeing and studying the workings of their National Government—its executive, legislative and judicial offices—and becoming acquainted with the history, the beauty and the cultural riches of Washington.

This year's fourth district high school scholars and sponsors are:

Greenville County—Greenville High School, Lynn Dorris, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Cecil B. Dorris—Sponsor, Greenville Jaycees; Wade Hampton High School, Hon. James R. Mann—Fourth Annual High School Scholarship Trip—Wade Hampton High School—Joey Glymph, son of Mr. and Mrs. John L. Glymph—Sponsor, Greenville Sertoma; Parker High School, Lanny Lanford, son of Mr. and Mrs. John C. Lanford—Sponsor, J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc.; Southside High School, Margaret Palmer, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. John L. Palmer—Sponsor, Pleasantburg Rotary Club; Greer High School, Melissa Riordan, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. John E. Riordan, Jr.—Sponsor, Greer Kiwanis Club; Laurens County—Laurens High School, Mike Simmons, son of Mr. and Mrs. J. Edward Simmons—Sponsor, Laurens Exchange Club; Spartanburg County—Chapman High School, Ruth Baker, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. William E. Baker—Sponsor, Jones Tractor Co.; Bolling Springs High School, Darrell Bullington, son of Mr. and Mrs. William H. Bullington—Sponsor, Station WSPA, TV and Radio; Paul M. Dorman High School, Phil Wilson, son of Mr. and Mrs. J. A. Wilson—Sponsor, Hillcrest Optimist Club; Spartanburg High School, Dewey Tullis, son of Mr. and Mrs. W. Dewey Tullis—Sponsor, Hillcrest Optimist Club.

The sponsoring organizations in the Fourth Congressional District of South Carolina have grasped the need to expose our young people to the realities and ferments of government in action. They are contributing to the development of a new generation of enlightened and concerned citizens. It is just possible that this week's trip to Washington could be the catalytic factor helping one young South Carolinian, or several, to decide on a career of public service. Thus, I would like to hail the sponsors for their distinguished service on behalf not only of the students they have sent here this week, and in years past, but on behalf of our country, the United States of the future and its greatness, as promised to us in the person of today's youth.

DRUG LEGISLATION

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the Public Health and Environment Subcommittee, of which I am a member, is well aware that drug abuse in America is no longer an isolated problem, but affects people, particularly the young, in urban, rural, and suburban areas. Drug abuse contributes to crime, and inflicts suffer-

ing on individuals, families, and communities. I believe that the subcommittee, particularly its chairman, PAUL ROGERS, should be commended for its fine work during the 92d Congress in combating this threat to our national health.

I was proud to serve as a House conferee on the very important Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972, H.R. 12089—now Public Law 92-255—reported by the subcommittee, which established a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention in the Executive Office of the President. This Office will direct the Federal effort against drug abuse through programs of prevention, treatment, rehabilitation, training, education, and research. The subcommittee also reported H.R. 9059, which required community mental health centers and other medical facilities of the Public Health Service to provide needed treatment and rehabilitation programs for drug addicts and other persons with drug abuse problems. This bill was incorporated in the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972—a far-reaching and historic measure in the struggle against drug abuse.

One of the tragedies of our involvement in Vietnam has been the alarming increase of drug abuse in the Armed Forces. Members of the Public Health Subcommittee co-sponsored the Armed Forces Drug Abuse Control Act of 1971, H.R. 8861—now H.R. 12846—which establishes a drug abuse control organization within each of the armed services to prevent the use of drugs, rehabilitate addicts, and eliminate any drug supply available to military personnel. The bill, having passed the House, is now pending before the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

Certainly, knowledge of the particular drugs being manufactured by each American drug firm would assist the Federal Government in the enforcement of laws requiring such drugs to be pure, safe, effective, and properly labeled. The subcommittee reported the Drug Listing Act of 1971, H.R. 9936, which amends the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for a current listing of each drug manufactured, propagated, compounded, or processed by a registrant under the Food and Drug Act. This bill, which has also passed the House, is pending before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Three other bills initiated by the subcommittee or cosponsored by its members are presently pending before their respective House committees.

H.R. 11466 amends the Food Stamp Act of 1965 to provide food stamps to narcotic addicts participating in drug programs, and to certain organizations conducting drug treatment and rehabilitation programs for addicts.

H.R. 9428 makes it unlawful in the District of Columbia to intentionally promote or facilitate illegal drug trafficking by possession, sale, or distribution of certain paraphernalia, and makes it unlawful for a person to possess an instrument for the purpose of unlawfully using a controlled substance.

Lastly, H.R. 9232 amends the Controlled Substances Act to reclassify am-

phetamine-type drugs, so as to tightly control all central nervous system stimulants.

Perhaps the most difficult challenge facing American youth today—one which has serious implications for the vitality of our Nation—is finding the strength to withstand the lure of drugs. What makes the challenge all the more demanding is the easy availability of drugs at those places where the young are most likely to be found—high schools, colleges, entertainment areas, and the streets. The least we can do is initiate legislation which attacks drug abuse at its source and provides relief for those who become its victims.

NICARAGUA HONORS DR. CAHILL OF NEW YORK CITY

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to my colleagues' attention the work and achievements of a great humanitarian and my good friend, Dr. Kevin M. Cahill of New York City.

Dr. Cahill was recently awarded the Grand Cross of the Order of Miguel Larreynaga, one of the highest decorations offered by the Government of Nicaragua to persons who render outstanding services to humanity and work for the health and peace of the world. This award, which is usually given to heads of state, was presented at United Nations headquarters in New York to Dr. Cahill and U Thant, former Secretary General of the United Nations.

Dr. Cahill's ideas on international health and diplomacy are articulated in his book, "The Untapped Resource—Medicine and Diplomacy." I had the great privilege of contributing an article to this volume. The book illustrates Dr. Cahill's desire to use medicine as a vehicle for humane contributions and for the promotion of international health assistance.

Dr. Cahill is director of the tropical disease center at Lenox Hill Hospital in New York City and professor and chairman of tropical medicine at the Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland.

Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD at this point the remarks made at the presentation of the Grand Cross to Dr. Cahill as well as the letter notifying Dr. Cahill of this award:

MISSION PERMANENTE DE NICARAGUA,
ANTE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS,
March 15, 1972.

DR. KEVIN M. CAHILL,
New York, N.Y.

My DEAR DOCTOR CAHILL: It is with special pleasure to inform you that during my recent trip to Nicaragua, I submitted your name to the Council of the Order of Miguel Larreynaga, one of the highest decorations offered by Nicaragua to persons like you who render outstanding services to humanity and work for the health and Peace of the World.

The Council approved my recommendation by unanimity and issued the Decoration, in the grade of Great Cross, and accompanying

Scroll, with the request that I present them to you.

I would like to hear from you in order that we may agree on the time and place for a brief ceremony, as it may suit you better.

President General Anastasio Somoza of Nicaragua, as Great Master of the Order, personally approved with deep satisfaction conferring you this well deserved honor.

With my sincere congratulations and best regards to you and Mrs. Cahill, in which Mrs. Lang joins me, I remain with the highest consideration,

Most Sincerely,

GUILLERMO LANG,
Ambassador to the United Nations, Consul
General of Nicaragua.

REMARKS

Honorable Doctor Kevin M. Cahill, Distinguished Ambassadors and Consul Generals, ladies and gentlemen, there are moments in man's life when we are privileged to give form in a tangible manner to an act of justice and recognition of the personal merits and achievements of those who have distinguished themselves among their fellow men.

May I say that, for me, this is one of such unique instances, for we are gathered here today, in compliance of an earnest wish of President General Anastasio Somoza of Nicaragua that the outstanding humanitarian work of Doctor Kevin Cahill, may be officially recognized by our country.

Well aware of the achievements of Dr. Cahill, as a man of science and as devoted worker in the noble cause of relieving suffering throughout the world among the victims of all kinds of tropical diseases, President Somoza thought that it was very much in order to confer upon him the decoration of the highest order established by Nicaragua to Honor those who, by their dedication and sterling qualities, have endeared themselves in the hearts of all mankind.

This is the Order of Miguel Larreynaga, which was created as a tribute to one of our greatest historical figures, who, as George Washington in what is today the United States, worked untiringly for the independence of Nicaragua and Central America. Miguel Larreynaga, was born in 1771. He, as our distinguished Doctor Cahill today, by his own efforts and dedication became a thinker, a writer, a statesman and a man of action, who set an example to follow for the new generations.

My dear Dr. Cahill, well do we know about your efforts and struggles to achieve the well-being and happiness of mankind. We know about your scientific research in Africa and Asia and the benefits they have brought along. And we know also that you have done all of this while putting aside your own sacrifices in that work of superation from which thousands get the benefits of your scientific conquests.

Ours, as you know, is a small country, but its heart is warm and great. That this tribute comes to you from a country that fights to maintain intact the dearest Latin American traditions, should not surprise you. In fact, may I assure you that this decoration is extended to you as a true American, by a country that is proud indeed to be a steadfast friend of the United States in the preservation of the democratic way of life and in its fight against communism.

May I pray the Lord that the faith that has inspired Dr. Cahill to find such a crowning success in his achievements may take him to even greater heights of scientific triumphs for the blessing of future generations which will always remember his name with gratitude.

Ladies and gentlemen, may I be permitted now to impose upon Doctor Cahill, our beloved Order of Miguel Larreynaga.

Doctor Cahill, in the name of President

General Anastasio Somoza and in the name of the people of Nicaragua, I take special pleasure in bestowing upon you the National Order of Miguel Larreynaga, in the rank of "Gran Cruz." I can assure you, that it is well and justly deserved. You do honor to the United States, to my country and to the world.

STATEMENT CONCERNING THE BALTIC STATES

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, 32 years ago the Soviet Union, through the use of force, took control of the Baltic States of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania.

In an era of "detente" and "negotiation," many seek to overlook the past, advancing the thesis that the previous policies of the Soviet Union are now altered, and that a continued discussion of previous terror and intimidation is simply fueling a "cold war" which, in reality, has ended.

The unfortunate fact, however, is that the policies of the past have not altered to any appreciable degree. Within the Soviet Union itself men and women still do not possess freedom of speech, freedom of religion, or the very basic right to leave the country. Within Eastern Europe, the captive nations do not possess the right of self-determination. We have witnessed the Soviet Union's brutal response to any effort to achieve such self-determination in Hungary in 1956 and in Czechoslovakia in 1968. The Brezhnev doctrine, a creature of our own time, not the Stalinist years of the past, holds that the Soviet Union has a right to invade the nations which surround it.

In the Baltic nations we witness a continued repression by the Soviet Union of the native culture and indigenous religious faith of these peoples.

Within the past several months the desperate plight of Lithuania's Roman Catholics, for example, was made known. In March 1972, a petition bearing 17,054 signatures was forwarded to 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 Communist Party of the U.S.S.R., because three previous collective letters had gone unanswered.

Demonstrations have taken place against the Soviet occupation of Lithuania in the city of Kaunas and elsewhere during the second part of May 1972. Several thousand youths battled police and Soviet soldiers after a young Roman Catholic, Romas Talanta, burned himself to death in a public park. The rioting continued for several days.

Since June 15, 1940, the Baltic nations have lost more than one-fourth of the combined populations to the ethnically genocidal deportation and resettlement programs of the Soviet Union. These programs continue today, yet a world which condemns genocide in Biafra and

in Bangladesh, seems strangely silent concerning genocide in the Baltic States.

Our own Government has never recognized the forced incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union. If we are to be true to our own principles, we must insist that the Soviet Union, which is a signatory of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, grant these rights to the peoples of the Baltic States. These include the rights of assembly, of free elections, and freedom of worship. These also include the right to move freely over the borders for emigration and visiting purposes.

It is high time that our Government implement House Concurrent Resolution 416 which was unanimously passed by the House and the Senate. This should be implemented by placing upon the agenda of the United Nations the question of Soviet withdrawal from Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia and the provision of the elementary human rights called for in the U.N. Declaration.

Those who would have us view the destruction of the cultural, religious, and intellectual life of the Baltic peoples in silence in the interest of peace and negotiation misunderstand America's role in the world, and misunderstand the meaning of peace as well.

If the Soviet Union will not live up to its past commitments, including the observance of the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights, why should anyone imagine that it will adhere to new commitments with any greater degree of honesty and care? The only kind of peace which can come as a result of silence in the face of such depredations is the kind of peace which was purchased at Munich. Such peace is both illusory and temporary.

Our own national honor demands that we do not permit the brave people of the Baltic States to suffer under the tyranny of the Soviet Union. No more fitting time than this anniversary exists for taking action to bring this question before the international community.

ENERGY PRIORITIES IN THE FEDERAL BUDGET

HON. MIKE GRAVEL

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, it is time for Congress to adjust the administration's energy budget to fit reality.

Administration figures tell us that the great bulk of the country's energy—75 percent—will be coming from nonnuclear-fission sources in the year 2000; even at its busiest, nuclear fission could probably contribute only 25 percent at that time.

This would suggest that the great bulk of our energy effort should be directed where the bulk of the action will be: In coal-gasification and mine-reclamation, in geothermal energy, solar power, hydrogen, and fuel-cells.

Why is there such a disparity between

the importance of these energy sources and their share of the budget?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table called Federal Energy Research and Development Funding, Fiscal 1969 Through 1973, prepared by the President's Office of Science and Technology, be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

GEOTHERMAL ENERGY

Under the heading "General Energy R. & D.," we see that the administration has budgeted only \$2.5 million for geothermal energy in fiscal 1973.

This is absurd, since our geothermal hot-water resources might offer a quick way to produce a lot of electricity. Geothermal hot-water plants can be built in a year or two, and they are safe.

The impressive potential of our underground hot-water resource was acknowledged by Dr. Alfred Eggers, of the National Science Foundation, in testimony June 7, 1972, before the Senate Interior Committee. However, he suggested that the technology is not yet ready:

The principal challenge is the development of technology that will produce economically competitive power from water at temperatures below 350 degrees Fahrenheit (underground).

Two engineers in York, Pa., J. Hilbert Anderson and his son, are convinced that they have already solved both the economic and the environmental challenge of this technology.

For instance, their capital-cost estimates on a vaporcycle plant are lower than other estimates, their kilowatts-per-pound-water-used are better, their new air-cooled condensers require no cooling water, and the underground water is returned underground in a closed cycle.

If it had not been for the flood last week, they would have testified on June 22 before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee; some of their earlier papers, at least, are in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 117, part 35, pages 46307-46311.

THE DOUBLING OF MINIEFFORTS

The administration's energy budget for fiscal 1973 includes only \$4.0 million for all solar-power technologies combined. The solar miniprogram is included under the National Science Foundation's proposed \$13.4 million for "Energy Resources Research."

I would like to thank Mr. KENNEDY, who is chairman of the Senate's NSF Subcommittee, for doubling the administration's request. The NSF authorization bill, S. 3511, which the Senate passed on June 23, explicitly stipulates that—

Not less than \$26 million shall be available for energy research and technology programs, including but not limited to solar, geothermal, and other non-conventional energy sources.

SOLAR ENERGY

Solar power is probably man's most important energy option. The NSF leadership now acknowledges it to be "the most promising of the unconventional energy sources." It is clean, safe, and so abundant that solar-power technologies alone could meet all of this country's conceivable energy requirements, both electrical and nonelectrical.

Chauncy Starr, the dean of Engineering at UCLA, wrote the following about solar energy in the September 1971, issue of the Scientific American:

The enormous magnitude of the solar radiation that reaches the land surfaces of the earth is so much greater than any foreseeable needs that it represents an inviting technical target.

In fact, solar technologies already exist. With proper financial support, some of them could probably become commercially available and competitive within 10 years or less. But the fiscal 1972 solar budget was only \$1.4 million.

A MODEST SOLAR PROGRAM

There is no doubt in my mind that a budget of \$13 or \$15 million this year could be well spent on improving solar technologies. Let us consider the figure of \$13 million, which would be an increase of about \$12 million over last year.

A rule-of-thumb in high technology is that you budget about \$50,000 per scientist. This amount covers lab costs, supporting personnel, and other overhead, as well as his or her salary.

On this basis, an increase of \$12 million would allow for only 240 additional scientists and engineers—out of a general labor force of 82 million Americans—to work on solar energy development including energy storage-and-retrieval systems.

An effort so small should be quite easy to organize. Few objections are heard from the administration about adding a few hundred-million dollars to a research program in a single year, if the program has the President's support, as do the cancer, heart disease, and weaponry programs. For instance, the administration requested an increase of \$750 million for new weapons research alone in fiscal 1973.

TECHNICAL FEASIBILITY OF AN ALL-SOLAR ECONOMY

Solar energy deserves far more than token-funding from the administration. Its potential was described in a recent paper prepared for the National Petroleum Council by Leon Gaucher, of Fishkill, N.Y. Mr. Gaucher, who is a consultant to Texaco, wrote:

Had it not been for an abundance of fossil fuels—coal, oil and natural gas—we might today have a "Solar Energy Economy" just as effective and efficient as our "Fossil Fuel Economy."

The large amount of capital investment involved in energy collection and storage systems and the large amount of land area involved constitute the reasons why solar energy has not been able to compete with our convenient and abundant fossil fuels.

Had we really needed this solar energy, however, it is quite likely that the technology would have been developed rather quickly to improve these economies materially.

INDEPENDENCE FROM FOREIGN FUELS

Once man starts tapping intelligently into the various solar energy cycles around him, the prospects for international peace and decency should improve significantly.

For instance, solar energy could make international competition and blackmail

over finite fossil fuels unnecessary; oil and gas can be made, fresh, and no doubt with a profit for someone, by managing photosynthesis.

Furthermore, solar energy in some form—for example, light, heat, wind—is distributed free in both overdeveloped

and underdeveloped countries; there need be no "have against have-not" tension over solar energy. A huge market for solar-power equipment can be expected, of course.

Since the development of solar energy technologies could guarantee abundant

energy for all humans, I believe we also have a moral obligation to press this program's advancement as rapidly as possible.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FEDERAL ENERGY R. & D. FUNDING—FISCAL YEARS 1969 THROUGH 1973

(In millions of dollars)

		Fiscal year—							Fiscal year—				
Agency		1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	Agency		1969	1970	1971	1972	1973
Coal resources development:							Energy conversion with less environmental impact:						
Production and utilization R. & D., includes gasification, liquifaction and MHD	DOI-BOM	12.3	13.2	15.4	14.7	19.0	Cleaner fuels R. & D., stationary sources	EPA	10.7	19.8	17.4	24.5	29.5
Mining health and safety research.	DOI-OCR	8.7	13.5	18.8	31.1	45.3	SO ₂ removal	TVA				2.6	15.2
Petroleum and natural gas:							Improved energy systems	HUD	.3	.8	3.0	2.4	2.8
Petroleum extraction technology.	DOI-BOM	2.6	2.7	2.7	3.2	3.1	Thermal effects R. & D	EPA	.5	.8	.6	.7	1.0
Nuclear gas stimulation ²	AEC	2.4	3.7	6.1	7.0	7.5		AEC	.8	1.5	1.8	3.2	6.8
Oil shale	DOI-BOM	2.5	2.4	2.7	2.6	2.5	General energy R. & D.:						
Continental Shelf mapping	DOI-GS				5.0	7.0	Energy resources research ¹	NSF		1.1	5.0	9.8	13.4
Nuclear fission:							Geothermal resources	DOI	.1	.2	.2	.7	2.5
LMFBR ³	AEC	132.5	144.3	167.9	236.6	259.9	Engineering energetics research	NSF	2.9	2.9	2.7	4.0	4.7
Other civilian nuclear power ²	AEC	144.6	109.1	97.7	90.7	94.8	Underground transmission	DOI			.8	.9	1.0
Nuclear fusion:							Cryogenic generation	NBS					1.0
Magnetic confinement ²	AEC	29.7	34.3	32.3	33.2	40.3	Nonnuclear energy R. & D.	AEC					1.5
Laser-pellet ^{2,3}	AEC	2.1	3.2	9.3	14.0	25.1							
	DOI						Total		361.0	363.2	405.2	524.7	621.6

¹ The funding listed in these tables covers the Federal R. & D. programs in development exploration and production, conversion, and transmission of our energy resources. This funding includes energy conversion R. & D. for stationary applications only; R. & D. funding for improved mobile applications (e.g., automotive, rail, seagoing) are not included. Fundamental research on environmental health effects of combustion products and low-dose radiation exposure is not included.

² This funding includes operating, equipment, and construction costs.

³ The primary applications of the multipurpose laser-pellet effort are for other than energy production (see text).

⁴ This entry includes \$1,500,000 for dry cooling tower R. & D. under the AEC's new nonnuclear energy R. & D. category. Other related work is carried out under other civilian nuclear power.

⁵ The NSF RANN program includes research on solar energy as well as fundamental energy policy studies.

Source: From the President's Office of Science and Technology.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the features of the Sun-Standard, Blue Island, Ill., is a column by Leonard Carriere, an attorney and civic leader, who in his spare time has become an extremely entertaining columnist.

In his column of Thursday, June 22, he discusses that monstrous bureaucratic friend of the taxpayer—the Internal Revenue Service:

IN PASSING

(By Leonard Carriere)

It's tough to be a bird, particularly if you are of the genus that flocks to the roost at I.R.S. Throughout history no one rated the tax collected very high. In 2,000 years it is doubtful that the tax man made any advance in the pecking order.

Things have come to a bad pass at I.R.S. Last spring I.R.S. took off on the income tax preparers, implying that they were all thieves or worse. As is usual in such cases it was the so called scare technique. Most preparers are honest. God does not guarantee 100 percent. Strangely enough, the I.R.S. people do not have 100 percent honesty. There are thieves everywhere (including heaven, I suspect) and in about the same proportions.

It also follows that while we are the most educated nation in the world, very few can understand the income tax regulations, rulings and instructions so that they can prepare a return with some assurance that they are doing so correctly. As usual, I.R.S. has more than its share that do not understand.

Recently someone asked the same question of five experts on the I.R.S. staff and got five different answers.

The situation is mean, so mean in fact that some senator is thinking of introducing a bill to simplify the tax return form (Form 1040). I do not believe it can be done so long as the tax law is not changed. The only simple way is for the government to take a cut without credits, exemptions, allowances or any thing else. This is what it comes down to in any event. It's just that the politicians like to make things difficult since if things were made simple, the little people would soon come to the conclusion that they did not need politicians. That would never do.

I.R.S. has a lot of cute tricks up its sleeve. Just let them notify you that they are going to audit you and at once you are in for a bad time. When they are through they do not compensate you for your trouble. They distinctly have a mistrust for everything you tell them. Why this is I do not know. If you cannot substantiate your position with records, affidavits and a certification from heaven they are not going to allow it.

Then, let them want some information on a package they are getting together for some poor slob and you find yourself deluged with requests for xerox copies (both sides) of all checks issued to the slob. He's in for a bad time. Ignore the requests and you're in for a bad time.

Do you have an employee that owes Uncle a little unpaid tax bill? That's bad too because now they make this your responsibility by serving you with lien claim. You either mail them a check, fire the employee, or surrender yourself to the nearest U.S. Marshal. So it goes.

It is readily apparent that soon this system will spread to the state level. It is also apparent that with the addition of new tax laws there will be new tax men. It is also equally apparent that no one is going to love them—not even their Mothers, and they shouldn't!

THE MACHINE TOOL INDUSTRY LOOKS AT THE ECONOMIC SCENE

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, this time last year the economy of the country was sluggish, and dramatic action was called by the administration to establish wage and price controls and provide tax incentives so that industry in this country could compete more favorably in the international and domestic market.

Following up the strong actions taken by President Nixon and the Congress, I asked members of the machine tool industry to look at the economic scene 1 year later.

I am happy to report that according to representatives from the Cincinnati area, and specifically in the machine tool industry, there has been an increase of 853 jobs, or 11 percent, since June 1971. Additional jobs and rehiring will be created if the economy continues at its present high level.

In an effort to share this information with my colleagues, I am enclosing correspondence on this subject.

I would also like to place in the Record a copy of the news release from the National Machine Tool Builders Association and a copy of an article from the Wall Street Journal which appeared June 26, 1972.

The items follow:

JUNE 20, 1972.

Hon. WM. J. KEATING,
House of Representatives, Longworth Build-
ing, Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: During my recent visit to your office, Tom Hayes and I discussed the present machine tool employment picture in Cincinnati, as well as the current level of incoming business. It was agreed at the time that I would again survey the management of the eight largest machine tool companies in the Cincinnati area to up-date the employment figures we gathered about a year ago. This I have done.

Attached you will find a copy of my letter to you dated July 1, 1971 in which we compared employment figures as of January 1, 1970 and June 30, 1971. Figures as of June 15, 1972 indicate that total employment for the same eight companies has increased from 7,810 as of June 30, 1971 to 8,663 as of June 15, 1972. This represents an increase of 853 jobs, or a gain of 11 percent.

It should be pointed out however, that the present level of 8,663 is still off 26 percent from the more representative level of 11,718 as it existed on January 1, 1970. Four of the eight firms have less than five percent increases. The remaining firms have registered gains in employment of 11, 13, 14 and 15 percent. Each of the eight companies indicate that the level of incoming business is up somewhat over a year ago. As a result they expect employment to increase further if incoming business maintains its present level or improves further. All companies are working full forty hour weeks which was not the case a year ago. There is some concern at three companies that business during May and early June was off again from March and April levels.

You are aware, I know, that the level of incoming orders in our industry has been improving. You may have heard some comparative figures on a year-to-date basis that makes it sound as though this year is going to be a banner year for machine tools. This is not necessarily the case.

I have attached herewith a set of machine tool statistics as released by the National Machine Tool Builders Association. They point out specifically what has been happening. There is no question, machine tool business is improving, but comparative figures are misleading since first quarter 1971 happened to be right at the bottom of the trough. It will be particularly important to see what happens during the next few months, and the remainder of the year. If new business continues at present levels or above, the total employment level in the eight companies represented here could approach 10,000 by year's end.

The ITC, ADR and the improvement in the economy generally, have all had their effect on improved new business levels. How much each has helped individually we do not know. However, it is a fact that the ITC and ADR have helped trigger orders in many, many instances where customers had been hesitating before.

Bill, I hope this information can be of value to you in some way. If I can be of further assistance, please let me know.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely,

E. J. KRABACHER.

MACHINE TOOL BUILDERS ASSOCIATION,
McLean, Va., May 24, 1972.

Net new orders for the machine tool industry during the month of April reached \$92,900,000—or \$67,050,000 in metalcutting type machine tools and \$25,850,000 in metal-forming type machine tools.

This current monthly industry total compares with \$119,100,000 in March of this year and \$55,600,000 in April, 1971. For the first

four months of 1972, the machine tool industry has received orders totaling \$368,500,000 or 55% higher than last year's four month total of \$237,150,000.

Using the same comparisons for the metal-cutting segment of the industry, orders in April were 59% higher than the \$42,300,000 registered a year ago but off from the March, 1972 figure of \$95,700,000. Orders for metal-forming machine tools rose 10% in April over the March figure of \$23,400,000 and 94% over April of last year when orders were \$13,300,000.

For the four month period, orders for metalcutting machine tools are up 71%—\$274,700,000 this year as compared with \$161,050,000 in 1971. Metalforming machine tool orders have risen 23% to \$93,800,000 for the first four months of 1972 as compared with \$76,100,000 for the same period of 1971.

MAY MACHINE TOOL ORDERS ROSE 16 PERCENT FROM APRIL LEVEL—BOOKINGS WERE 52 PERCENT ABOVE DEPRESSED 1971 MONTH, BUT FIGURE IS STILL TERMED LOW; CUTTING GEAR SECTOR SURGES

Machine-tool orders rose 16% in May from April and 52% from the depressed May 1971 level, the National Machine Tool Builders Association reported.

Orders for the first five months were up 55% from the year-earlier period, and machine-tool makers said they were confident the upturn will continue through the year.

The sharpest gains this year have come in orders for metal-cutting machines. Makers of metal-forming equipment, however, still are looking for a substantial upturn.

The association said May orders totaled \$109 million, up from the \$94.4 million of April and the severely depressed \$71.8 million of May 1971. Five month orders increased to \$479 million from the year-earlier \$308.9 million.

Orders for lathes, milling machines, machining centers, grinders, boring mills and other metal-cutting machines were \$82.5 million in May, up 24% from \$66.7 million the previous month and 76% from \$46.9 million in May 1971. For the five months, orders rose 72% to \$356.8 million from \$207.9 million in 1971.

CUTTING MACHINES GAINING

Makers of cutting machines said the positive trend should continue. "We feel very confident there's an upturn," said C. William Bliss, of Warner & Swasey Co., Cleveland, which makes a broad line of cutting machines. "Our orders have improved since last September, and they're still rising. We're starting from a low base, but it's a tangible and clear increase which continues."

"Our expectations are that the second half of the year will be considerably stronger than the first half in terms of incoming orders," said Henry D. Sharpe Jr., president of Browne & Sharpe Manufacturing Co., North Kingston, R.I., another cutting-machine maker. "Some of the more expensive machines are showing a healthy upturn that is very pleasing." But while percentage gains from last year are dramatic, he cautioned, "actual dollar volumes are still very conservative."

May orders for metal-forming machines, however, slipped 4% to \$26.6 million from April's \$27.7 million and were up only 7% from the \$24.9 million of May 1971. Five-month 1972 orders of \$122.2 million were only 21% above the depressed year-earlier level of \$101 million.

SLOW MARKET FOR FORMERS

"Our principal market isn't spending—the auto makers aren't buying new equipment," said David W. Bonnar, senior vice president, of the U.S.I. Clearing division of U.S. Industries, Inc., Chicago, a maker of metal-forming machines. "It's getting better," he said, "but there isn't any bonanza in sight." Mr. Bonnar,

whose company's primary markets are the auto and appliance industries, said potential customers still have much unused capacity and are reticent about making large capital outlays. "The small machines are selling well, but the big machines aren't," he said.

However, some metal-forming machine makers are much more confident than at any time in the last two years. "A year ago and two years ago we were very pessimistic, but now we're very optimistic," said C. J. Kelleher of Verson Allsteel Press Co., Chicago. "Our feeling is that our part of the industry is going to book very heavily in the last half of the year." He said auto makers have a large "pent-up demand" for new machines, and "we feel the industry is about to let go with a lot of spending." Already, he added, "the level of inquiries is substantially higher than a year ago."

The industry orders backlog, including both cutting and forming machines, stood at \$674.8 million at the end of May, up 4% from April and 46% from a year earlier. But it will take much greater improvement in backlogs, manufacturers said, before shipping rates increase sharply.

SHIPMENTS UP SLIGHTLY

For the industry, shipments totaled \$82.2 million in May, up only 8% from the previous month and only 4% from May 1971. Five-month 1972 shipments of \$373.4 million were 17% below the year-earlier \$451.9 million.

Makers said they aren't eager to rebuild work forces that were slashed drastically during the past two years until backlogs are much higher. "Our shipments are lagging behind incoming orders, and we're making every effort to bolster shipments," said Mr. Sharpe of Browne & Sharpe. He added, however, that the company's machine-tool work force is only 4% larger than a year ago, at which time it was sharply below traditional levels, "and our emphasis is on increasing our productivity."

Mr. Sharpe said, though, that productivity gains can be carried only so far, and if orders pick up as expected in the second half, many machine-tool makers may be unwilling or unable to rebuild production forces sufficiently to handle added volume without lengthening the time between receipt of an order and delivery to the customer. He said it currently takes six to eight months for a machine-tool order to be filled, and this time could be increased to two years if makers are jammed with too many orders all at once.

"The earlier that customers declare their intention of buying, the easier it will be to insure a steady flow of deliveries," Mr. Sharpe said. However, he added, many potential buyers seem to be waiting "until the last minute" to place orders, unwittingly contributing to a possible jam-up that could make it difficult for them to get the equipment.

COMPARATIVE NEW ORDERS FOR METAL-CUTTING MACHINES

	May 1972	April 1972	May 1971
Domestic.....	\$71,750,000	\$57,200,000	\$41,300,000
Foreign.....	10,700,000	9,500,000	5,550,000
Total.....	82,450,000	66,700,000	46,850,000

Note: 5-month total for 1972, \$356,800,000; for 1971, \$207,900,000.

METAL-FORMING MACHINES

	May 1972	April 1972	May 1971
Domestic.....	\$24,200,000	\$26,500,000	\$23,000,000
Foreign.....	2,350,000	1,150,000	1,900,000
Total.....	26,550,000	27,650,000	24,900,000

Note: 5-month total for 1972, \$122,150,000; for 1971, \$101,000,000.

COMPARATIVE SHIPMENT FIGURES FOR METAL-CUTTING MACHINES

Domestic.....	\$49,300,000	\$44,400,000	\$44,200,000
Foreign.....	9,200,000	5,150,000	8,350,000
Total.....	58,500,000	49,550,000	52,550,000

Note: 5-month total for 1972, \$250,800,000; for 1971, \$305,200,000.

METAL-FORMING MACHINES

Domestic.....	\$21,500,000	\$21,950,000	\$22,500,000
Foreign.....	2,150,000	4,400,000	4,000,000
Total.....	23,650,000	26,350,000	26,500,000

Note: 5-month total for 1972, \$122,550,000; for 1971, \$145,650,000.

NOT SO BEAUTIFUL AMERICA

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in a recent edition of the *Liguorian* magazine a very lucid article appeared on abortion by Vivian Rackauckas, a young liberal political activist.

In addition to fully agreeing with Miss Rackauckas' sensitive and compelling thoughts on the moral issues involved in liberalization of abortion laws, she reaffirms my trust and hope that our young people can offer society progressive and responsible thinking.

I strongly urge my colleagues to take but a few minutes to read the following short article:

NOT SO BEAUTIFUL AMERICA

(By Vivian Rackauckas)

After pushing my way through the large crowd, it was finally my turn to ask a question.

"Senator," I said pulling his sleeve to get his attention, "Senator, do you favor the passage of more liberalized abortion laws?"

Looking down at me thoughtfully, George McGovern, Senator from South Dakota and presidential hopeful replied, "Yes, I definitely favor that."

His wife looked on, beaming with pride. "Thank you, Senator," I said softly as I turned and walked away.

The presidential candidate and his wife no doubt thought that, being in college and because my hair is long and I wore jeans and a peasant blouse, I was pleased with his answer.

Nothing could have been farther from the truth. I was crushed.

In the Senator's Valentine's Day visit to the University of Miami campus, he had impressed me with his protective attitude toward the elderly, the poor, even toward the imprisoned marijuana smokers.

And he spoke of a world where "future generations will be able to love their country." I thought that maybe he would be the man who would take the gigantic step to give unborn babies back their rights.

And suddenly everything else he said had no meaning. I am frightened. I see changes going on around me and they scare me. In the past few years I have seen abortion change from a shameful underground crime to every woman's right.

It is not any one person or one issue that upsets me. It is the fact that people's ideas are changing so rapidly, and on the pretense

of improving the quality of life, they are changing the definition of it. Whereas the unborn child was generally believed to have some legal rights (the right to inherit, the right to be born should his mother be sentenced to death, the right of his parents to sue for wrongful death should something happen before birth), the little guy is no longer a baby. He is not even a fetus. He has become nothing more than an "unwanted pregnancy."

The moral issue as to who can call the shots is my primary concern. Who can say which life is valuable and which not? Surely I would not want to be the one with such a tremendous responsibility.

It is not particularly difficult for me to understand why men advocate more liberalized abortion laws. Nobody is overjoyed with the prospect of supporting an unwanted child. A legal abortion may be the escape valve that keeps today's liberal from paying tomorrow's child support.

But it is difficult for me to understand why the "liberated woman" would allow her body to be abused in the name of freedom.

Although I am certain that she believes that she is doing this on her own, I do not believe that it is so. Ironically, in an attempt to free herself from man's bondage, she has become his slave in the lowest form.

The indoctrination to insure the continued public support of abortion is well under way. My younger sister's junior high school science class was recently told that abortion is "nothing more than the destruction of cells."

Abortion referral services are readily available to those in need, and the "problem pregnancy" listings under Personals in the classified ads no longer refers a girl to a home for unwed mothers.

Abortion has now become an acceptable part of American family life. In the coming years a few oldsters will cringe when they hear the word, but soon that will be gone too. Ridding oneself of unwanted cells will soon become about as painless and guilt-provoking as clipping toenails.

And the American society will be beautiful, except for one thing. Old people who sit in homes for the aged contribute nothing to society and gain nothing from it. Their bodies are deteriorating. They no longer meet the standards that we consider to be worthy of life. For their own sake they should not be allowed to continue being unwanted. They should be saved from their misery. And then America can be beautiful.

But wait—while we rush to save unwanted babies and old people from unhappiness, we also have an obligation to the deformed, the retarded, and the mentally ill. They deserve not to have life forced upon them.

And the people with low IQ's crooked noses, and flat feet. They too deserve not to suffer. What a perfect society we will have!

Isn't America beautiful?

THE SCOTT REPORT

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the following report by well-known Washington columnist Paul Scott deserves the careful attention of every Member of Congress. It calls attention to a major campaign launched by the Agency for International Development—AID—to promote worldwide population control, using economic coercion among other methods, with specific recommendations for overriding

opposition among the people whose population is to be controlled. The AID document spelling out the details of this campaign specifically endorses abortion as a means of population control, despite the fact that we specifically provided at the time of passage of the Family Planning Act of 1970 that abortion was not to be recognized or approved as a method of family planning.

The report follows:

THE SCOTT REPORT

(By Paul Scott)

Members of Congress expressing their concern over the distribution within the U.S. of films prepared by the U.S. Information Service should take a hard look at some of the activities of the Agency for International Development (AID).

Although established by Congress to administer U.S. foreign aid abroad, AID is using its funds and employees to rally support in this country for world-wide population control programs including the use of abortion and sterilization.

Working closely with the major, private American groups advocating strict population controls, AID is circulating thousands of copies of an elaborately prepared 232-page report boosting the fight to limit the number of persons that will be permitted to sit at the world's banquet table.

Titled "Population Program Assistance", the document also highlights information on such population control groups as the International Planned Parenthood Federation, the Population Council, and the Population Crisis Committee.

Significantly, these are the same groups that furnished AID with the mailing lists of persons and organizations now receiving the slick paper report at taxpayers' expense. In addition to giving away thousands of copies, AID has arranged to have the document put on sale at the U.S. government printing office.

Despite President Nixon's announced opposition to abortion as a means of controlling population, the AID document goes out of its way to highlight and support this controversial method of population control, stating:

"With the advent of postconceptive methods of fertility control, family planning programs in many areas seem likely to become more 'pregnancy centered'—with emphasis on early diagnosis of pregnancy, termination of unwanted pregnancies—and sterilization services.

"In some cases this will require liberalization of laws pertaining to contraception and abortion."

New Health Culture—In seeking to rally support for its world-wide population control programs, the AID document states that "family planning programs cannot be completely successful until the spacing and limiting of births is firmly inculcated in health culture worldwide."

"In order to accomplish this," the document says, "all health personnel meeting the public will have to be educated and indoctrinated in family planning, whether or not they are directly connected with family planning programs."

The AID document clearly indicates that U.S. officials are preparing to try to dictate population control policies to developing states. The document puts it this way:

"In order to overcome the inability of existing health delivery systems to provide family planning services for all, increasing assistance will have to go to developing countries, and they, in turn, will have to plan and implement realistic family planning programs, especially with regard to manpower."

AID officials also revealed that "the base of support for family planning programs will be widened during the 1970's to include

ministries of government besides the health ministry.

"Ministries of planning, education, information, agriculture, and community development have important roles to play in supporting family planning programs," the document reports. "Staff members of such agencies must be educated in family planning in order that they, too, can help educate the public. There must be broadened recognition of the need for family planning and the availability of services offered."

In order to build up support for population controls in nations where there is strong opposition among the people, the AID document stresses that U.S. funds will be given to private groups "to take the risks involved in initiating programs where governments fear to tread."

Under the AID-financed programs, private medical practitioners also will be encouraged throughout the world to become involved in family planning programs.

"They must be brought into the mainstream of family planning programs," states the AID document.

Although currently most effective means of distribution of contraceptives are through clinics sponsored by governments, AID officials want this widened to include commercial channels. Their document says:

"All family planning delivery systems should include commercial channels because potentially they can give much better geographic coverage than any program has reached to date. Many countries with national policies still have laws impeding the importation and use of conventional high import taxes or other restrictions."

"The inconsistency of such policies and regulation is obvious, and efforts are being made to remove unnecessary restrictions and impediments to cheap and easily available conventional contraceptives."

In other words, AID has launched its own program to sell both abroad and at home the "contraceptive society". This growing worldwide society last year produced at least 34,000,000 abortions, according to figures of the United Nations.

Dr. R. A. Gallop, Professor and Head, Department of Food Science, University of Manitoba, and a leading population expert, believes the world-wide total in 1971 of abortions is closer to 100,000,000.

What the American people should realize is that the government's \$100 million foreign aid population control program is helping to encourage and pay for this record slaughter of the unborn. Since it is your tax dollars, maybe now is the time to let President Nixon, AID officials, and Congress know how you feel.

A STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES AND POLICIES ON FARM AND RURAL ISSUES

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the National Farm Coalition, made up of leading national producer organizations, recently met in St. Louis, Mo. and drafted a statement of Principles and Policies on Farm and Rural Issues which I believe should be must reading for every member of Congress and all others who are in policy shaping positions of our Government.

This statement of principles, if followed, would lead to the preservation of viable family farms and the development of Rural America for the well being of

the entire Nation and the preservation of the private enterprise system.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission, and for the information of my colleagues and the many others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to insert this Statement of Principles and Policies on Farm and Rural Issues:

NATIONAL FARM COALITION—A STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES AND POLICIES ON FARM AND RURAL ISSUES

Farmhouse lights are going out all over America.

The Census reveals that 427,000 farming units were closed out in the five years 1964-1969, or 13½% of all of them. Only 2.7 million out of 3.1 million in 1964 and 6.8 million in 1935 remained in 1970.

Enterprises in smaller communities are disappearing at a rate comparable to farm closures. The President's Commission on Population and the American Future recently reported that the "purpose of future investment in such areas should be to make the decline (in rural communities) easier to bear rather than reverse it."

America traditionally is a nation of widespread opportunity and private ownership. That is not only being abandoned, its abandonment is being stimulated by farm programs designed to help balance the deficits in our international trade with agricultural exports cheapened at the farmers' expense. This is accomplished by inadequate support of farm commodity prices in an otherwise managed-price economy. It is further aggravated by deteriorating transportation and public services, and unthinking surrender to a corporate-employee society in which the opportunity for individual enterprises—even farming and rural community enterprises—are greatly reduced.

The time has come for clear decision between policies which will continue the depopulation of rural America and policies which will recreate a society in which there can be widespread family farms, individual opportunities and individual enterprises.

Operators of our family farms and ranches must have parity in every respect: parity prices, parity income, parity in transportation and utility services, parity of access to capital at reasonable interest, parity in taxation including protection from the unfair competition of tax-loss farmers and corporate conglomerates now allowed to deduct farm losses from non-farm income, and parity in such public services as schools, health facilities, housing, highways, conservation and pollution control assistance.

A policy to achieve parity prices, which will reflect cost of production and a reasonable profit, and parity income which will restore individual opportunity in agriculture need not be at increased public expense.

Farm price support levels, including non-recourse loans and payments, should be increased to not less than 90% of parity when accompanied by effective adjustment of supplies to need. The current set aside program has failed to meet these objectives, and surpluses are piling up although government costs have advanced substantially.

Production adjustment should assure adequate food and fiber for our citizens, including low income families and individuals whose purchasing power is supplemented with Food Stamps, and also including sufficient commodities for export and to give liberal assistance to the less developed nations of the world through Food for Peace and the United Nations Freedom from Hunger programs.

A Strategic Reserve of storable commodities should be established to guard against emergencies and to stabilize commodity supplies from year to year. Such a reserve can make adjustment of production to the Nation's needs possible while assuring consumers of adequate supplies at all times.

Marketing order authority should be extended to all commodities, including those for processing, and contain price provisions and production controls, and improvements in quality or grade standards when a majority of producers in any commodity support such a measure.

Current antitrust laws have not been used effectively to protect individual owner-operator farming and ranching from unfair competition by non-farm corporate conglomerates and integrators. New legislation should prohibit farming or monopolistic control of production by those corporations whose resources and income are derived primarily from non-farm sources.

To the extent that agricultural commodities are used to achieve national objectives in either domestic or international fields, the cost of subsidizing such programs should be paid, not by depressing farm prices and income, but from the public treasury as the cost of achieving the national public objective. Such programs include domestic food aid, the maximizing of agricultural exports to recapture dollars and close the dollar gap, and Food for Peace, Freedom from Hunger and other international food assistance.

International Grains Agreements must include minimum and maximum price provisions which will assure farmers of a fair and decent return. Past negotiations on tariffs and non-tariff barriers have sometimes set aside agricultural issues to facilitate agreement on industrial products. This must not be permitted in the 1973-74 negotiations. Agricultural trade negotiations must have equal priority and efforts must be concentrated on improving access to foreign markets at favorable prices rather than major efforts to influence the domestic policies of the importing nations.

Farmers' use of cooperatives and membership associations authorized by the Capper-Volstead Act of 1922 to combine their economic strength to achieve parity in dealings with other organized segments of the American economy should be encouraged and protected from interference, punitive taxation or other hindrances.

Discontinuance of railroad services in rural areas and restriction of the agricultural exemption in the Motor Carrier Act of 1935 will block instead of bringing new life to rural America. Railroads have an obligation to serve the public convenience and necessity. The agricultural exemption in the Motor Carrier Act should be extended to farm supplies and not restricted in relation to either motor carriers or barges.

Adequate public services in rural areas require adequate funding for rural electric cooperatives, power generation and transmission facilities, and rural telephone service.

The U.S. House of Representatives and Senate have each adopted rural development bills, but both are weakened by the rejection of a rural development banking system. Therefore, they must be adequately financed by the Congress and Executive if rural development is to be effective. Sound rural redevelopment must start with improved farm income. It cannot successfully be based on this misconception that thousands of small industries will appear on the countryside to provide a new economic base for rural towns. The principal industry already there—commercial family farms which still constitute the Nation's largest industry—must be strengthened. The administration of rural development programs, including REA, rural housing, and rural community loans and grants should be kept in the Department of Agriculture rather than transferred to any new urban-oriented department of government unfamiliar and unconcerned with the basic industry on which the rural communities largely depend.

The funding of rural environmental protection and conservation program should be on a scale comparable to aid given those

objectives in urban areas; the ACP/REAP conservation program should be funded to the full extent originally authorized to assist farmers in correcting land and water waste and pollution.

Agriculture has a large stake in national policies on power and fuel. There should be vigorous anti-trust and other legislative and administrative action to preserve inter-fuel competition and prevent a monopoly of varied energy sources by large conglomerate corporations. In addition, a national grid system should be established to enable the rapid transfer of electric power from a surplus area to a deficient area.

The following farm and commodity organizations in approving this statement believe that the preservation of viable family farms and the development of rural America are essential to the well being of the nation and the preservation of the private enterprise system.

LIST OF FARM AND COMMODITY ORGANIZATIONS

Midcontinent Farmers Association, Columbia, Missouri.

The National Grange, Washington, D.C.

National Farmers Union, Denver, Colorado.

National Association of Wheat Growers, Washington, D.C.

National Farmers Organization, Corning, Iowa.

N. Carolina Peanut Growers Assn., Rocky Mount, N. Carolina.

Farmers Union Grain Terminal Assn., St. Paul, Minn.

Vegetable Growers Assn. of America, Washington, D.C.

Farmers Cooperative Council of N.C., Greensboro, N. Carolina.

National Assn. of Farm-Elected Committeemen, Newman, Illinois.

Farmers Union Central Exchange, St. Paul, Minn.

National Milk Producers Federation, Washington, D.C.

Southwestern Peanut Growers Assn., Gorman, Texas.

Virginia Council of Farmers Co-ops, Richmond, Va.

Grain Sorghum Producers Association, Lubbock, Texas.

Trans-Pecos Cotton Association, Pecos, Texas.

Rolling Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., Stamford, Texas.

National Corn Growers Assn., Boone, Iowa.

Soybean Growers of America, Lafontaine, Indiana.

Virginia Peanut Growers Assn., Capron, Virginia.

Peanut Growers Coop. Mktg. Assn., Franklin, Virginia.

Webster County Farmers Organization, Guide Rock, Nebraska.

Southern Cotton Growers, Inc., Dahlonga, Georgia.

Farmers Union Mktg. & Processing Assn., Redwood Falls, Minn.

National Rice Growers Assn., Jennings, La.

National Wool Growers Assn., Salt Lake City, Utah.

Farmers Grain Cooperative, Ogden, Utah.

This article pretty well explains the tragedy that is connected with drug abuse. The comments by the father should certainly serve as food for thought for all parents as well as all citizens who are concerned with the drug culture.

The article follows:

[From the Tulsa Tribune, June 14, 1972]
A FATHER SPEAKS OF FAMILY'S LOVE FOR MURDERED DAUGHTER

RESTON, VA.—Gwen Ames, 17, was found dead on a well-lit walkway in this upper middle class community early June 4.

The initial reaction was Gwen had probably died of a drug overdose. Reston, for all its idyllic image in the television commercials, has had a major drug problem with its youth.

But a subsequent autopsy showed Gwen had been murdered, the first such victim for the town, which was founded in the mid-60s.

The feeling throughout Reston was naturally one of shock. But the horror of it was increased by the fact that Gwen had gone deeply into the drug culture, and then, upon an ultimatum from her parents, had begun to painfully and slowly crawl back toward the light.

As far as anyone can tell, and she was checked thrice weekly by Fairfax County authorities, Gwen had been off drugs for nine months. She and her parents were readjusting to each other. What had been an acrimonious family atmosphere was gradually evolving back into one of trust and love. Life had become good again. Then it was cut short.

There were, as there are in all families, things left unsaid when Gwen's life was over. Her funeral, in the Baptist Church, drew an overflow congregation that spilled through the stairwell and out into the plaza below, where loudspeakers had been set up.

At the service Gwen's father, ArBee Ames, tried to express his love for Gwen, his grief at her passing and his joy in the triumph of her last few months.

He tried to say the things that were left unsaid.

His is a statement that far transcends the bounds of any suburban community and speaks to parents and children everywhere.

The Tribune has reproduced with the family's permission the transcript as it was published in The Reston Times.

I want to take a moment to tell you about Gwen and how much we loved her. I may not be able to get through this. If I can't, I have asked Embry (Rucker, Episcopal Vicar) to finish for me. He knows what I want to say.

We spend so much of our lives behind our private masks. At least at times like these we ought to be able to share our humanity. And speak from our hearts.

When death strikes, suddenly the smallest things take on such importance. The way Gwen did the dinner dishes for us without being asked on the very day she died. I did get a chance to tell her how really pleased we were by her gesture. Because her gesture meant something special in our relationship. And my heart cries out for one more chance to tell her how very much we loved her. To tell her we got all those little signals she sent us that told us how she was coming along.

We had a special relationship with Gwen over the last year that was so intense emotionally that words seem like dry leaves in trying to describe it. Gwen had gotten pretty deep into drugs this time last year.

But she was pulling herself out of it. And she was doing just great. Every step forward, every bit of progress she made in the last few months brought such joy to us.

Perhaps to some these little signals might not mean too much. But when someone is

trying to climb out of the drug culture, it means a lot.

She began to kindle some real interest in education last year, thanks to the help and care of some great teachers at Herndon High School, especially Mrs. Swicord and Mrs. Sebring and others.

She began to develop a real interest in Spanish, and she began getting "A's" in Spanish, her first "A" in high school. We talked to her about enrolling for a summer program in Mexico this summer to develop her Spanish ability, and she agreed. Last year the thought of any kind of summer school would have been out of the question. She even mentioned that she might like to become a Spanish interpreter and get a job at the U.N. or something like that.

This too was an important signal that her head was beginning to clear and she was beginning to look beyond the pleasures of today and was starting to think about her plans for the future.

A few months ago, on her own initiative, she expressed interest in taking modern dance lessons. We enrolled her in Ethyl Butler's dance program in Maryland, and she was taking lessons twice a week. She began talking about becoming a professional modern dancer, maybe on Broadway.

There were lots of other little things too. She came home from school one day and confessed that she had heard a piece of classical music that she liked. At the Spring festival she bought a print of a Picasso painting and hung it up in her bedroom, along with her Jimi Hendrix posters.

We began having dinners together as a family—something that had pretty much stopped during the drug period because of all the tension and hostility in the family.

When she died she was wearing a little Crucifix around her neck, which Rick, her boyfriend had given her just the day before. I don't know what it meant to her because we weren't a church-going family and we didn't talk about religion. But I'm sure it was part of the spark that was lighting new directions and new horizons in her life.

That's why Gwen's death is so terribly painful to Priscilla and me. Because she was making it. Because she had turned the corner. She was going uphill, not downhill.

And I want everyone of you here today to know the preliminary medical reports indicate that drugs were probably not the cause of death. We still do not know the cause. The medical authorities and police are fully investigating.

But the important thing is that Gwen's death is a reason for hope, not despair.

Over in the underpass leading to Hickory Cluster, some kid painted a sign on the wall: "All you need is drugs." But those of us who have lived with it, and those kids who have gone far beyond the first euphoric highs know what a terrible price it exacts—the price the users pay in damage to their minds and bodies, the price society pays, and most of all the grief, the sheer human agony that parents, wives, husbands and friends have to go through.

Because of all this, some people have perhaps given up hope and feel the drug problem is out of control.

But if Gwen's death has any meaning, it is as a symbol of hope. Hope to all the suffering parents whose children are involved in drugs. Hope to all the kids who are on drugs that there is a way out, that you can be what you want to be, that you can stand up and tell all those around you: "I don't care what you think. I'm going to make something out of my life." Because let's face it, the peer group pressure is there. The kids who have gotten in too deep and know they're heading downhill—the last thing they want to see is one of their friends trying to head uphill. They don't like to be reminded of the failure they are making of their own lives. The more friends they can keep in the same boat with them, the better they feel.

THE TRAGEDY CONNECTED WITH DRUG ABUSE

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Tulsa Tribune on June 14, 1972, authored by the Tribune's Washington correspondent, David Jones.

Everyone who has learned of Gwen's death has asked us: "What can we do?"

Two things. You can pray for Gwen. Pray that there is a heaven and she is there.

And we can all make a personal vow to do something with our lives so that Gwen's death will not have been in vain.

I don't know the answers, but there are a few things I feel strongly.

If I had a chance to start over, I would have loved Gwen more. In ways that showed.

I remember once a wise counselor who said to a woman who thought she loved her child but displayed nothing but hostility to the child in their daily relationship: "Suppose, Mrs. Jones, that every time I thought something nice about you, I scratched my knee. Would you get the message that I liked you just by scratching my knee?"

Well, I was too much of a knee scratcher when it came to showing my love to Gwen. Not Pris. She had a love for Gwen beyond belief. I kept telling myself I loved Gwen. I sometimes told my wife I loved Gwen. I occasionally showed Gwen's picture in my wallet to friends to let them know I loved her. Sometimes I even told Gwen I loved her—usually just about the time I was getting set to punish her for something that displeased me.

The other big mistake I made was thinking that I knew everything I needed to know about one of the most complex and difficult tasks we face in life—raising a child from infancy to become a strong, responsible and caring man or woman.

My philosophy was: "What's good enough for my parents is good enough for me. Certainly I'm not making any more mistakes with my kids than my parents made with me."

It's obvious that philosophy isn't enough today, with drugs available everywhere and so easy to use as an escape from the hassles and disappointments that face young people as they are growing up.

All my adult life I've spent becoming knowledgeable about housing and urban affairs, about everything but becoming a good parent.

It wasn't until about nine months ago that I picked up and read a book that had a profound impact on my thinking, called "Parent Effectiveness Training," by Dr. Thomas Gordon. A little too late.

So if I can leave one thought with you, I would like to urge you parents to leave here today and show your children the love you feel for them. Help them build a sense of inner confidence and strength in themselves. If they have that inner stability, they may experiment with drugs, but I don't think they will get sucked in. Give them a chance to grow and make their own mistakes. And take a look at your priorities in terms of how much time you spend with them.

To the young people here today, I only ask that you think of Gwen from time to time, and help her death add a little bit more meaning and purpose to your own lives.

Dear God, take care of Gwen.

REVENUE SHARING FOR ARIZONA

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, in passing H.R. 14370 the House has taken an historic step by increasing the Federal Government's financial responsibility to our State and local governments. The legis-

lation will return tax revenues in the amount of \$5.3 billion to our State and local governments. This act creates a new relationship between these local units and the Federal Government and is designed to help keep our statehouses and city halls viable while simultaneously preserving and strengthening the federalist system of sharing responsibilities.

HOW WILL THIS HELP ARIZONA?

In the first year all of Arizona will receive \$46.1 million. The State's share is a \$14 million tax supplement based upon the tax effort made by Arizona. This allocation can be increased when our legislature places greater reliance on the income tax as a source of revenue.

Local governments will receive \$32.1 million to be used in the area of public safety, public transportation, and environmental protection. Most of these funds will go to Tucson and Phoenix, since most citizens live there and they face the increasing transportation and pollution problems. Tucson will receive \$4.1 million while Phoenix's share is \$9.2 million. The original Nixon revenue-sharing program was less generous to our cities—Tucson would have received \$2.6 million and Phoenix \$6.3 million—over 30 percent less than they will get under the proposal that the House of Representatives has approved this week.

Some of the most important features of this act are the safeguards which prevent State and local governments from abusing the concept of revenue sharing.

Item: States cannot reduce their assistance to local governments without losing some State funds.

Item: No more than 50 percent of a local government's revenue can come from funds provided in the act, thus preventing an unfair burden on the Federal Government's program.

Let me add one caution however—revenue sharing should not be looked at as a panacea that will solve all of the problems of the cities overnight. Local problems will still have to be met at the local level. State and local governments must take new steps to restructure and modernize their operations. The Federal Government can help, but only through local effort will the crises facing the cities be overcome. This is a modest first step in meeting the urban crisis of the 1970's.

WISCONSIN DEMOCRATS VOTE TO ABOLISH HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, On June 17, Wisconsin Democrats voted overwhelmingly to support the abolition of the House Committee on Internal Security, the cutting off of all funds for the Subversive Activities Control Board, and the repeal of title I of the Internal Security Act of 1950.

The text of the Wisconsin Democratic Party's resolution follows:

"Whereas certain relics of McCarthyism like the so-called 'Attorney General's list of subversive organizations,' the Subversive Activities Control Board, and the Un-American Activities Committee (under its new name, the House Committee on Internal Security) threaten us today as they threatened us in the 1950s, putting the finger of suspicion on the dissenter and the activist, supplying the John Birch Society with its propaganda;

"Whereas the House Committee on Internal Security and the Subversive Activities Control Board are idle and expensive monuments to the spirit of Joe McCarthy, the one with no legitimate legislative function, the other put out of business by the Bill of Rights;

"Whereas 69 Members of Congress, including Messrs. Aspin, Kastenmeier, and Reuss in the Wisconsin delegation, have introduced resolutions whose effect would be to abolish the House Internal Security Committee entirely, transferring those of its functions which are legitimate to the Judiciary Committee;

"Whereas our own Senator Proxmire, along with Senator Ervin and others, has acted to cut off all appropriations for the Subversive Activities Control Board;

"Whereas the Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee has introduced legislation to repeal Title I of the so-called Internal Security Act of 1950 (the McCarran Act), which provides the legal basis for the Subversive Activities Control Board;

"Whereas President Nixon's attempt to put the Subversive Activities Control Board back in business, by assigning it the task of updating the so-called 'Attorney General's list of subversive organizations,' has no legislative foundation, and runs afoul of the United States Constitution to boot;

"Whereas this conjunction of reasons provides a reasonable expectation that important civil liberties objectives may be achieved in the next Congress; and

"Whereas the Democratic Party of Wisconsin is under a special obligation to support the good friends of civil liberties in the Wisconsin Congressional delegation: Messrs. Proxmire and Nelson in the Senate, and Aspin, Kastenmeier, Obey, and Reuss in the House of Representatives;

"Therefore be it resolved, that the Democratic Party of Wisconsin goes on record in support of three objectives: (a) the abolition of the House Committee on Internal Security; (b) the cutting off of all funds for the Subversive Activities Control Board; and (c) the repeal of Title I of the Internal Security Act of 1950; and urges the national Party to incorporate these objectives in its platform likewise."

The resolution was introduced by David Luce, from Milwaukee's 3rd Ward Democratic unit, and carried the signatures of 24 other delegates, including three State Assemblymen. Dr. Luce is National Legislative Liaison for the Wisconsin Civil Liberties Union.

UNION CARBIDE CORP. SPONSORS HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT FOR CONGRESSIONAL SEMINAR OF WASHINGTON WORKSHOPS FOUNDATION

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a young constituent of mine, Miss Jeanette

Williams of Caldwell, Ohio, is studying here in Washington this week in the fifth annual series of the Washington Workshops Congressional Seminar. Jeanette, who just completed her senior year at Shenandoah High School, has maintained a marvelous academic and extra-curricular record during her high school years.

I am especially happy to welcome Jeanette to Washington for her participation in the fine and effective Washington workshops seminar program for high school students. Jeanette's participation has been made possible by a scholarship grant under a splendid citizenship education program sponsored by the Union Carbide Corp. Each year this company recognizes outstanding merit and ability in a young person from each of their plant communities across the Nation. These students, chosen by their teachers and principals, are then presented with a full scholarship to attend the Washington workshops seminars in American government. I can think of no finer way for a large corporation to demonstrate its interest in the youth of the Nation and a commitment to the continued strength and well-being of our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, my congratulations are extended to Miss Jeanette Williams and the Union Carbide Corp., for their true and positive involvement in the process and better understanding of our American government.

TRIBUTE TO GORDON CANFIELD

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to pay tribute to the memory of one of my old friends, and one of our most dedicated colleagues, the late Gordon Canfield of Passaic, N.J.

During his 20 years in the House of Representatives, Gordon earned an unsurpassed reputation for integrity and commitment to the public good. I was privileged to serve with him on the Appropriations Committee during my freshman term in the Congress, and I learned much from his wealth of experience in the handling of this Nation's finances.

In addition to his wisdom, Gordon Canfield possessed an abundance of compassion, tact and understanding. I was but one of many newcomers to the House of Representatives who benefited from his kind words and unassuming instruction in the art of lawmaking.

He has been greatly missed on the floor of the House and in committee since his retirement on January 3, 1961. As a private citizen, however, Gordon Canfield continued to contribute to his community and his country.

This past March, I was pleased to join many of my colleagues and his old friends at a luncheon in Gordon's honor.

At that time, Adm. C. R. Bender of the U.S. Coast Guard presented him with the Coast Guard's Distinguished Public Service Award. At that time, we exchanged reminiscences of our days in the Congress. The affection and esteem which Gordon Canfield has earned among his peers was more than evident on that occasion. It had been more than 10 years since his retirement, yet all of us vividly remembered his teachings and example.

If there were ever to be designated a Model Congressman—a man who stands out for his decency, humanity and patriotism as a guiding light for other legislators—Gordon Canfield would be an outstanding candidate for that honor.

While we in the House of Representatives will miss him greatly, I am sure that Gordon Canfield's family must be inconsolable. Our words then, can do little to assuage their loss.

Yet as I extend my deepest sympathies to his wonderful wife, Dorothy, and his two sons, Carl and Allan, I would like to express my feeling that they were very privileged to share the life of a fine human being and true American—the Hon. Gordon Canfield.

HOW TO HURT AMERICA—JUDICIAL STYLE

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, of all the judicial baloney I have seen in recent months—and there has been a lot of it—yesterday's District Court ruling that an oath to support the United States is unconstitutional as a condition precedent to the issuance of a passport tops them all. You don't need judicial jargon to know such an oath is a proper requirement. When judges get so far afield in their ivory towers as to interpret our proud Constitution as to say it doesn't allow a requirement that American citizens wishing to travel abroad under U.S. protection shall first affirm their allegiance to the United States, they're sick, sick, sick.

This is more of a tragedy because most judges today are earnestly endeavoring to restore balance in our judicial process. Foremost among examples of this is the new firmness and direction of the U.S. Supreme Court since the departure of Earl Warren.

U.S. citizens ought never to have a judicially imposed legal right to travel under U.S. protected citizenship unless they're willing to give oath subject to penalties of perjury that they support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies and will bear true faith and allegiance to same. If they will not give such oath, they ought not to be permitted a passport to foreign lands in which they quite probably in light of their indicated disloyalty would cooperate with hostile governments or their representatives against

the interests of the United States of America.

Let us sincerely hope that the Appellate Courts will make short shrift of this latest harmful and patetically naive exercise in judicial license.

The article follows:

JUDGE RULES PASSPORT OATH IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL (By J. Y. Smith)

The State Department's practice of requiring an oath of allegiance from U.S. citizens before issuing passports to them is unconstitutional, a U.S. District Court judge ruled yesterday.

In an order accompanying a 30-page opinion, Judge Thomas A. Flannery directed the department to delete the oath from passport applications. He also "enjoined and restrained" the department from denying a passport "to any United States citizen because he has refused to swear or affirm the contents of an Oath of Allegiance."

The case was brought by the American Civil Liberties Union on behalf of Beverly A. Woodward and Allan Fletcher. Both had passports denied to them because they refused to subscribe to the oath required by the State Department.

A Douglas Melamed, an attorney for Woodward and Fletcher, described the former as a person who wished to travel to Britain to attend an anti-war conference, and the latter as a journalist whose business required him to travel abroad.

He said the objections to the oath were based on a feeling that true loyalty to the U.S. Constitution might require a citizen to oppose some particular policy of the U.S. government.

The oath in question states:

"I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; and that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservations, or purpose of evasion: So help me God."

The State Department allowed some variations, such as deletion of the words "So help me God."

Judge Flannery noted that Justice Department attorneys defending the State Department argued that foreign countries may try to induce Americans abroad "to act in some fashion inconsistent with his primary allegiance to the United States."

For this reason, the government argued, "no more appropriate manner can be imagined to inform the American of his legal obligation than to require him to swear or affirm his allegiance to his country."

The judge said he disagreed and added:

"Because the requirement serves to deny passports only to those who openly refuse to comply with the oath requirement, it would certainly appear to be a wholly ineffective means of preventing the travel of individuals intent upon committing acts contrary to the country's foreign policy interests."

The right to travel abroad is guaranteed by the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution, the judge said, and "no serious national purpose" is served by denying passports to persons who refuse to subscribe to the oath.

From 1861 to 1966, the government required an oath from passport applicants. In 1966, the requirement was deleted, but the oath was retained on passport applications for subscription at the option of applicants.

Last year, U.S. District Judge June L. Green ruled that the option to take the oath "unfairly discriminates against U.S. citizens." On Nov. 1, in an apparent response to Judge Green's ruling, the State Department made the oath mandatory. That action led to the case decided yesterday.

GOOD LUCK TO THE WEST TENNESSEAN

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the thriving city of Jackson, Tenn., just last week produced new evidence that it provides the healthy climate necessary for a vigorous free enterprise economy.

Beginning Monday, June 19, a new morning newspaper began publication to complement the well established afternoon daily, the Jackson Sun. The new paper, called the West Tennessean, is published by J. Frank Warmath, a well known banker, contractor, and publisher from Humboldt, Tenn.

The West Tennessean, which will appear every morning Monday through Saturday, began operations with a circulation of 17,300 and a staff made up almost entirely of persons under the age of 30. The editor is 25-year-old John Barnes. Jay Jackson is city editor, and Laura Harris edits the women's section. The night editor is William Cryer, and the sports page is edited by Ted Lewis, who at 23 is the youngest member of the staff.

Although the editorial and advertising offices are located in downtown Jackson, the paper plans to be regional in scope, rather than local, serving the whole west Tennessee area.

Earlier this spring, ABC television's Frank Reynolds did a 30-minute documentary on the city of Jackson, and in that show recognition was given to the good health of the business community. The establishment of the West Tennessean is a good indication that Jackson is indeed a thriving business center.

I certainly wish the West Tennessean well, and I feel sure that the people of the area will benefit by having two fine daily newspapers delivered to their doors.

RESULTS OF CONGRESSMAN HATHAWAY'S ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I recently sent to residents of Maine's Second Congressional District the results of my annual questionnaire. For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to insert this information into the RECORD:

(In percent)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Education.....	6.9	8.7	7.3	10.2	10.6	12.3	11.0	10.8	9.6	9.4	3.2
Economy.....	28.5	18.3	10.7	10.2	7.2	6.4	6.3	5.1	3.8	2.4	1.1
Fuel and power shortage.....	3.5	6.5	7.1	6.9	11.3	11.2	2.0	5.0	15.3	22.4	8.8
War in Indochina.....	25.2	12.3	8.9	9.9	6.6	7.5	8.2	8.2	10.1	1.3	1.8
Poverty.....	6.1	8.2	3.4	3.4	15.3	22.7	23.3	3.3	2.8	7.8	3.7
Crime.....	8.4	11.5	12.0	10.5	12.9	17.7	16.7	8.7	.4	.5	.7
Unemployment.....	10.3	17.3	15.7	12.6	11.9	8.8	7.2	6.5	5.3	4.2	.2
Drug abuse.....	5.3	9.5	12.8	10.7	10.7	10.8	10.1	10.3	10.2	8.2	1.4
Pollution.....	7.3	7.4	11.4	10.4	11.3	11.1	8.8	11.2	11.3	8.2	1.6
Needs of elderly.....	4.5	5.2	10.5	11.1	9.1	9.4	10.4	15.1	12.0	12.0	.7

Note: "Other issues" suggested by the respondents varied widely, with no issue predominant.

EMPLOYMENT AND JOB SECURITY

2. Seventy-five percent of the respondents favored the passage of legislation imposing quotas on most imported goods and discouraging U.S. companies from producing abroad by eliminating a wide range of tax advantages for such companies, as a means to reduce unemployment here at home.

3. Sixty-four percent favor the increase of the federal minimum wage above the present \$1.60.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

4. On the question of the enactment of a nationally uniform no-fault system of auto insurance under which the victim of an accident recovers his losses from his own insurance company no matter who caused the accident, 74% answered "Yes" while 26% said "No."

5. Regarding the creation of a new, independent agency to set and enforce safety standards for foods, drugs, and consumer products, 64% of those responding indicated "Yes" while 36% indicated "No."

6. On the question of supporting the recently proposed Truth in Food Labeling Act, which would establish a system of grade labeling for goods (grades "A" to "E" and "substandard quality") and require that labels also disclose the ingredients and nutritional content of the product and the latest date on which it can be sold as fresh, 93% said "Yes" and 7% said "No."

ECONOMY

7. Residents of the Second Congressional District were asked to indicate their stand on each of the following options, should our economic situation worsen.

(In percent)

	Yes	No
a. Controls on interest rates.....	84	16
b. Reduced Government spending possibly extending to some essential services.....	78	22
c. Increased excise taxes on certain items such as tobacco and liquor.....	73	27
d. Other.....	(1)	(1)

1 Varied comments, for example, reduce defense spending close tax loopholes.

EDUCATION AND TAX RELIEF

8. With regard to the distribution of \$5 billion to the states for general aid to education on condition that each state bring all its school districts up to equal levels of per pupil expenditure, in line with recent court decisions against the tying of educational expenditures to local property tax returns, 73% expressed approval and 27% expressed disapproval.

9. Seventy-three percent were against the passage of a national sales tax (value added tax) to be used specifically for granting tax relief to state and local governments.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRIENDS: This newsletter contains the results of the questionnaire I sent to you in March. This information will go to every household in Maine's Second Congressional District, will be sent to the President, entered in the Congressional Record for Members of the House and Senate, and released to the Maine press.

I would like to thank all of you who took the time to respond to the questionnaire. Many of you wrote letters with supplementary comments and suggestions which I found especially helpful. This kind of effort gives strong indication of the deep concern Maine people have for the problems affecting our state and our nation.

The response was very gratifying—approximately 15,000 answers were received, which is an extremely good record for questionnaires of this nature.

Once again, thank you for sharing your ideas, suggestions, and convictions with me. Sincerely,

WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY,
Member of Congress.

CURRENT ISSUES

1. Questionnaire respondents rated the following issues in what they felt was the proper order of importance. The economy, for example, was given top priority by 28.5% of those answering question 1, while 18.3% saw the economy as the second most important issue.

HEALTH CARE

10. Federal funding of a national health insurance plan that would guarantee low cost health care coverage to every American citizen was favored by 67%, with 33% expressing disapproval.

CHILD CARE

11. Respondents were asked to indicate which of the following alternatives best represents their views with regard to legislation to provide child care facilities for families with working mothers:

Thirty-one percent favored child care legislation for families at any income level, paying anywhere from no fee to full cost of services, according to income.

Twenty-five percent recommended child care legislation for low-income families and families on welfare, free or at low cost, according to income.

Thirteen percent called for child care legislation for mothers on welfare only, free of charge.

Twenty-nine percent were opposed to any sort of child care program.

Two percent indicated that they did not know.

THE WAR AND U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

12. Questionnaire respondents were requested to select what they thought U.S. policy with respect to the war in Indochina should be:

Twenty-nine percent recommended the setting of a definite date now for complete U.S. withdrawal of forces from Indochina assuming that agreement could then be reached on return of American prisoners-of-war.

Thirty-four percent favored the signing of an agreement with North Vietnam providing for a general cease-fire and standstill throughout Indochina, total withdrawal of U.S. forces from South Vietnam within 6 months of the signing and release of all American prisoners-of-war during the same period of time, and independently supervised Presidential elections in South Vietnam within that 6 month period, with President Thieu resigning a month before the election, as proposed by President Nixon.

Twenty-three percent indicated favoring the continuing of a phased withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam, but maintaining a residual force there until American prisoners-of-war are released and agreement is reached on a military and political settlement.

Fourteen percent suggested that the U.S. maintain troop commitments and training and air strike support to the armies of South Vietnam.

13. Extending U.S. diplomatic recognition to Communist China now that it is a member of the United Nations was agreed to by 83 percent of those answering the question.

14. Twenty-eight percent said "Yes" and 72 percent said "No" with regard to the U.S. continuing to support the UN at the level of funding it has maintained in the past.

15. Supplying Israel with economic and military assistance necessary to the maintenance of a "balance of power" in the Middle East was agreed to by 53% and opposed by 47%.

16. Sixty-four percent felt the use of secrecy does not hamper American foreign policy in achieving its objectives.

AMNESTY

In response to question 17 dealing with amnesty:

Ten percent would grant amnesty without any conditions.

Thirty-three percent would grant amnesty with an alternative service requirement (Taft proposal).

Ten percent would grant amnesty, but were uncertain about requirements.

Forty-seven percent opposed amnesty.

INEQUITY IN THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been aware of an inequity in the Social Security Act as it relates to the denial of payment to deserving recipients who have obtained medical care from their doctors and have been certified by the appropriate Utilization Review Committee, only to be denied payment by those in the Social Security Administration who are not medically qualified for such determination. Therefore, I am introducing a bill today which provides relief to those involved in such a situation.

My bill amends title 1814 of the Social Security Act to make it clear that whenever services furnished an individual in a hospital or extended care facility are certified as necessary by a physician and approved by the appropriate utilization review committee, payment for such

services under the hospital insurance program may not be denied on the ground that the level of care involved was not medically required.

A number of my constituents and residents of the State of California have experienced long delays in action being taken upon their claims pending before the Social Security Administration, only to be turned down by the Social Security Administration—necessitating severe hardship in their attempts to pay their bills from their meager savings, or forced to go into debt to pay them. Retirees are those who suffer most under these circumstances.

I am hopeful that the Congress will view this bill in the light in which it is introduced and will give favorable consideration to its provisions so that it may become law.

THE PACT RUSSIA WILL NOT ACCEPT

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Frank Starr, Chicago Tribune Washington bureau chief, is an expert authority on the Soviet Union having covered the Moscow beat for many years.

His column on Monday, June 26, is in my judgment of special significance as we keep in mind his expert knowledge of the Soviet Union, and especially the lack of individual freedoms for its citizens.

The column follows:

THE PACT RUSSIA WILL NOT ACCEPT (By Frank Starr)

WASHINGTON.—In case there is any doubt about where the line was drawn in the change of Soviet attitudes that produced a Moscow summit and strategic arms agreements, we had a good demonstration of it a few days ago.

To most Americans, with the possible exception of a few Tribune readers, it passed without notice.

For hundreds of millions of people living in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union who have the most to gain from a new relationship between Moscow and Washington, there is little hope of direct benefit.

MAY GET WORSE

On the contrary, things may get worse. The dread midnight knock on the door ended in Russia when Stalin died in 1953. But in the enlightened Russia of 1972 they don't even wait until midnight. They knocked on Pyotr Yakir's door the other day at 30 minutes past noon and took him away because he said publicly and repeatedly that Soviet authorities do not observe Soviet law in dealing with their own citizens.

Yakir was a leading member of a loose group of intellectuals who, in a general sense, may be said to have played a role in the greater awareness of Western ways and living standards among Soviet citizens. It is an awareness credited by some with creating the economic pressure which led to a limited domestic reassessment of economic priorities and, hence, a decision to broaden economic and other contacts with the West.

It is not likely that the cause and effect chain is that simple or direct, but that a gradually awakening Soviet citizenry has had some effect on the Kremlin is clear.

That's why it was interesting but little

noticed during the Moscow summit that Pravda insisted that, despite a U.S.-Soviet detente, the "ideological struggle continues as before," and why some American diplomats were disappointed that in the orgy of agreements one of the most obvious candidates for agreement—information policy—was missing at the end.

The U.S. has made repeated representations to the Soviets for years to stop hounding American correspondents in Moscow, to stop jamming Voice of America broadcasts, and to allow free sale of American [our Russian language magazine sold there by agreement], to allow a flow of American-written information about America into Russia equalling that of Soviet-written material about Russia that flows into the United States.

While it has been suggested that this may be a subject of discussion at a coming European Security Conference it is hardly likely that the Soviets will budge much on such a issue because it comes directly to the heart of what they call the "ideological struggle."

But more importantly, it comes to the heart of the intellectual honesty with which the Soviet leadership is willing to confront public problems. While one may argue that the Soviets have honestly assessed the need for a new relationship with the West, that is simply untrue. It is not honesty but pragmatism that produced the new assessment.

Accordingly, it is naive to believe that if the leaders of two adversary states could only communicate directly and clearly with one another, an understanding between them must necessarily follow.

If Yakir represented such a threat to the Soviet leadership as to merit the dreaded knock on the door when the Soviet constitution protects the right of free speech, what can one expect from Soviet leaders with regard to international commitments?

WHAT HE WASN'T

He was not giving away government documents as Daniel Ellsberg says he gave away U.S. policy studies of the Viet Nam war nor as Jack Anderson published secret transcripts of top-level policy discussions.

Neither was he a devoted revolutionary publicly committed to the reordering of the state and economic structure as is Angela Davis.

As Russia's new relationship with the West has practical effects at home and abroad, both Americans and East Europeans—including Russians—may ask themselves how different the present leadership is from Stalin.

ISRAEL—A MODEL OF EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, on May 4, 1972, the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Dr. Sidney P. Marland, delivered an excellent speech before the National Academy of Education.

In an effective description and analysis of the problems which we must overcome to improve our system, he realistically evaluates those shortcomings to which we must turn our attention.

At the same time, however, Dr. Marland recognizes the accomplishments of our own educational system, and is justifiably optimistic. I believe, in his predictions of successes that will come for our efforts for reform. He points to the outstanding educational advances of the State of Israel from which the United

States can learn a great deal, especially in the areas of early childhood development and career education.

He gives tribute both to Israel's programs and to the attitude which that country has established toward education in general. We can benefit greatly from the experience of other nations, and Commissioner Marland's example of Israel is indeed well-chosen, perceptively analyzed, and extremely noteworthy.

I commend this speech to the attention of my colleagues as a truly fine expression of how American education can change and where we can look for tested methods of implementing such reform:

ISRAEL—A MODEL OF EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT

(By S. P. Marland, Jr.)

Later this month, as many of you know, the proud State of Israel will celebrate its 24th anniversary. Therefore, it is a special privilege, Dr. Cremin, members of the Academy and distinguished guests to join with you tonight in honoring Dr. Yigal Allon, who as a brigade commander in 1948 was one of the military architects of Israel's rebirth. Today, he finds himself in a different kind of battle, one that is as decisive for the growth and development of the new State as the struggle a quarter of a century ago was for its very existence.

Dr. Allon, I understand that not only do you wear the hat of Minister of Education but also that of Deputy Prime Minister. As U.S. Commissioner of Education, I can well sympathize with the heavy burdens of dual responsibility you surely endure. Frankly, I have all the problems I need, and then some, trying to manage the house of education, but doing that and also serving as Deputy Prime Minister must demand, I would judge, the wisdom of Solomon, the political finesse of Golda Meir, and a good many of the tactical skills developed in your earlier career.

Dr. Allon, you and your government have somehow managed in a brief span to work education miracles that are of special interest to me and to the members of this Academy for we are all deeply concerned with the promotion of scholarly inquiry concerning education here and abroad. To a rather surprising extent, your successes have been attained in areas that are of special interest to American Education at this particular moment in history. Let me cite but three of our critical, mutual concerns—early childhood education, education of diverse disadvantaged groups, and programs for career development.

In the area of early childhood education, Israel recently made kindergarten free and compulsory for all five-year olds. We still have only about three-quarters of our children here in kindergarten. What seems even more remarkable to me is that Israel has mustered the will and resources to provide preschool programs for more than half of all disadvantaged three-year-olds, most of them non-Western in origin. Not only that, but your goal is to reach all disadvantaged three-year-olds with preschool classes in the immediate future. Also worth noting is the fact that in communities with large disadvantaged populations, there are day centers that accept children almost from birth. Likewise, in the justly famed kibbutzim, and in the lesser known but equally significant moshavim, or cooperative villages, infants are placed in day care or early childhood development centers. A United States House select subcommittee on education that visited Israel two summers ago noted that the facilities for preschool programs were well-staffed and well-operated. "We found," the report stated, "that preschool children seem to use tools and equipment which most Americans would consider too sophisticated for two-to-four-year-olds." I am not suggesting that

your system is a perfect model for us, but it is clear that Israel's work in preschool education deserves the most thoughtful attention and analysis in terms of our own needs.

In the second great area of our mutual concern—education of the diverse and disadvantaged—Israel has an especially marked success. Israel has of course attracted an influx of immigrants from undeveloped neighboring and distant regions, people whose traditional cultures have placed them at a disadvantage in contributing and competing in a modern, technological land. The scale of the problem is immense. Consider what our condition in this country would be if half the American people in this generation had come to the United States as immigrants and with backgrounds and cultures, moreover, that had little or no relevance to our society. Israel's answer to this stunning challenge is a whole battery of educational experiences that start in the day care and preschool programs we mentioned, and continue in the form of specialized programs through elementary and secondary schools, the military and adult evening classes. For elementary school disadvantaged children, for instance, there is an extended school day program involving special tutoring, recreation and athletic programs, and instruction in cultural heritage (which contrasts interestingly with our own long-established and recently lamented practice of rejecting and eventually destroying non-majority cultures). In the military, basic language and skill courses are available to youngsters who come to Israel as teenagers with virtually no formal education. For the adult immigrant, there are the intensive language centers and courses aimed at fostering their integration into the mainstream of society with as much rapidity as possible. The effectiveness of these multifaceted efforts can best be measured, in my opinion, by the remarkable sense of identity and purposefulness most Israelis have, in addition to basic cognitive skills. Irrespective of cultural and national background.

The third area of Israeli educational achievement, I would mention tonight, certainly has special interest to those of us in the Office of Education. It is career education—which, as you may be aware, is now the number one priority of OE. Career education is not necessarily a new idea. In fact, it was one of the greatest of Jewish scholars, the Rabbi Maimonides—philosopher, physician, mathematician, and theologian—who counseled as follows in the 13th century:

"Anticipate charity by preventing poverty; assist the reduced man by teaching him a trade; and putting him in the way of business; so that he may earn self-respect and a livelihood and not be forced to the dreadful alternative of holding out his hand to charity. This is the highest step and the summit of charity's golden ladder."

To quote something more contemporary, I would refer again to the special subcommittee on education that visited Israel. The group commented that:

"Members of the subcommittee were impressed by the fact that all the high schools we visited, whether rural or urban, had a strong vocational-technical component. We observed, in several different geographical and cultural settings, young people, age 14 and 15, at work on expensive metal lathes or doing relatively difficult tool and die exercises.

"We also felt it significant that nearly all vocational technical secondary schools are actually comprehensive high schools. In no instance did we visit a school described as a 'vocational school' in which vocational training was any more than a part of a comprehensive secondary education."

Well, here again, much as I respect and admire their accomplishments, it's a little disconcerting to find that Israelis at this early stage in their development seem to be attaining an educational goal that is largely

only a gleam in our eye. In providing a comprehensive secondary school system, Dr. Allon, you are enabling your youngsters to qualify for good jobs upon graduation or postsecondary education and training, and, what is virtually as important, to choose their own future rather than having it thrust upon them. This strengthening of skills and broadening of choice are precisely what we're trying to do in the development of a viable career education program in the United States. Our need is to alter drastically the situation which prevails today in which millions of our youngsters emerge from high school and college—either as graduates or dropouts—with a general or liberal arts education, and with virtually no skills to offer in the workaday world. Clearly, Israel's career education activities are deserving of our most intensive scrutiny as we seek in this Nation the same modernity, the same utility, the same sort of results that are distinguishing your efforts.

Israel could hardly have a minister of education more sympathetic to the career education concept than Dr. Allon, particularly to the idea of flexibly leaving and re-entering the system at one's inclination and need, rather than as the result of a rigid predetermination. Dr. Allon's personal experience proves the wisdom of the approach, having entered the Army as a youth—temporarily terminating formal education at that point—and later resuming studies at Oxford. Dr. Allon returned to education when he needed to return and wanted to return, and my vision of career education in the United States includes the exercise of such free choice on an unlimited scale.

But, even recognizing your achievements in these difficult areas I have cited, it strikes me that we can learn the most from Israel in analyzing the means by which you have managed to build a sense of public confidence and faith in your educational system. On that score, the House subcommittee commented in very favorable terms, "Everywhere we visited," the report notes, "people told us: 'Education is the key to the survival of Israel.'" I likewise believe that education is the key to survival of the United States, if not quite in the physical sense, certainly in the sense of evolving the kind of society that not only assures growth and development but also guarantees humane and justice. Surely without a society answering that description, the United States could not be described as having survived in any accurate sense. Therefore, I would like to take a few moments more to lay before you the general condition of disaffection that unquestionably exists between the educational system of the United States—preparatory through graduate school—and a rather large segment of its citizenry, and to elicit from you your views, and thoughts, and ideas as to the steps we must take in every part of the educational enterprise to make it once again trusted implicitly and supported willingly and even enthusiastically.

Probing the seemingly mysterious, elusive, and often fickle ways of public opinion can be like looking for a black cat in a dark room. Yet somehow we must deal with this issue of how the various groups, and individuals, and organizations that fall under the overall heading of "public opinion" view this basic institution of ours that is so fundamental to the successful operation of all the others. Admittedly, we have little specific data on which to make a careful analysis of the whys and wherefores of public distrust of the schools. We do know, though, that bond issues are routinely shot down, tax levies are rejected, bitter confrontations are the norm at board meetings, and students—at all levels of education—are in rebellion against many of the forms and standards of instruction that in the past both served the needs of the country and at the same time allowed for personal ful-

filament and profit. Members of this Academy are certainly proof of the latter.

Yet we must deal with the reality of the criticism, some of which unfortunately has more than just a ring of truth. We would be remiss, for instance, if we failed to acknowledge that years after, and billions of dollars later, a commitment to turn around ineffective inner-city schools has not been fulfilled. Of course, there are individual urban districts and schools to which we can point with pride, but they are the exceptions that underscore our fundamental lack of success. However, if we gamely accept the brickbats of failure, then the orchids of success should also be ours. Statistics show, for example, that black enrollment in colleges and universities more than doubled during the decade of the 1960's and totals nearly a half-million today, and that all manner of educational opportunities are opening in significant volume to the hitherto shamefully treated minorities of America. In 1970, it should be noted, a larger percentage of blacks were enrolled in higher education in the United States than were all races enrolled in higher education in Western Europe.

Statistics of this kind, however impressive, are understandably of small comfort to all those who have been failed, and who still are being failed, by our schools. So I think it not unnatural for us to receive criticism from the media, from our books, and from the mouths of scholars such as yourselves who find the system wanting. In the time-honored but, in this instance, valid cliché of public speakers, much *has* been accomplished, much *remains* to be done. Education, after all, if not a many-splendored thing, is indeed a many-faceted institution. And if we are to be judged fairly, then our objectives and aspirations must be laid out clearly, so that the public has at least an even chance of properly evaluating the extent of our accountability or, if the case can be made, culpability. The Office of Education does have today a clearly defined set of objectives, three of which I mentioned earlier. The others, as you probably know, are Right-to-Read, improvement of education of the handicapped, encouragement of innovation, and better management of all these and other educational activities that the Federal Government is engaged in.

We recognize, quite naturally, that in being very specific about our goals, we are setting ourselves up for more of the same type of criticism in the future that education is currently receiving. But what is criticism, after all, but a measure of the concern and interest people have that an individual or an institution perform to fullest expectation? In education criticism is, at least in part, an honest-to-goodness expression of just how well we have performed in the past in sending forth from our schools and colleges thoughtful and insightful people who manifestly care about what is happening to their kids in classrooms. You are all by now familiar with the poised, articulate, and knowing young men and women who can, at the drop of a hat, take the system apart, and through such performances unconsciously provide a very accurate testimonial to the good quality of their own educational experiences. So we know we have done something right despite the sound and fury. And the more they come down on us and our efforts, we should recognize the more they're rooting for our ultimate success.

In the meantime, we in the profession must accept the judgment of our publics, including, of course, this Academy and the scholarly community of educators it represents. We need your criticism, and we need your wise and practical counsel. We also need to benefit from the insights and experiences of educators outside this country—from Israel and undoubtedly from many other nations. But we must determine precisely how we are to take advantage of *their* models in meeting *our* needs. How do they

have to be modified and shaped for the American setting? What about our objectives themselves? While they are not immutable, we do happen to believe that they meet the needs of our time. But perhaps there are other, more significant goals that need to be proclaimed. And how do we restore the faith we and our fathers had in education as the best vehicle for not only enhancing our society but the lives of each individual?

I realize that these are elemental, nagging questions and that we have been groping for the answers in one way or another for about as long as the educational establishment has been in existence. Yet I ask them again today because it seems to me that we have a better chance of finding satisfactory answers today than ever before. And while I realize the difficulties entailed—we are not, for example, doing very well in our search for the best ways to educate the poor, or to overcome physical or mental handicaps, or to channel the talents of the gifted, and so forth—yet I must stress that my stance is basically one of optimism. As Larry Cremin said recently, "Men and women without hope do not choose to study and teach. It is the very essence of education," he continued, "to look up from the blackness and try to see the stars. And if it makes us sometimes seem a bit foolishly optimistic, I am more than ready to answer the charge."

As for myself, I too am ready to answer the charge of foolish optimism. For I do not believe it is foolish to hope and believe that education can be made to match even a typically large American expectation. Or to overcome a physically small but educationally difficult condition that one would encounter in Israel. I do not expect that education will create a millenium in its own terms, a time of perfection when men and women will receive from teachers and schools precisely what they want. For normal expectations must always reach beyond reality, and schools must always—in that sense—fail. It is simply my purpose to try to make that margin of failure as narrow as possible.

"MASS-PORTATION"—A NEW CONCEPT IN MOVING PEOPLE

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at the recent Transpo 72 exhibit a firm from my home in Oakland County, Mich., demonstrated a new and revolutionary idea for the mass transportation of people. The system, called Mass-Portation, is being advanced by United Technology, Inc., of Southfield, Mich. I found this system to be a refreshing and innovative approach to the crisis of urban transportation.

Mr. Speaker, the problem of urban mass transportation is upon us. Nothing we say either now or in the future will make it go away. The movement of mass numbers of people from one part of a city to another, or from the center of the city to outlying areas, or vice versa, has been debated, planned, designed, and in some instances financed at great costs to the taxpayer.

All concepts I have known anything about, and those shown at Transpo 72 a few weeks ago, are a result of updating and modernizing existing modes of the movement of people.

"People movers," are so new that an

actual system for the mass movement of people from within and without any city has yet to be completed.

Mass-Portation is recognized by officials at the Department of Transportation as the only real "new" system they have seen. Mass-Portation is a constantly moving "people mover," powered by electric linear induction motors. This eliminates the need for bearings, and practically eliminates all noise. There is no emission of fumes to cause pollution.

Mass-Portation will move along at 30 miles an hour without stopping, while a moving conveyor or loading platform alongside the car brings people to the 30-mile-an-hour speed for them to conveniently step aboard. The car never stops. Each loading area loads similarly at every 1,300 maximum feet apart.

A somewhat conventional system presently nearing completion with a seating capacity of 18,000 passengers is reported to cost \$1.5 billion, giving it a per-seat cost of about \$83,000. Mass-Portation would cost about \$1,000 per seat for the same distance and for the same amount of construction below and above ground. That is where the big saving in cost is made.

Here are some of the advantages of Mass-Portation as the answer to the Nation's mass transit problems:

First, the system is amazingly simple. There are no computers to lose memory and foul up the machinery.

Second, no lost time in loading. The main conveyor never stops.

Third, loading and unloading is easy because this can be accomplished all along the system. The loading and unloading conveyor stops every 1,300 feet.

Fourth, it is safe. There are no exposed pits or high voltage third rails.

Fifth, it is clean, attractive. It is air-conditioned in the summer and heated in the winter. There is no place trash or dirt can accumulate.

Sixth, it is quiet. The system moves on plastic grooved wheels, that move along on plastic track, eliminating the noise from metal wheels on metal track.

Before going into mass transportation for our cities, I hope transportation and city government officials will look at Mass-Portation. I think it is an answer to their need for the best possible people mover at the lowest possible cost.

HERITAGE '76

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of discussion about what the ARBC is doing, has done, and proposes to do relative to the historic commemoration of the American Revolution and the Declaration of Independence and, as I briefly pointed out on the floor the other day, there is an ARBC Heritage Committee headed by the very distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. James Biddle, who is president of the National Trust for His-

toric Preservation. On his committee are the following: James Biddle, chairman; Dr. Paul Smith, vice chairman; Senator Harry Byrd; Ann Hawkes Hutton; Dr. Richard McCormick; Rogers C. B. Morton, Secretary of Interior, ex-officio; Quincy Mumford, Librarian of Congress, ex-officio; James Rhoads, Archivist of the United States, ex-officio, and Fredrick Seaton.

Noted below is this committee's statement of principles and purposes and advisory panels, also a May 22, 1972 report: HERITAGE '76: A STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES AND PURPOSE

"The heritage of America embraces the whole country. It is the substance of our collective memory. The Bicentennial Era is rich in historic events to be commemorated and provides opportunity for direct citizen participation in examining the heritage and values of this nation.

"The Bicentennial is the anniversary of these first two hundred years of growth and development. Though this nation is now troubled by both ancient and modern problems of human society, the Commission first urges an examination of our country: its heritage and values. . . . We have faced countless problems and have continued to function and grow under our establishing Constitution longer than any other contemporary nation. This heritage of acting, or change, and of willingness to change will carry America forward to its third century." (*Commission Report to the President, 1970.*)

"Heritage '76" is one of three themes adopted by the ARBC for the 200th anniversary of the American Revolution in 1976. The other two are concerned with developing a nationwide program to encourage widespread visitation and participation in the Bicentennial by citizens of the U.S. and other countries, and a forward-looking program to celebrate the nation's heritage by improving its democratic processes and conditions of life.

The Heritage '76 Committee is the principal arm of the ARBC for evaluating and proposing Bicentennial programs in the Heritage area. It is responsible for recommending ARBC approval of Heritage programs to be included in the National Bicentennial Program, and for assisting State and local Bicentennial Commissions with the development of their Heritage programs. It is responsible for Heritage programs conducted by the Commission in conjunction with other nations, individuals and groups in other countries.

The Committee is authorized to establish standing advisory panels to provide advice on a regular, continuing basis, as well as ad hoc advisory panels which are to function as needed. It has the authority to employ consultants for special assignments related to the development or evaluation of programs.

DIMENSIONS OF THE PROGRAM

A primary emphasis of the Bicentennial Commission in the anniversary program will be on improving the quality of American life. A goal and responsibility of Heritage '76 will be to reinterpret and reaffirm the values of the Revolution.

Heritage '76 is concerned not only with the past but also with the present and the future. It is as interested in the continuity and contemporary validity of those ideals. It is as much concerned with the present state of our national inheritance as it is with the events which led up to the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

Heritage '76 recognizes that the American Revolution is a permanent process of renewal, change and improvement in American life; that political institutions and forms of government, as well as all the agencies of social responsibility, must reflect the

times, and adapt to changing needs; that in 1976, as in 1776, social, economic and political systems must serve the ultimate purposes of a democratic nation to free men from tyranny and oppression, from injustice, from human deprivation and the denial of human rights, and from the degradation and destruction of the natural habitat and the social environment. The American Revolution is a continuing revolution, and the "pursuit of happiness" a continuing quest.

HERITAGE CONCEIVED AS CULTURAL UNIQUENESS

The Heritage '76 program is conceived as that aspect of the Bicentennial program which will be directly concerned with the values, laws, institutions—beliefs and achievements, or cultural heritage, of the American people.

Yet for purposes of commemorating the anniversary of the American Revolution, there is a fruitful way of defining the cultural aspects of the American heritage, one which will give both focus and meaning to the celebration of not only the birth, but also the growth and development of our country. It will be viewed in the specific sense of cultural uniqueness—those characteristics of our nation which were considered distinctive and significant at the time of its founding, and are still regarded as being the essence of "the American way of life."

The Commission, in this vast and varied country, should seek to establish a heritage program which recognizes the many differences and perspectives involved in celebrating the anniversary of the Revolution. In the thirteen original states, for instance, the heritage program will be different than in other states. Similarly, the perspectives of minority groups may differ substantially from those of majority groups in the society. Heritage '76 will take these differences into account in the development of the national program.

The American Revolution belongs to all Americans, and each must interpret it individually. Neither the Commission nor any other group can legitimately claim to be the only spokesman for the principles of the American Revolution and their relationship to contemporary society.

There are, however, values and traditions which should be common to all Americans. These are the tradition of elective, representative government; the tradition of law, of due process, of justice; the tradition of equal opportunity; the tradition of free speech and press, freedom of assembly, freedom from fear and want; the tradition of personal privacy; the tradition of respect for human life and the rights of others. They can be celebrated with all of the variety, spontaneity, and vitality of which Americans are capable, and in a manner and style which do credit to the occasion.

We have not always been unwavering in building these traditions within the framework of our ideals; however, the Bicentennial should serve as the occasion for examining how we can better attain the original goals and purposes of the American Revolution.

PRESERVING THE PAST

To stimulate the preservation of the remaining tangible evidence of our past—the districts, sites, buildings and objects significant in American history and culture—and to sharpen public awareness of the need for this will be one of the principal goals of Heritage '76.

An increasing number of Americans are beginning to realize that the past need not necessarily be past, that the past has not only brought us where we are, but that it can continue to serve our contemporary needs and to enrich our environment. When they grasp what is implied in the statement that almost half of the 15,000 structures in the U.S. officially declared to be of historic or architectural significance have been de-

stroyed during the past 30 years, they are ready to act to stop this wanton plunder.

Building on the work done by the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the National Park Service and many state and local organizations, Heritage '76 will make every effort to reach this vast reserve of preservation sentiment and offer Americans the means to organize their preservation efforts. There can be little doubt that they will respond positively to a realistically planned program geared to community requirements.

Historic records of government, particularly in states and counties, are also yielding to the vicissitudes of time and neglect, and to abuse by those who lack a sense of history. Only in recent years have steps been taken to preserve and to utilize more effectively the remarkable collections of historic records on the revolutionary period which are available in the United States. There is, for example, a vast collection of official papers on the Continental Congress, but only small portions have ever been published, and the collection was not even microfilmed until a few years ago. Moreover, the papers have never been adequately indexed, and this limits the utility of the microfilms. By 1976, however, after a lapse of 200 years, the papers will finally become fully available when the National Archives, as a basic part of its Heritage '76 program, completes a comprehensive index to the collection.

In addition, the Archives, through the National Historical Publications Commission, is assisting with the preparation of definitive editions of the papers of Washington, Franklin, Jefferson, Madison, Hamilton, John Adams, and hopes to aid in the publication of papers of other leading figures of the period of the Revolution. These projects will fill a long-standing need in the study of the founding of the United States.

The Library of Congress, which has in its collections the most extensive collection of private historical source materials in the country, is preparing, as a Bicentennial project, guides to the manuscripts, maps, broadsides, prints, music, and the like relating to the American Revolution (1765-89) that are in its custody. It is also collecting copies of the Letters of Delegates to the Continental Congress and the Congress of the Confederation for editing and publication in some 20-25 volumes.

Simply stated, Heritage '76 will be concerned with what Americans can see, touch and feel of their historic past, with the houses, churches, bridges, parks, documents and decorative objects that form the heritage of their manmade environment.

CONSERVING THE FUTURE

Our national heritage consists of our democratic philosophy, our political and other social institutions and traditions, our historic places, records and artifacts—in short, our culture. But there is another dimension, which is an essential aspect of a program commemorating the American Revolution. This is our natural heritage—the natural wonders of which we once could sing—"America the Beautiful . . . from Sea to Shining Sea." Two hundred years ago it was unspoiled wilderness, one of the most magnificent and abundant lands in all of nature. Today, while still beautiful and abundant in part, it is suffering from the unthinking devastations of man.

At a time when all Americans are becoming conscious of the relationships between man and nature, between the human social world and the other living and nonliving systems in our ecosystem, it is appropriate, therefore, to define "heritage" as including our natural heritage.

Just as political systems must remain vital and valid if they are to survive, so natural systems must continue to support the environment required for social existence. If our natural heritage is to continue to sustain our society, and if our descendants are

to inherit a healthy, natural and physical world, we must carry out our responsibilities to strengthen, protect and preserve that natural inheritance. We must defend our environment against further abuse, as well as to correct the misuses which are evident in every part of the country.

BROADENING DEMOCRATIC BELIEFS AND INSTITUTIONS

The nation's 200th anniversary comes at a time when many of its citizens question the efficacy of its policies, and even the validity of its institutions. Therefore, it is fortuitous that the Bicentennial should coincide with the re-examination of the values and premises of the democratic process. The Heritage '76 Committee will seek ways of encouraging discussion of the values and principles of American democracy, the possibilities for improving the democratic process, our laws and institutions, and the uses made of our resources. If it is to have meaning for the multitude of Americans who are searching for goals and purpose in their lives and in the national life of their country, the Bicentennial will serve as a time of reconsideration and reaffirmation; of reconstruction, rather than the mere celebration of historical events; and above all, of renewal and rededication to making this a country worthy of the aspirations of its founders and responsive to the needs of all of its citizens.

HERITAGE '76 COMMITTEE ADVISORY PANELS

Historic Conservation Panel: American Association of Museums, American Institute of Architects, American Institute of Interior Designers, American Institute of Landscape Architects, American Institute of Planners, American Society of Civil Engineers, The Garden Club of America, National Trust for Historic Preservation, Society for American Archaeology, Society of Architectural Historians.

Commemoration and Convocations Panel: American Academy of Arts and Sciences, American Antiquarian Society, American Association for State and Local History, American Historical Association, American Philosophical Society, American Political Science Association, Daughters of the American Revolution, Phi Beta Kappa, Sons of the American Revolution, United States Capitol Historical Society.

Publications and Research panel: American Association for State and Local History, American Historical Association, American Political Science Association, Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, Institute of Early American History and Culture, National Historical Publications Commission, Organization of American Historians, Society of American Archivists.

The first meeting of the Heritage '76 Program Committee of the ARBC, chaired by James Biddle, President of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, was held in Washington, D.C. on December 10, 1971.

All but two members of the Committee were present at the meeting. The Committee discussed the Heritage '76 Statement of Principles and Purposes; the establishment of three advisory panels: a) Historic Conservation, b) Commemoration and Convocations, and c) Publications and Research; and the selection of organizations to serve on those advisory panels. There was a minimum of four months work required in contacting appropriate individuals and organizations leading to the creation of the Heritage Advisory Panels. These panels were created to provide the program committee with needed advice and expertise for recommending historically oriented programs to be developed by the Heritage Committee and the ARBC. The Heritage Committee also agreed on the necessity to encourage participation in the Heritage program by as many appropriate and concerned groups as possible.

The first meeting of the Heritage '76 Advisory Panels were held in Washington, D.C.

on February 10th and 11th, 1972. Those present at the meetings are indicated in Attachment B. Among the proposals discussed by the Historic Conservation Advisory Panel was an archeological site conservation action program for junior and senior high school students encouraging them to investigate their own local heritage by making historical base maps, inventory historic artifacts and tape record conversations with senior citizens to establish a sense of identity for young people with their communities. Each representative serving on the Historic Conservation Panel was encouraged to compile a list of projects that his or her organization thought should have the highest priority during the Bicentennial Era. It was recommended that the preservation of historic buildings be emphasized and the study and contribution of the immigrants that settled each locality or region be recorded.

The Commemorations and Convocations Advisory Panel representatives discussed the proposed Bicentennial plans and programs of their respective organizations. Mention was made of the many activities and programs underway or being planned at the local and State levels and of the need of close coordination on the part of the Heritage '76 Committee and the Commemorations and Convocations Advisory Panel in developing Bicentennial Commemoration and Convocation plans.

The Publications and Research Advisory Panel recommended that the ARBC establish a joint Federal-State, public-private program to locate, identify, preserve, and make available the historic records from state and local sources throughout the United States. Resulting from this was an invitation from James Biddle, Chairman of the Heritage '76 Committee for the formation of an ad hoc committee of the Publications and Research Advisory Panel, consisting of Dr. Bartholomew Cox, representing the American Society for Legal History (Chief, Center for the Documentary Study of the Revolution); Dr. Daniel P. Jordan, representing the Organization of American Historians (Department of History, Virginia Commonwealth University); Dr. Charles E. Lee, representing the Society of American Archivists (Archivist of the State of South Carolina); Dr. Edward Papenfuss, Jr., representing the American Historical Association (AHA staff member); Dr. Samuel S. Silsby, Jr., representing the SAA (Archivist of the State of Maine); Dr. James Morton Smith, representing the American Association for the State of Local History (Director, Wisconsin State Historical Society); Dr. Clarence L. Ver Steeg, representing the American Historical Association (Department of History, Northwestern University, and Chairman of the AHA Committee on the Bicentennial); Dr. Richmond D. Williams, representing the American Association for State and Local History (Director Eleutherian Mills Historical Library, Greenville, Delaware); Dr. James E. O'Neill, Deputy Archivist of the U.S. This ad hoc committee met on April 11, 1972, in Washington, D.C., to discuss a proposal for establishing a National Historic Records Program as a major Bicentennial project. In essence, the NHRP as a companion program to that for historic structures and sites which was created by the Historic Preservation Act of 1966, would involve the creation of appropriate mechanisms and principles for making matching grants to assist States, communities, groups, institutions and individuals in locating, identifying, preserving, making available and developing better utilization of the nation's historic records.

The group agreed that the NHRP would be submitted to the Heritage '76 Committee of the ARBC for its approval and support and that it then be presented to the full Commission for its approval and that the NHRP then be submitted to the President and Congress for appropriate action.

The second meeting of the Heritage '76 Program Committee was held in Boston on May 15, 1972; all members were present but one. The Committee adopted the Heritage '76 Statement of Principles and Purposes.

The Heritage Committee voted unanimously to approve the proposed NHRP. Mr. Biddle presented the NHRP to the full Commission. Dr. Richard P. McCormick, a member of the ARBC and the Heritage Committee, introduced Dr. Alexander Wall, President of the American Association for State and Local History; Dr. Thomas Cochran, President of the American Historical Association; Dr. T. Harry Williams, President of the Organization of American Historians; Dr. George L. Haskins, President of the American Society for Legal History; and Mr. Charles E. Lee, President of the Society of American Archivists, who discussed the National Historic Records Program and its relationship to the Bicentennial. The ARBC unanimously adopted a resolution introduced by Mr. Biddle, recommending the NHRP be an official ARBC program and that it be submitted to the President and Congress for appropriate action.

The Heritage Committee also agreed to add the National Conference of State Liaison Officers to the Historic Conservation Advisory Panel, and the American Council of Learned Societies, the American Library Association, the American Society for Legal History and the American Studies Association to the Publications and Research Advisory Panel.

Also, at this meeting, the Heritage '76 Committee directed the ARBC staff to send the Heritage '76 Statement of Principles and Purpose to all individuals and organizations who were thought to be interested or concerned with the historical aspects of the Bicentennial. The staff was also directed to send out letters encouraging participation in the Bicentennial by all National Veterans' groups, Patriotic societies, and hereditary and service organizations. These letters will, in addition, encourage the creation of an informal "Patriotic and Service Congress" to keep the ARBC advised of current Bicentennial plans.

Among other proposals, it has been recommended that State Bicentennial Commissions be requested to compile an annotated bibliography of historical publications being developed or published within the State in connection with the Bicentennial. The ARBC plans to publish periodically a national compilation of these bibliographies.

In addition, Federal agencies are well underway in their plans to commemorate the Bicentennial.

HAROLD V. EASTMAN, SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY'S "MR. WATER"

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the career of one of the greatest advocates of the development of our God-given water sources in San Joaquin Valley came to an end a few days ago with the passing of Harold V. Eastman of Chowchilla.

"Judge" Eastman, as he was fondly known by people from throughout the State, was also identified as "Mr. Water" in that area of the Golden State which he served so well. Many of us here in Congress, and especially those serving on the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittees will recall this quiet, dignified gentleman, who came to testify

concerning the needs of the area he served so well. His testimony, as was his management of the Chowchilla Water District, was efficient, to the point and effective. Judge Eastman lived for the Chowchilla Water District, which he helped establish and which he served as secretary-manager from the outset. One of his primary goals was the development of the Buchanan Dam and Reservoir project on the Chowchilla River, upstream from his home community.

It is indeed gratifying to know that during his lifetime this project got underway, and at groundbreaking ceremonies held a few weeks ago Judge Eastman was present and was presented the silver plated shovel which turned the first spadeful of dirt on this project. Just a day or two before his passing I was able to tell Judge Eastman that the contract for the main dam construction had been awarded. I know in his heart he felt that his mission had been accomplished.

In addition to his service to the Chowchilla Water District Judge Eastman took pride in the community in which he had lived for 50 years, helping to establish a junior fair, a hospital district, serving as mayor, as judicial district judge, and working with farm organizations for the benefit of the community. He was a gentle soul whose prime characteristic, described in the Chowchilla News, his hometown paper, was "one of patience."

Mr. Speaker, may I extend on behalf of myself, my wife and those of us here in Congress who have had the privilege of knowing Judge Eastman and working with him sincerest condolences to his wife, Laura, and other members of the family, and may I say that they can be proud of the growth and development not only of Chowchilla and Madera County but of the State and Nation which have resulted from the service of one of the most dedicated people I have ever known.

I would like at this point to insert in the Record the editorial comments recently found in the Chowchilla News, his hometown paper, and the Madera Daily Tribune, the paper serving the county-wide area. They express so well the affection and admiration which his fellowmen had for this great gentleman.

The articles follow:

[From the Chowchilla News]

H. V. "JUDGE" EASTMAN

A long career of public service came to an end Thursday with the death of Harold V. Eastman, 81. Funeral services were held Monday at 2 p.m. in the sanctuary of the First Baptist Church, of which he was a charter member, treasurer, and honorary deacon and trustee.

He died Thursday, June 8 at the Chowchilla Memorial Hospital following a short illness. Interment was in the Chowchilla District Cemetery.

Few persons will distinguish themselves in so many fields of endeavor as Mr. Eastman. In later years he qualified as "Mr. Water" in the San Joaquin Valley, since one of his principal activities has been in this field for the past quarter of a century. His knowledge took him to Sacramento and the nation's capitol on many occasions to testify on the subject before committees.

Mr. Eastman was brought to Chowchilla in 1924 by the late O. A. Robertson, from Minnesota, where the two were associated in land development. He came about a dec-

ade later than Mr. Robertson, founder of Chowchilla, and for a few years continued in the employ of Robertson's Land Company, which firm opened the Chowchilla Ranch to colonization in 1912.

His experience in his many activities no doubt paved the way to the leadership he showed as secretary-manager of the Chowchilla Water District. Working with others, he was instrumental in the separation of what is now Chowchilla Water District and the Madera Irrigation District. With the Chowchilla District formed, it was free to get going on bringing surface water to the district. It was a source of satisfaction to him and others on the CWD board to sign the first contact with the Bureau of Reclamation for water from Friant Dam.

Mr. Eastman found time to serve as a board member of the Chowchilla Junior Fair since its inception more than 25 years ago; was a leader in the formation of a hospital district and was a member of Friant Water Users organization.

This did not mean he did not have time for other organizations as he was an organizer and director of Calcut, Production Credit Association and the Federal Land Bank of Chowchilla. He served 16 years as mayor of Chowchilla and 20 years as judge of the Justice Court. He was a member of Lodge F&AM 485 of Chowchilla, of which he served as treasurer from 1929 to 1940 and received his 50 year membership pin in October of 1967. He was also associated with the V.F.W. and American Legion.

One word describes his character "patience." With his desk piled high with work he was never too busy to listen to a person recite his problems. It was a source of wonderment to understand how he accomplished his work with the numerous interruptions that came to him in the course of a day. So it was, no matter who sought his counsel, he would give a listening ear.

It can be said he wore many shoes during the half century of his life in Chowchilla, and it will be a long time before persons will be found who can fill them.

He leaves his wife Laura of Chowchilla, two sons, Harold Eastman of Fresno and Ralph Eastman of Chowchilla; two daughters, Mrs. Francis Dill of Fresno and Mrs. Helen O'Brien of Fresno and 17 grandchildren and 14 great grandchildren.

[From the Madera Daily Tribune]

JUDGE EASTMAN

We all owe so much to those pioneers who worked hard to make life quite a bit better for us.

One such man, without doubt, was Judge H. V. Eastman of Chowchilla who died at age 81. He helped lay the cornerstone which led to the development of his beloved city.

The judge came to Chowchilla over 50 years ago suffering from a lung disease that was supposed to be fatal in three months' time. But he proved to be a battler of Jack Dempsey proportions and helped breathe life into Chowchilla and in turn the city returned life to him. He often laughed about how he was supposed to have died decades ago.

Judge Eastman arrived when Chowchilla was in its infancy and helped chart a course that brought it from a farming colony into a city. He was Chowchilla's mayor for eight years, was a school board member and presided as judge for 20 years.

Keenly aware of the value of water in the valley, the judge was instrumental in forming the Chowchilla Water District, which he served as secretary-manager. In addition, he was a member of the Irrigation Districts Association of California and the Friant Water Users Association.

He always pushed for construction of Buchanan Dam on the Chowchilla River—which had groundbreaking ceremonies just last year—a dream come true for him although he did not live to see its completion.

One office observer points out there may

well be some impetus now to rename the dam in his honor.

There would be a precedent. In recognition to his endeavors on both the Chowchilla and Madera Fair Boards, the main fairgrounds' exhibit hall at Chowchilla bears his name, and there is Eastman Lake near Chowchilla, which pays tribute to him as a believer in water development and control.

TAXES: PLAIN TALK ON A PAINFUL TOPIC

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, about the only thing cheap concerning taxes is some of the surprisingly careless talk on the subject. Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN recently defended one of his proposals as meaning a "modest" increase in taxes for single persons and small families in the \$14,000 to \$16,000 a year bracket. With all due respects to the Senator, I must say it is my experience that taxpayers view a modest increase in their burden somewhere in the neighborhood of a modest case of leprosy. In brief, there just is no such animal.

Let us take a look back to 1773. Relative to other things, the proposed tax on tea sent to the colonies was also modest, but the following is the reaction from one group, who sent this letter to the captain of a ship bringing tea to Philadelphia:

Sir: We are informed that you have imprudently taken charge of a quantity of tea which has been sent out by the [East] India Company, under the auspices of the Ministry, as a trial of American virtue and resolution.

Now, as your cargo, on your arrival here, will most assuredly bring you into hot water, and as you are perhaps a stranger to these parts, we have concluded to advise you of the present situation of affairs in Philadelphia, that, taking time by the forelock, you may stop short in your dangerous errand, secure your ship against the rafts of combustible matter which may be set on fire and turned loose against her; and more than all this, that you may preserve your own person from the pitch and feathers that are prepared for you.

In the first place, we must tell you that the Pennsylvanians are, to a man, passionately fond of freedom, the birthright of Americans, and at all events are determined to enjoy it.

That they sincerely believe no power on the face of the earth has a right to tax them without their consent.

That, in their opinion, the tea in your custody is designed by the Ministry to enforce such a tax, which they will undoubtedly oppose, and in so doing, give you every possible obstruction.

We are nominated to a very disagreeable, but necessary, service: to our care are committed all offenders against the rights of America; and hapless is he whose evil destiny has doomed him to suffer at our hands.

You are sent out on a diabolical service; and if you are so foolish and obstinate as to complete your voyage by bringing your ship to anchor in this port, you may run such a gauntlet as will induce you in your last moments most heartily to curse those who have made you the dupe of their avarice and ambition.

What think you, Captain, of a halter around your neck—ten gallons of liquid tar

decanted on your pate—with the feathers of a dozen wild geese laid over that to enliven your appearance?

Only think seriously of this—and fly to the place from whence you came—fly without hesitation—without the formality of a protest—and above all, Captain Ayres, let us advise you to fly without the wild geese features.

Your friends to serve,

THE COMMITTEE OF TARRING
AND FEATHERING.
WHOSE "LOOPHOLES"?

The political thickets are full of Robin Hoods, who pause while busily stringing their verbal bows, ready to wing a quick shot at the fat and wicked sheriff, and shed copious tears over the "mammoth loopholes" that let "the rich" get away without paying taxes. They will cite the 1968 figure that showed 222 returns with incomes over \$200,000, and no taxes paid.

Let us look a little closer at this; in fact, let us consider it against the 74 million tax returns filed in 1968. That comes down to three in 1 million escaping taxes; the loopholes closed rather quickly, did they not?

Now, there were also 12,440,000 tax returns filed in 1968 where people did not pay any taxes, either. Primarily, because these "tax evaders" had less than \$5,000 in adjusted gross income.

Now how about the 222 wealthy who did not pay? In their same income bracket, over \$200,000 there were 19,001 returns that did not have loopholes of any sort and choked up almost \$4 billion in taxes. In numbers they were far below 1 percent of total returns, but they paid 4.9 percent of all income tax dollars.

Much tongue-clucking goes on about the top 20 percent of our population that collects 46 percent of all income. And the lowest 20 percent receives only 3.2 percent. But this top 20 percent pays 65 percent of all taxes. And the lowest 20 percent pays only 0.5 percent of all taxes.

And one more thing: Just who fits in this top 20 percent of rich? Anyone—any family—bringing in over \$12,000 a year. If you are in this, or hoping to get there, or moving closer, then, be careful about running after any soak-the-rich schemes. The truth of the matter is, you will be soaking yourself.

One last word about "the rich." One of Senator McGovern's most noted charges was that ITT paid no Federal taxes in the last 5 years. ITT paid over \$100 million in Federal taxes in the last 5 years. And let us look at another statement he once made:

It is the Establishment center that has erected an unjust burden on the backs of the American workers while 40 percent of the corporations paid no Federal income taxes at all last year.

The year 1969 is the last year for which complete figures are available. It is true that right at 40 percent of 1,749,345 corporate tax returns had no check attached to them.

For the simple reason that in the vast majority of cases they had no income on which to pay tax.

Corporations are things other than GM, Ford, GE, ITT. Anyone with the most rudimentary grounding in business knows a corporation can be a very tiny

operation indeed, struggling to stay alive, and doing so only through the night and day week-long sweat and labor of a family or two.

And one more word about corporate wealth. In 1971 corporations paid \$38 billion in Federal taxes, but they distributed only \$26 billion in dividends. This is hardly indicative of great wealth being hoarded and the poor being cheated as a result. Dividend checks do not go just in large amounts to majority stockholders. More than one widow, or widow with a family, or elderly couple, put great dependence on these dividend checks to survive. In 1965 there were 20,100,000 stockholders in this country. Today there are over 31,900,000, and the number grows daily.

And who holds this stock? Latest figures are for 1965; half of all stockholders had total incomes under \$10,000 a year; 6 million were under \$7,500.

WHAT "LOOPHOLES"?

When you hear that term, do not automatically think of deductions for mineral depletion, or other things primarily of concern to boards of directors and heads of corporations. Technically speaking, a loophole is anything that allows a deduction. Legislation has been introduced in both House and Senate which in its wording calls for termination of 54 such loopholes by specified dates. Following is a list of the loopholes and the dates for their abolition:

PROVISIONS TERMINATED ON AND AFTER JANUARY 1, 1974

1. The \$30,000 exemption for the minimum tax.
2. The deduction of ordinary income taxes for the minimum tax.
3. The exclusion from gross income of group-term life insurance of employees.
4. The \$5,000 death benefit exclusion.
5. The \$100 dividend exclusion.
6. The guaranteed business bad debt deduction.
7. The provision permitting assets to be written off over a period 20 per cent shorter than their class lives under the ADR system.
8. The capital gain treatment of lump-sum distribution from pension funds.
9. Qualified stock options.
10. The tax exemption for credit unions and certain mutual insurance funds.
11. Special reserves for losses on bad debts of banks, mutual savings banks, etc.
12. Percentage depletion for oil, gas, and other minerals.
13. Capital gain for timber, coal, and iron ore royalties.
14. Exclusion of gross-up on dividends of less developed country corporations.
15. Exclusion of earned income from foreign sources.
16. The alternative tax on capital gains of corporations and individuals.
17. The recapture rules for real property.
18. The special exemption for excess deductions account for farm losses.

PROVISIONS TERMINATED ON AND AFTER JANUARY 1, 1975

1. The exclusion from gross income of sick pay.
2. The deduction for nonbusiness interest.
3. The deduction for nonbusiness taxes.
4. Fast depreciation methods.
5. The deduction of research and experimental expenditures.
6. The deduction of soil and water conservation expenditures.
7. Additional first-year depreciation allowance.

8. The deduction of expenditures for clearing land.
9. Amortization of railroad grading and tunnel bores.
10. The deduction of intangible drilling and development costs.
11. The deduction of development expenditures in case of mines.
12. The exemption of ships under foreign flags.
13. The special deduction for Western Hemisphere trade corporations.
14. The exemption of income from sources within possessions of the United States.
15. The exclusion from Subpart F of shipping profits and certain dividends and interest.
16. The provisions relating to domestic international sales corporations.
17. Step-up in tax basis of property acquired from a decedent.
18. Capital gain from the sale or exchange of patents.

PROVISIONS TERMINATED ON AND AFTER JANUARY 1, 1976

1. The \$25,000 corporate surtax exemption.
2. The retirement income credit.
3. The deduction and credit for political contributions.
4. The investment credit.
5. The exclusion of interest on state and local bonds.
6. The exclusion of the rental value of parsonages.
7. The exclusion from gross income of scholarships and fellowships.
8. The exclusion from gross income of gain on sale of residence by person over 65.
9. Additional personal exemptions for the aged and blind.
10. The exemption for child where income exceeds \$750.
11. The deduction for nonbusiness casualty losses.
12. The charitable contribution deduction.
13. The medical expense deduction.
14. The child care deduction.
15. The moving expense deduction.
16. Nonrecognition of gain on the use of appreciated property to redeem stock.
17. Nonrecognition of gain in connection with certain liquidations.
18. The deduction for long-term capital gains.

Now, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means (Mr. Mills) who introduced the House version—H.R. 15230—has made it quite clear that he has listed these provisions in his bill for the purposes of review. He has also said he himself finds many of them desirable under present circumstances. He has stated, and I agree, that—

Many of these terminations will not, in fact, be allowed to occur.

But I cite them here as a reminder that only a very small percentage of taxpayers exist who do not have occasion to take advantage of a loophole.

It goes without saying that elimination of some of these would be nothing less than disastrous to a great many families who are now struggling to make ends meet. For instance, the provision allowing deduction of interest has been one that has put homeownership in reach of millions. Remove this and the home mortgage burden will be far too heavy for many to bear.

Deductions to charitable institutions? If it is no longer tax-deductible, this contribution will surely drop, drastically, and mean the death of many community and national organizations that now live only on voluntary contributions

Retirement income credits? Ask anyone who is retired what this means to them.

Medical care exemptions? Ask the family that is trying to pay medical bills.

Now, there will be no tax-reform legislation until next year. Hearings will be held this year to see how the House Committee on Ways and Means should proceed, but the chairman (Mr. MILLS) has announced that—

I will ask the committee to make tax reform the first order of business when we get back into the business of the new Congress.

Never mind the tune; listen to the words.

Talleyrand was one of France's greatest statesmen and diplomats. He also has the questionable distinction of being one of history's most notorious two-faced turncoats and opportunists. He has, however, left us, out of his rather checkered career, some pithy gems on politics and one in particular is appropriate here:

The art of politics is to find new names for institutions which, under old names, have become odious to the people.

Tax reform is a nice tune to hum, sing, or whistle. But how about the words? If you lift a tax from one thing, as sure as anything grows it is going to be laid upon something else. Mussolini, not the diplomat Talleyrand was, had a comment for that:

The economists are not yet agreed as to what is a tax and what is an impost; but the taxpayer at the window finds that it is a futile discussion, because, impost or tax, he has to pay it.

"Something for everybody" at first sound has a certain siren-like attractiveness, but the blunt truth is, "something for everybody" will mean "everybody will pay something"—usually a lot more something than they are paying now.

REFORM? HOW ABOUT SIMPLICITY AND HONESTY?

No one questions the need for reform—now and in the future—because by its very nature, the concept of reform also means constant review with an eye to changing circumstances. I have tried in the foregoing to scrape away some of the glitter to show the dross underneath, and illustrate that yelling "Reform!" at the top of the lungs often drowns out the facts of the matter being whispered elsewhere.

How about simplicity? The U.S. Treasury would go along with that one; so would everyone else. We cannot escape a certain degree of complexity but I believe it is obvious that we are all about to disappear and lose our sanity under a mound of laws, codes, regulations, terms, and interpretations that would defy the collective wisdom of the ages.

It is said of Napoleon that when he ordered new codification of the laws of France, he stressed they were to be condensed to the point where any Frenchman could carry a copy in his hip pocket. At present it takes a semi truck—not too far from the truth—to haul tax laws around. At least they could be cut down to wheelbarrow size.

And how about some more honesty on the all-important subject of what we are getting for our tax money? The highly prestigious and independent Brookings Institution in Washington, D.C., recently released a major study called "Setting National Priorities: the 1973 Budget." The New York Times called the study "An Epitaph for the Great Society" and pointed out that what Brookings was really saying was that while there was plenty of money—Federal social spending up from \$30 billion to \$110 billion in 10 years; great society programs alone from \$1.7 billion to \$35.7 billion—there was no knowledge of what was going on. The net result was immense waste of time, effort, talent—and tax money.

From the study:

Once it was decided that the federal government should undertake an activity, and that a particular amount of money should be allocated to it, getting the job done was not considered an overriding problem of national policy. . . . It was considered safe to assume that if federal money were allocated to a particular objective, that objective would be achieved.

For a while, the new aspirations and the old approach to setting priorities persisted side by side. It was not immediately recognized that the new demands on the federal government required that attention be paid to how federal programs were to be carried out. The problem of setting national priorities in the 1960s was still seen primarily as determining what should be done and how much should be spent. The idea persisted that if one could identify a problem and allocate some federal money to it, the problem would get solved. (emphasis in original)

Of course, it was wrong, all wrong. An English classical scholar once commented on the same attitude, prevalent in Rome in the fading days of her glory. He noted that for years the Roman eagles had carried the letters SPQR—Senatus Populusque Romanus—the Senate and Roman people. But with the concept of bread and circuses, he observed, the meaning had subtly changed to Stultus Populus Quaerit (ad) Roman—or, the stupid people run to Rome, as they saw Rome the solution, through more spending, to all of their problems.

Reform? Certainly; as I have stated, reform is a constant process. No one individual has a corner on the process, nor on the idea. I am surprised they would think they could sell themselves so easily to the public on such a stance.

Simplicity? A must, before we collectively go mad each April 15.

Honesty about what we are getting, and the courage to say "Thus far and no farther, and even seriously consider stepping back"? Equally essential, before we spend ourselves into utter bankruptcy.

Or slavery. That comes right along with bankruptcy. Plato said, centuries ago, in the republic:

The tyrant . . . Has he not also another object which is that they may be impoverished by payment of taxes, and thus compelled to devote themselves to their daily wants and therefore less likely to conspire against him?

FORMER CONGRESSMAN RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH SPEAKS TO MOTHERS OF WORLD WAR II ANNUAL CONVENTION

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, our good friend and former colleague, Rick Roudesh, has been serving his country faithfully and well in the executive branch as Assistant Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for the last 2 years.

In the following remarks he addressed the important and misunderstood question of the VA hospital and medical care system, and I am proud to insert his speech in the RECORD at this point:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH, ASSISTANT DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE MOTHERS OF WORLD WAR II

Madam President—my friend, Sophie Sulski—ladies of the mothers of World War Two. There are several reasons why I am delighted to meet with you today.

I am aware that this is your 29th national convention—and that your group was organized 30 years ago in Gary, Indiana—and that the Gary unit, No. 1, is still very active in your organization.

It was very pleasant to recall that your national headquarters is located in Indianapolis, Indiana. I pass your national headquarters frequently—for as you may know—Indiana is my home State—and I had the privilege for many years of serving Indiana people in the Congress of the United States.

To come back to the Midwest—to be in Illinois—next door to Indiana, is always a pleasure, but, to also have the good fortune of meeting with you is an honor and a privilege.

At any time it would be entirely fitting for me to pay deserved tribute to the unselfish women who make up the mothers of World War II.

Hospital volunteers are not only unselfish people, who give so generously of their time, and so compassionately of their hearts, but collectively, you have made your organization a most remarkable one.

I say "remarkable" because of the diversity of your membership as volunteers in the service of VA, and those all of us serve.

Members of your 230 units come from all walks of life—from every element of America's educational, economic, ethnic, social and religious spectrum.

In your ranks are retired, and highly successful professional women, serving alongside busy homemakers, and many widows who hold jobs and have careers on a full workweek basis.

At the end of a hard day, or week, so many, many of you forego needed and deserved rest and relaxation, because ill and disabled, and lonely veterans need your concern and companionship and care, even more.

But you are even more remarkable because, during this 30th year of your organization, you are asking yourselves, and those with whom you work, as well as those you serve, what more can be done in the voluntary movement, and how can we do it better?

Thus, I repeat, the terms "remarkable" and "unselfish", when applied to the mothers of World War Two units, are truly justified.

Now, what about the hospital volunteer in today's world?

This is a good question to ask and I know you and your officers have been thinking about that, and not telling yourselves, and those you have served, how much you have done for them in the past 30 years.

A progressive group, such as yours, knows there is a difficult, demanding course the hospital volunteer groups must follow in the next thirty years.

I am not an alarmist. However, I am a realist.

As a realist, I can foresee changes in the kinds and delivery points of hospital and medical care, which the Veterans Administration must provide in the years ahead, and thus comparable changes in the kinds and delivery points of voluntary services.

I am not talking about broadened, or liberalized, or revolutionary social welfare-mandated changes, in VA medicine.

And I am not talking about the impact of the President's health care message to Congress, or national health insurance, or related future developments, upon VA medicine, as we have known it for more than four decades.

In this connection, however, I must digress at this point to give you, and through you, all of the officers and members of the organizations, which you so ably represent, this assurance.

Quality health care must be, and will be, made available to all Americans, at reasonable cost.

But, I assure you, that as far as the Veterans Administration is concerned, such care will never be at the expense of America's veterans.

The Veterans Administration hospital and medical care system, will not be dismembered.

This, I can promise you.

For two reasons.

First, because the President, the Congress, and the American people will never permit this to happen.

And second, because they recognize, as do you and I, the unprecedented achievement, and the unequalled strengths of VA medicine.

They recognize the opportunity, we now have to build on these strengths, not only for the continued health and welfare of America's veterans, to whom this nation has a commitment, but to build on the strengths of VA medicine for the added health and well being of all Americans.

You should also be aware of these strengths, not alone because they are chapters in the outstanding success story we call VA medicine, and certainly your organization, has written many such chapters in the past 30 years.

You should also be aware of the strengths of VA medicine, because of the almost daily opportunities you have, to articulate these strengths, for friends and neighbors, for associates, and fellow citizens, who are not familiar with the story, of quality VA hospital and medical care.

What are some of the principal strengths of VA medicine?

You will agree, I am sure, that size, with a capital "S", is one of the greatest strengths of the VA hospital system, the world's largest.

At this moment, as you well know, it is 167 hospitals, 76 nursing homes, six restoration centers, 202 outpatient clinics, and two blind centers.

You may not know, however, that the \$2.7 billion budget, proposed for VA medicine, in fiscal year 1973, is a record high for VA.

The President has recommended for fiscal year 1973, a total of \$155 million for hospital construction. This will be the largest appropriation for VA construction in the past 20 years. Two new hospitals, and seven major modernization projects, costing \$127.7 million are currently under construction.

Three new hospitals costing \$77.9 million were recently opened.

Undoubtedly, you have been alerted to the fact, that in our own facilities, in the coming year, VA will care for nearly one million veterans, the greatest number in history, and 100,000 over last year's total.

Staff outpatient visits are expected to exceed 10 million next year, or nearly three quarters of a million more than last year.

Some may ask, how can these record figures, which add up to unprecedented responsibilities for VA medicine, be considered strengths?

I say that they are "strengths," even for the Veterans Administration hospital volunteers.

They are strengths, because these record setting responsibilities will test, to your present limits and skills the resourcefulness, the flexibility, and the durability of the voluntary service.

I have not the slightest doubt, that you will be equal to the challenge that lies immediately ahead, because having met this test, you will be equal to the ever sterner tests, and ever greater challenges, that face you in the next 30 years.

To complete this brief summation of VA medicine's principal strengths—

The VA hospital system, as we know it today, has not just been existing for 30 years. It has been developing, and growing, and improving during those years.

As the result of this development, growth, and improvement, VA hospitals and medical facilities today are located within 100 miles, or 2 hours' drive, for 90 percent of America's 28 million living veterans.

This geographical dispersment, together with the broad range of services, provided by our hospitals and medical facilities, give the VA hospital system the potential, the strength, if you will, for its own effective regionalization, the kind of organization which the President had in mind when he pointed out that the consumer should not be forced to thread his way through a complex maze of separate services and specialists, but instead should have a full range of resources available through a single organization.

Another strength of VA medicine is the on-going ability of the VA hospital system, under the sharing law, to become actively engaged with all elements of the private health sector, in all forms of organizational, professional, and functional regionalization.

The established relationship of the VA hospital system with medical, dental, nursing, pharmacy, and schools of allied health sciences, throughout the country, and at last count, including 74 graduate departments of psychology, these totaled nearly 600, this relationship, enables VA medicine to be a major source of expansion, for the development and production of critically needed health manpower, for the Nation's total health care system.

And, by any standard, this, too, is a strength.

So is the recognized leadership of VA medicine, in providing about half of the Nation's third and fourth year medical students, with part of their training, and our ability to train 60,000 persons, in 60 different categories of health services, in the coming fiscal year. And this number will increase in the years ahead.

I have cited these strengths, not to brag, but to remind you, that as team members of the Veterans Administration voluntary service program, you are privileged to be part of the finest, the strongest, the most modern, and the most devoted medical team in the world.

I encourage you to be proud of this team, proud of its past accomplishments, and ongoing achievements, and proud too, of the vital role which hospital volunteers have played, in building the VA medical team.

It is my strong, personal conviction, that the real worth of the Veterans Administration voluntary service, and the Godlike charity and concern, and compassion of your volunteers, can never be measured.

And need not be, if Dr. Albert Schweitzer was right when he said:

"I don't know what your destiny will be, but one thing I know: the only ones among you who will be really happy are those who sought and, found how to serve."

He further observed that, "What the world lacks most today is people who occupy themselves with the needs of others. In this unselfish labor," he said, "A blessing falls on both the helper and the helped."

I can tell you today that, were Albert Schweitzer present, he would know well, and be pleased, that he was in the company of really happy women. He would realize fully, and be grateful, that he was witness to unselfish labor's blessing, that has fallen on your volunteers, and on the deserving and thankful veteran patients in VA hospitals whom you have helped.

I know that the 9,000 mothers in your organization, have devoted many thousands of hours to hospitalized veterans.

Take just one of these hours, and give it to a lonely, hospitalized veteran, for whom medicine has done everything possible, but who needs the simple company which only a volunteer can provide.

He may never be able to express, adequately, his gratitude.

But, he need not.

His smile, the clasp of his hand, the "thank you" mirrored in his eyes, are reward enough for the volunteer.

So today, even as I acknowledge your unselfish service, we must also recognize the need for new volunteers, to fill the tens of thousands of lonely hours of these veterans, who will need the concern, compassion, and care, of a volunteer in years to come.

When I speak of a volunteer's care, I do not mean amateurish service, or service on an, "If I can be there" basis.

I mean dependable service, on a firm schedule basis.

And I mean professional service, resulting from the professional training which VA hospital personnel, are qualified, and anxious to provide.

Horace Mann tells us that to pity distress is but human, to relieve it, is godlike.

I think I am truly blessed today, to be in the company of so many women, whom God must like very much, indeed.

May he grant all of you many years of continued health, so that you may serve our ill and disabled and aging hospitalized veterans, with the same devotion and skill, compassion and care, that have earned you much recognition.

Most important, may he inspire others, through your shining example, to join you in giving your hearts and hands in service to those who served.

Thank you, very much, for permitting me today to be with so many truly good people. God bless you.

A FINE CITIZEN RETIRES

HON. ROGER H. ZION

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, one of the Eighth Congressional District of Indiana's outstanding citizens recently stepped down as secretary-treasurer of the Tell City Chair Co. in the community of that name.

Roy Fenn's entire lifetime of service has been devoted to bettering the life of his fellow man. His philanthropies are legendary and there are few worthy charities that have not benefited from this fine man's help.

Mr. Speaker, I share with my colleagues this little summary from the Tell City Thursday News on the productive and fruitful career of Roy N. Fenn: FENN TO CLOSE 45-YEAR CAREER WITH CHAIR FIRM

Roy N. Fenn, secretary-treasurer of Tell City Chair Company, will retire April 30 from active duty after being associated with the firm for 45 years.

The 78-year-old industrialist and philanthropist, widely known for his work in Boy Scouting and with crippled children, as well as in civic and fraternal organization endeavors, joined the company in 1927.

His first job there was in the bookkeeping department where he worked for his brother, the late Chris Fenn, secretary-treasurer and general manager of the company. Chris Fenn died in 1945 and he was succeeded in the position by Roy.

Shortly after that time Fenn and a cousin, Karl Zoercher, who was president of the firm, put on a night crew to increase the plant's productivity and output.

The former Tell City Desk Company, now the company's No. 2 plant, was purchased and a short time later the firm bought the former Knott Manufacturing Company plant, now the firm's No. 4 plant.

The company currently is operating four plants, numbered 1, 2, 3 and 4.

When Fenn became general manager, the company employed approximately 200 people. Now it employs over 800 and its products are shipped all over the United States.

A native and lifelong resident of Perry County, Fenn was born March 27, 1894 the son of the late A. P. and Anna Zoercher Fenn.

A 1912 graduate of Tell City High School, Fenn entered Purdue University following graduation where he received a Bachelor of Science Degree in Agriculture in 1916.

RETURNS TO TELL CITY

He then returned to Tell City where he worked on his father's farm in what is now the Fennhaven area for 10 years, a period interrupted only by his service with the U.S. Armed Forces during World War I.

Fenn entered service in 1917, serving 13 months in France with the 648th Aero Squadron. The squadron was in charge of all American aviation, pursuit, bombardment and observation areas.

Fenn said "there was lots of excitement. We were right on the front in the Verdun sector." He was discharged from service in 1919 after being with the military over a period of 18 months.

MARRIED PAULA MUELCHI

On May 5, 1920 he married the former Paula Muelchi. The couple lived and worked on the Fennhaven farm.

Fenn said his 10 years experience on the farm was the secret of his success in the plant. His farm years, by his own admission were not overwhelmingly successful. "But I learned a lesson during each of those years," he said.

"I found out," he said, "you can't sell something for less than it costs to raise or manufacture."

"I don't know too much about engineering, design or other details of manufacturing," he said, "but I do know about costs—cost is all important and the secret of success. If we can't manufacture goods at a profit we let someone else do it."

Fenn has many interests in life and his age, although it may have slowed him a little,

has not dampened his enthusiasm. Probably his main interest is in Camp Koch for Crippled Children at Troy which he built in 1947, he said, "with Evansville Industrialist, the late Henry Koch's \$125,000."

HUMBLE BEGINNING

The camp began humbly enough on a meagre—but adequate 2½ acre site overlooking the Ohio River, from one of the highest points in Perry County, the cliffs east of Troy. The camp, since then, has grown to a rambling 33 acres.

Fenn is not hesitant about asking people to remember the camp, for which he has fought and labored so long and hard, in their wills. "But," he added, "I would prefer getting anything they might want to give while they are living."

Fenn recalls when the 4-H Fair was held in City Park in Tell City and later at Legion Field.

However, his donation of land for the 4-H Fairgrounds in Fennhaven, brought an end to the 4-H Fairs in Tell City. Now they are held annually at the fairgrounds.

Perry County Memorial Hospital was also built on a four acre tract of land donated by Fenn.

The Fennhaven property originally covered an area of some 300 acres.

Fenn has been in the Scouting movement since 1916 when he became a Scoutmaster. He has paid his registration fee in the Scouting organization ever since.

IN SCOUTING 56 YEARS

He has served Boy Scouting 56 years. No one else in southern Indiana can claim such a long period of service in the movement.

He has received numerous scouting awards including the Silver Beaver which was presented to him in Evansville and the Silver Antelope, a national award, presented to Fenn in Chicago. He and Raphael Blessinger, Jasper, are the only two southern Indiana men who hold the Silver Antelope award.

The Tell City Industrialist has also been extremely active in the Santa Claus letter answering program sponsored by the committees of the American Legion, the 40 et 8 and the Legion's Welfare Department.

The program was begun in 1939 when some 10,000 letters were sent out to children all over the world. Last year some 60,000 letters were answered.

Fenn said the sponsors get help in the answering service from many organizations. "It's wonderful," he said, "the way everyone pitches in to help in the program."

Fenn, who headed the program for years said he has "had it" now and although he is still extremely interested in its continued success, will no longer take such an active part.

SANTA LETTERS

"We get some 400 to 500 letters from destitute children each year with appeals to Santa Claus. They are forwarded to American Legion Posts or service clubs in the cities of their origin. These groups were asked to investigate and help these children if they were deserving and the organization desired to do so," he said.

In answer to one letter, an American Legion Post in Connecticut took a whole wagon load of provisions to a group of six children living with their grandparents.

A letter from a little girl in San Diego, Calif., who wanted a doll for Christmas, brought quick response from the local organization. The mother's thank you letter credited the Legion's answer to the child's letter with giving her hope and saving her life.

Few turn Fenn down when he asks for aid on a civic project. He's hard to turn down because he has done and is continuing to give so much of himself.

"I don't like to take 'no' for an answer when it comes to community service," he said.

Fenn summed it all up when he said, "I've had a lot of hardships in my day, but each and every one that came along taught me a lesson."

Fenn is a charter member of the Tell City Barbershopper Chapter, founded here in 1946. He has, over the years, been its life blood.

Barbershopper headquarters is in Harmony Hall which is located in the basement of Fenn's home on Ninth Street.

COMPLETE RECORDS

He has a complete record of everything connected with the Barbershoppers' annual show including ticket sales, proceeds and profits since the group first began having the show in 1954.

"As to the future," he said, "I'll keep busy doing most of the things I have been doing with Camp Koch, Boy Scouting, 4-H and recreational work but I also plan to do some fishing and playing golf as well as working in my flower garden."

He and Mrs. Fenn plan to leave May 10 for a 16-day trip to the Scandinavian countries of Norway, Denmark and Sweden.

In 1969 the Fenns visited a granddaughter, Mrs. Susan Grant Akyurt in Ankara, Turkey. They have visited Hawaii and also were on a cruise to Japan and the Orient.

In their plans for the future they have also included visiting with their only child, a daughter, Phyllis Grant, M.D., in New Castle and their grandchildren.

A Kentucky Colonel, Fenn is a past president of the Indiana Society for Crippled Children and the Indiana Rehabilitation Association. He holds honorary life memberships in both the Hadi Shrine and 40 et 8.

President Richard Nixon has invited Mr. and Mrs. Fenn to Washington, D.C. on May 3 to attend a conference on the handicapped.

He is also to be honored by 40 et 8 Voiture Locale 1040, Connersville June 24 and 25.

His invitation states the affair is to "honor the most honorable Roy Fenn. He is giving his all for the benefit of the Societe." Fenn has never done anything in his life to which he didn't give his all."

JOHN LEACACOS, PLAIN DEALER
WRITER, RETIRES

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, our world today is an extremely complex and fast paced one. Each day's newspaper tells of a world moving at lightning speed in an infinite number of directions. Events could easily overwhelm us, were it not for the fact that there are men among us who have the ability to interpret events, make them understandable, and show us how patterns and relationships exist among things which had seemingly been unrelated.

Such a man is John P. Leacacos, who has served the Cleveland Plain Dealer and its readers in a variety of capacities over the past four decades, including as roving correspondent in Europe and the Middle East, writer for the Plain Dealer's Washington bureau, and head of the bureau since 1966.

Mr. Leacacos has gained a reputation for diligently searching out the facts, and then, in his writings, placing these facts in a historical perspective which explains both their significance and their

meaning for the future. Officials of the Government, as well as the general public, have benefited greatly by his penetrating analyses. One indication of the esteem he has earned among his colleagues is the fact that he received the Overseas Press Club Award for his foreign correspondence.

Mr. Leacacos has announced that he will retire from the Plain Dealer as of July 1. While I deeply regret that we shall no longer see his writings in the newspaper on a regular basis, I am certain he will continue to speak out, and that his wisdom will benefit us for many years to come.

I would now like to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two articles from the Cleveland Plain Dealer concerning the career of John P. Leacacos.

The articles follow:

PLAIN DEALER'S JOHN LEACACOS RETIRING

John P. Leacacos, chief of The Plain Dealer's Washington bureau for the last 6 years and before that foreign correspondent and writer on foreign affairs in the bureau, will retire July 1.

Leacacos has written from most corners of the globe, covering major events, analyzing the politics, interviewing the leaders and reporting on the lives of the people he observed.

In a weekly Sunday column, "Clearing the Fog," he has probed every aspect of the national government and the people who run it.

Leacacos was born in Kingston, Pa., 63 years ago. He attended schools in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., and Lakewood before going to Harvard University, class of 1931.

He joined The Plain Dealer staff in 1934 and soon became its expert on local, state and federal agencies in the socioeconomic field during the depression.

His coverage of the draft led to a commission as captain in the manpower branch of the U.S. Army in 1942. At war's end he held the rank of lieutenant colonel, having served three years in North Africa and Italy with the 5th Army.

From 1946 to 1957 Leacacos was a Plain Dealer roving correspondent in Europe and the Middle East. There his knowledge of six languages served him well. In those years he and his wife, the former Vella DeMarco of Cleveland, made their home in Rome.

Leacacos returned to the United States in December 1957 and joined the Washington bureau in June 1958, concentrating on the international scene from the Washington viewpoint and achieving a reputation as an authority on foreign affairs.

On assignment he spent three months on a fact-finding tour of Russia and Eastern European countries in 1965 and visited other capitals of Europe in 1961 and 1970.

He received Overseas Press Club awards for foreign correspondence and for his book, "Fires in the In-Basket—the ABC's of the State Department." His article on "The Kissinger Apparatus" in the December 1971 issue of "Foreign Policy" was widely circulated among world chancelleries and reprinted in Japanese and French.

Leacacos' articles from 38 years on The Plain Dealer and his book manuscripts are housed in the John P. Leacacos Collection of Boston University Library.

For his service in Italy, Leacacos was made a Knight Officer of the Order of the Crown of Italy and a Knight of the Order of Saints Maurizio and Lazarus.

He and his wife live in Arlington, Va. Mrs. Leacacos is deputy administrative chief of the U.S. Passport Office in Washington.

Their son, Peter, recently was made a loan officer in the international marketing department of the Cleveland Trust Co. Peter and his wife, Sophie Lee, live in Shaker Heights.

LEACACOS RETIRES

The Plain Dealer on July 1 will say goodbye to John P. Leacacos, chief of its Washington Bureau and for many years a reporter and a commentator in the field of foreign affairs. He is retiring on that date.

For 38 years, Leacacos has been a member of The Plain Dealer's staff, a span interrupted only by several years of service in the U.S. Army in World War II.

Leacacos is a man who knew his way around in government circles and who used this knowledge, and his friendship with government officials, in a manner to best serve the readers of this newspaper. His familiar byline will be missed and we wish him many satisfying years of retirement.

REMARKS OF HON. PAUL ROGERS ON HEALTH LEGISLATION

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Public Health and Environment Subcommittee, it has been my privilege to serve with Representative PAUL ROGERS, of Florida. Those of us on the subcommittee have witnessed firsthand the leadership and diligence of Congressman ROGERS as well as his unfailing courtesy to all who appear before us.

Thus far in this 92d Congress, seven health proposals which Chairman ROGERS, myself, and most subcommittee members cosponsored have become Federal public health laws. These new laws are the Sickle Cell Prevention Act, the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases, the Cancer Attack Act, the student loan and scholarship program, the Health Manpower Act, the Nurse Training Act, and the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act.

Six more health proposals we have cosponsored may become Federal law this year. These are: The Health Maintenance Organization Act, the Heart, Blood Vessel, Lung, and Blood Act, the multiple sclerosis bill and the Cooley's anemia bill, the National Institute on Aging, and the Emergency Medical Services and Transportation Act. In addition to these, under the able leadership of Mr. ROGERS, the subcommittee has considered the Safe Drinking Water Act, the Food Processing and Inspection Act, and studied the creation of a Department of Health to coordinate these many health laws. Such a record of accomplishment deserves recognition.

In this regard, the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy recently honored Mr. ROGERS. At this point, I would call to the attention of my colleagues an address given by Representative ROGERS before that association:

INCREASED RESPONSIBILITIES FOR PHARMACISTS

Mark Twain once said that:

"It is the will of God that we must have Congressmen, and we must bear the burden."

Your excellent representatives in Washington, Executive Director Charles Bliven and Assistant Director Bill Skinner, no doubt, will tell you that the burden has been heavier than usual during the past several months.

The Congress, and our Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment, has had much to consider about pharmacy education and the pharmaceutical profession. In the Health Manpower bill, the Congress said that Schools of pharmacy are vital national assets, deserving of an increase in federal financial assistance. Moreover, in the Manpower bill and the recently adopted legislation to establish a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention, the Congress ascribed to educators and to pharmacy practitioners and researchers a new relevance. Indeed, with more pharmacists better distributed than any other health team component, the young men you are training can be on the front lines in this nation's commitment to solve the problems of a drug-oriented society. Pharmacists are the most improperly used health asset in this country. Yet, they have the potential to become mainstays in the drug abuse fight as well as principals in primary care administration. Presently, the lack of primary care involvement of today's pharmacist as a first contact or entry into the health delivery system is evident.

I don't hesitate to tell you that I am convinced of the necessity to attach a new relevance to pharmacy education both in the areas of patient care and in drug abuse treatment and prevention. As you know, clinical pharmacy became a required subject for all pharmacy schools with the passage of the Health Manpower Act. What we in the Congress were stressing was that your students should assume a more direct relationship with the patient with respect to drug misuse, abuse, and nonprescription advice. Pharmacists and schools of pharmacy have been reluctant to utilize their potential abilities. For the most part, they have been reluctant to meet head on the problems of the country in the health field. I believe there is a changing trend developing.

I am glad to witness the movement of many schools of pharmacy to the academic health center complex, where students of medicine and pharmacy are trained side by side, assuring that pharmacists will play a more dominant role as members of the health care team.

I do not think that pharmacists are yet assuming within this country's health delivery system a sufficiently important role. As you may know, our Subcommittee is in the midst of hearings on health maintenance organizations, and many of us have visited several HMOs during recent weeks. I was encouraged to learn of a group practice in which the group's 70 physicians have arranged for once-a-month briefings by pharmacists on the latest developments in drug treatment. Some progress—not much—but encouraging. Old rigidities and jealousies are gradually breaking down, and your contributions to the continuing education of physicians must be accelerated.

Who knows more about drugs—and their effects—the pharmacist, or those in medicine? Who can best keep up-to-date with the ongoing changes in pharmacology? Yet how many pharmacists are advising on drugs in a clinical setting? How many are educating the doctors in their communities—in a continuing education program—or have they left it all to the detail men of the pharmaceutical manufacturers to assume these duties?

As you may have guessed by now, the principal message I want to convey to you—and one which I hope you will see fit to take back to your students—is that I believe the pharmacist must assume far greater responsibilities inside and outside the pharmacy, both in his own community and on the national level. Our country's increasing maldistribution of health personnel has, in many areas, left the pharmacist as the lone health professional in his community. This status, coupled with the terrifying overuse and misuse of drugs, both legal and illegal ones, in my

view dictates increased responsibilities for the pharmacist.

What are these responsibilities?

I believe you must assume increased responsibilities at the national level. In particular, the Food and Drug Administration and the Federal Trade Commission must rely on the pharmacist's experience. Your assistance in removing the family medicine cabinet from the list of major sources of drug abuse is vital.

When a drug is being abused, who knows it first? The pharmacist! Yet, what machinery do you have for taking action against such abuse? How many schools of pharmacology have bothered to research and teach the problems of drug abuse—problems involving hard narcotics? The methadone problem? The abuse of legal drugs?

Have you instilled in the pharmacy student the feeling of responsibility to report an over-prescription of drugs to the medical society or to the FDA? What mechanisms have the centers of knowledge in pharmacy worked out for this problem? Or for wrong prescriptions? Or for stocking the many over-the-counter drugs which are ineffective and constitute a sham?

I think it would be most appropriate for local and county pharmacological associations and societies to pay close attention to trends in the prescription of legal but abuseable drugs. As you know, attention to these trends has caused a federally mandated cut back on the production of amphetamines by some 80 per cent. But this alone will not prevent the abuse of this drug. Your attention to the remaining market will help greatly—and could be a most effective force if you will accept this additional responsibility.

I also believe that the pharmacist's cooperation in reporting subpotent or questionable drugs and drug reactions to the FDA could be a major contribution, particularly with respect to the recently announced review of the over-the-counter drugs. I have become acquainted with FDA's relatively new Drug Product Defect Reporting Program, which is a voluntary program in which hospital pharmacists across the nation report defects which they encounter in their drug products, their packaging, and their labeling. FDA officials tell me more than 1,200 reports have been received in the first nine months of this program. Unlike ordinary consumer complaints, these reports reflect the observation of professionals familiar with products, and therefore, the payoff rate is quite high. In my judgment this program should be expanded to include input from all pharmacies.

You undoubtedly have observed that the Federal Trade Commission is beginning to maximize its role of protection of the public against deceptive and misleading advertising of certain drugs. I know that most of you welcome this new consumer advocacy role of the FTC, as I do. I am particularly concerned, as are some of you, with the effect of "mood drug" advertising on television. I have seen estimates that the average 16-year-old has spent about 20 per cent of his waking life watching television. This makes television quantitatively the greatest single influence impinging upon the developing central nervous system at the most crucial time. To teach a developing child that pleasure and gratification of his senses can occur instantaneously without his active involvement or expenditure of energy—but rather by taking drugs—is an extremely dangerous trend and one that I believe is partially responsible for this country's drug abuse crisis. Madison Avenue has flooded the media with encouragements to take this drug for tension, that one for insomnia, another to awaken the next morning, and yet another to ease the discomfort caused by the other pills. The youngster with a nervous system attuned from birth to the reception of television messages,

may well incorporate both the desirability and means of escape from discomfort into his basic concept of living as a result of adult examples absorbed from the media. I believe that pharmacists have a real obligation to report apparent trends associated with advertising to the Federal Trade Commission and to make a conscious effort to use discretion in the drugs they stock and the advice rendered on over-the-counter products sold in the 55,000 drug stores in this country. I believe that you, as educators, must take stock of opportunities to educate with these types of cautions in mind. You should, in my view, continually inculcate a sense of responsibility for the effect of every prescription written.

On the local level, schools of pharmacy can do much in the areas of drug abuse prevention, treatment, and enforcement. Like schools of medicine, your responsibilities must extend far beyond those of training of students.

The new social consciousness of today's student makes him a valuable resource in the area of drug abuse prevention. Some of you are already using your pharmacy student resources admirably. Let me candidly say, however, that I hope you will do more. You can do more. We on the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment have seen the data and know that drug dependence is still increasing despite our efforts to stop it. We know of your involvement in educational efforts with elementary and secondary teachers and counselors, with law enforcement personnel, with other health professionals. We think you should continue to use your imagination to educate the nation about dependence-producing drugs. Yours are the centers of knowledge on pharmacology. You must educate the public against irrational use of drugs and promote a respect for drugs within pharmacies and the communities they serve.

As you know, the new Special Drug Abuse Action Office legislation is aimed principally at drug abuse treatment. One of the treatment bases we attempted to expand and encourage in the legislation is the school of pharmacy. Some of you have participated uniquely in the treatment process. A few of you have students participating in free clinics which offer assistance to dependent persons. Some of you have sponsored treatment seminars and programs for pharmacists and other health professionals. I commend you for this; but no real impact has yet been made. It seems to me that exposure of all pharmacy students to a drug abuse treatment setting is vital if pharmacists are to continue to assume the increased relevance they seek and deserve.

I know that you must become extremely sensitive to the fact that the discretion of your students after they receive their licenses will have an important bearing on law enforcement efforts against indiscriminate prescribing. Pharmacy schools have provided many opportunities for students and practicing pharmacists to learn about proper control through a knowledge of federal and state laws and regulations. I am told by Justice Department officials that you have been most cooperative in their efforts to implement the several new laws in this field including the Controlled Substances Act of 1970, developed by our Subcommittee.

I recognize the pharmacists as a group have complied with the letter of the law in most cases. I know, as you do, that some pharmacists have not participated in opportunities to practice proper controls. The recent FDA proposal to remove methadone from the pharmacy is, in part, due to a refusal of some pharmacists to be cautious in filling prescriptions for large quantities of drugs with high potential for abuse and indicates a deficiency in exercising their obligation to report what they believe to be unwise prescribing.

I would suggest that a lack of aggressive

action by pharmacists is responsible for such actions as those of the District of Columbia Medical Society and Pharmaceutical Association which recently requested that prescriptions for methadone cease to be written or dispensed. The removal of methadone from the pharmacy may well be precedent for the treatment of other drugs. Only leadership from the schools of pharmacy and the profession can reverse this trend. I am sure that with this warning signal you will respond with an increased awareness of the necessity to instill the highest ethics and an activist role in your students.

In conclusion, let me restate my conviction—and the conviction of our Subcommittee—that schools of pharmacy are vital national assets which are making increasingly important contributions toward the health of this nation.

The nation has not used you and your graduates as it should. You and your students must assume a new relevance in response to an overwhelming public need. I urge you to continue to provide the health care team with valuable new assets and to promote development and further skills and basic aggressiveness which will provide solutions to our nation's health care and drug abuse crises. I assure you that you have my support in this endeavor, and the support of the Congress.

THE WILLIAMS-STEIGER ACT

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, at the time Congress approved the historic Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, there should have been no illusions about the difficulty of administering an undertaking of this magnitude in a fair and effective manner. The law was too complex, the field too uncharted, and the administrative discretion bestowed by the act too broad to produce a smooth and frictionless implementation of the act during the initial period. That many of us have heard a rising volume of complaints from our constituents about the Williams-Steiger act should therefore not be entirely unexpected.

Hopefully this initial wave of criticism can play a constructive role in ironing out the rough spots in both the statutory requirements and administrative regulations governing the program, and in implementation and enforcement activities in the field. Now that two committees of the House have already begun or announced oversight and review hearings of the initial operation of the act, we have an effective forum or focal point into which these complaints and dissatisfactions can be channeled, scrutinized, sifted and constructively acted upon. The end result, I would expect, will be a series of modifications in the administration of the act that will put it on a firmer, more acceptable, and more effective footing over the long run.

This morning, Mr. Roy Seacor, chairman of the Construction Safety Task Force for the Sheet Metal and Air Conditioning Contractors National Association presented a statement to the House Small Business Committee that reflects

the spirit of this process of fair criticism and constructive modification. Specifically, he emphasized the need for more consistent enforcement of the act between regions of the country and even from employer to employer in the same area. In addition, he suggested reevaluation of some of the more questionable and unnecessary standards and more balanced compliance policies.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Mr. Seacor's testimony represents a helpful contribution to the review of OSHA that is now getting underway and would commend it to all of my colleagues for their consideration:

STATEMENT BY ROY SEACOR ON BEHALF OF THE SHEET METAL AND AIR CONDITIONING CONTRACTORS' NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, INC. BEFORE ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE U.S. HOUSE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS ON PROBLEMS AFFECTING SMALL BUSINESSES UNDER THE OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ACT TUESDAY, JUNE 27, 1972

Good morning, Mr. Chairman: I am Roy Seacor, President of P & P Sheet Metal Works, Hawthorne, New York, and Chairman of the Construction Safety Task Force for the Sheet Metal and Air Conditioning Contractors National Association (SMACNA). I am accompanied today by Mr. James P. Hensley, Director of Legislative Affairs for our National Association.

SMACNA is the national trade association spokesman for America's 30,000 mechanical specialty construction contractors engaged in the fabrication and installation of residential, commercial, institutional and industrial, warm air heating, cooling, ventilating and air handling systems; architectural sheet metal and roofing; industrial sheet metal; air pollution control and specialty fabrication. The majority of the firms we represent—including my own—are definitely small businesses.

On behalf of the Association, we would like to comment today on the administration of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, including various legislative measures currently under consideration by the Congress to remedy inequities under OSHA.

Let me say at the outset that SMACNA and our counterpart union—the Sheet Metal Workers International Association—enjoy a long history of cooperative efforts to enforce safety and safety awareness both in our shops and on our jobsites. Long before OSHA became the law of the land, we were requiring intensive safety instruction as a key element in our Apprenticeship Training Courses throughout the country, preparing and distributing a well-received Construction and Shop Safety Practices Guide, and participating in the development of Safety Workshops for the industry.

Since the signing of the Williams-Steiger Safety Act in December of 1970, we have invested literally thousands of hours of staff time and thousands of dollars of Association funds in assisting our industry to comply. We concentrated initially on bringing the Act and the resultant standards to the attention of all contractors in our industry through the preparation of guidelines, interpretive digests of standards, evaluations, and special hazard mailings.

We have prepared and distributed thousands of copies of our Layman's Guide To The OSH Act (copy attached) as well as a slide presentation and script on OSHA. We are now in the process of shooting a 20-minute color, sound movie on particular hazards in our industry, and SMACNA has inaugurated a monthly membership newsletter devoted exclusively to safety through

the efforts of our top-level Construction Safety Task Force. Finally, we have filed comments on all major OSHA proposed rulemakings and worked closely with the Administration to assist in defining our role as a Target Industry. In short, SMACNA has enthusiastically accepted our responsibility under the new safety act and worked diligently to insure the awareness and compliance of our contractors across the country.

At the same time, however, we have come to feel strongly that current enforcement of the Williams-Steiger Act has been inequitable and capricious in many respects, and that many enforcement activities and attitudes have betrayed the original Congressional intent behind passage. Specifically, we object to:

1. Inconsistent enforcement policies and procedures.
2. Promulgation and enforcement of unrealistic and unnecessary standards.
3. Undue emphasis on issuing citations rather than on overall compliance.
4. Unrealistic inclusion of Sheet Metal with Roofing as a Target Industry category.
5. Lack of any enforcement procedures to insure employee compliance.

OSHA's enforcement of their 300-plus pages of detailed standards has been capricious and inconsistent throughout our industry. We have seen, for instance, the same, identical violation cited as "de minimis" in one western state but as "serious" in New York, with a \$100 fine assessed. We have seen, also, two different compliance officers—working under the same Area Director—assess two different \$100 fine assessed. We have seen, also, two different employers of roughly the same size. In one case in the mid-west, one employer was given a week to guard the belt on his compressor, yet a neighbor was told to abate the same violation "immediately." There are many, many more examples similar to these that we could cite, but these few point-out the need for greater uniformity in standards and consistency in their interpretation and application throughout the country.

Our second major objection to the current administration of OSHA concerns the adoption and enforcement of ridiculous and unnecessary regulations. In this connection we have specific reference to the much discussed prohibition against ice in drinking water, the requirement for self-closing toilet stall doors, the requirement for toilet paper holders and there are numerous examples in other areas including general housekeeping and stairway guarding. Not only is this type of regulation playtime and hardly in the serious interest of increased health and safety, its enforcement tends directly to reduce overall confidence in and compliance with other basically worthwhile standards.

Thirdly, we feel that the congressional intent behind OSHA's passage is being severely undermined by present enforcement procedures. That is, the logic for passage of the Williams-Steiger Act was specifically stated to be the providing of a safe and healthful working place for employees. We feel that too much emphasis is being placed on citations and fines and too little on the overall subject of compliance. In most cases, the employer has had little or no opportunity to review the standards and determine which apply to his particular operations until the compliance officer walks in to fine him. Copies of the standards were not furnished to the employer by OSHA in advance. OSHA has consistently refused to conduct "courtesy inspections" and fines are being assessed regardless of the employer's intention to abate or other evidence of good faith to comply. SMACNA strongly urges the passage of legislation (like H.R. 13562 by Representative CHARLES THONE and H.R. 15399 by Representative FISH) that would al-

low an employer the opportunity to correct a cited violation during the period prescribed for its abatement without being subject to a fine. If, of course, he failed to correct the violation during this period, he would then be subject to a fine. We feel that this legislation is fully consistent with the intent of the act and would assist immeasurably in improving health and safety in the workplace.

Our fourth objection relates to OSHA's inclusion of both roofing and sheet metal in Target Industry category number two. There is little question but what roofing—and commercial and industrial roofing in particular—can be hazardous. Yet the vast majority of sheet metal work is not. It is not conducted at extreme heights, there is no hot tar used and the men employed are usually of a completely different trade. We feel that by lumping roofing and sheet metal together as they have for compliance and enforcement purposes OSHA has done the purely sheet metal contractor a tremendous disservice. We feel that OSHA should conduct an in-depth study of both injury frequency and severity rates in this category and make a more realistic realignment of their target industry categories. As we have repeatedly told Administration officials, SMACNA is willing to assist in this study and work with them to obtain meaningful industry statistics.

Finally, we object to the total lack of enforcement procedures under the Act to insure employee compliance with its provisions and regulations. We readily accept the responsibility of the employer to provide a safe and healthful workplace. And we understand the Administration's reluctance to dictate labor-management relations. At the same time, though, we think it is unfair and inequitable for an employer to be subject to a fine simply because an employee was acting in callous disregard of his own welfare. All the safety meetings, workshops, posters and reprimands in the world will not force some employees to work in a safe manner or keep their personal tools in safe condition. Should the employer, then—who may well be contractually bound to keep the man—be penalized for the employee's disregard? We think not, and urge legislative modification of the Act to provide for a reduction or dismissal of penalties against the employer under these circumstances.

In conclusion, we wish to reiterate our commitment to safety, our historical record of dedication of providing a safe and healthful workplace for our employees and our complete intention to continue helping our contractors comply with the Occupational Safety and Health Act. At the same time, we respectfully urge the Committee to consider legislative recommendations to correct the inequities we have described above.

We appreciate having had this opportunity to make our views known and we will be glad to answer any questions the Committee may have.

COOLEY'S ANEMIA

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 16, 1972, I visited one of this Nation's leading centers for treatment, research, and teaching on childhood blood disease.

At that center, the Clinic of Pediatric Hematology at New York Hospital-Cornell Medical Center, I saw young Cool-

ey's anemia victims receiving the blood transfusions needed to keep them alive.

I talked to these children, to their parents, and to the doctors who treat them. What I learned increased my determination to help these children with Federal funds.

Since 1952, the clinic at New York Hospital has been almost entirely supported by the Children's Blood Foundation, an organization of concerned New Yorkers who solicit private contributions to pay for the many services provided at the clinic.

The work of the Children's Blood Foundation, and of the clinic it supports, has been outstanding. Progress has been made, progress which has lengthened the life of many Cooley's anemia victims.

But now it is time for our Government to stand up for the more than 200,000 Americans of Mediterranean descent who have the Cooley's trait. It is time to provide funds for treatment, screening, and research.

About one-fourth of the children of parents who both have the Cooley's trait will inherit the severe form of this disease. Most will not live through their teens. All will need regular blood transfusions on an average of every 2 to 4 weeks, an extremely costly process.

Dr. Denis R. Miller, director of the clinic at New York Hospital, told me that advances in treatment have enabled some victims of Cooley's anemia to live well into their twenties. But there is still no known cure for this disease.

Legislation now before this House, including the National Cooley's Anemia Control Act which I introduced, would establish a national program for the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of Cooley's anemia. It would establish a voluntary screening program to detect this disease.

This is a step we must take.

I wish to commend Congressman GIAMMO for his leadership in this very important area and to recognize Congressman ROGERS for his work as chairman of the Public Health and Environment Subcommittee in reporting out this legislation.

I urge all my fellow Members to support this legislation. The children at the Children's Blood Foundation Clinic and those in similar facilities throughout our country are in desperate need of this help.

PRESERVING AND ENHANCING COMMUTER MASS TRANSPORTATION SERVICES

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced two bills which are designed to aid in the national effort to provide convenient, efficient, reliable, safe and economical mass transit system for our urban areas.

The inadequacy of mass transportation facilities in many of our urban areas, and the fiscal plight of public and private transportation companies is widely

acknowledged as one of our nations most pressing problems. While the problems are widely recognized, the most effective solutions are subject to considerable study, debate and controversy. Grants, loans, subsidies, public operation, and other programs have all been tried with varying degrees of success. While these approaches, and others as yet proposed, may eventually bring a measure of success in meeting this critical need, time is running out for many private transit companies which perform the vital function of providing basic and supplemental commuter transit service.

The two bills I have introduced today are intended as incremental proposals in the evolutionary process of improving urban mass transportation service. Specifically, they are designed to provide a margin of competitive parity between public and private commuter transit companies with respect to operating costs for fuel and tread rubber. The first provides for the return of all Federal excise taxes paid for fuels and the second provides for the return of all Federal excise taxes paid for tires, tubes and tread rubber. Both apply only to local transit systems which qualify under the existing test in the Internal Revenue Code and when the products are used in providing commuter service. These bills will provide reduced operating costs for private transit companies which will enable them to maintain, improve or expand existing services without resorting to increased fares to the detriment of the riding public. In addition, many private transit systems operate on very small margins of profit or loss, and these measures can effectively provide operating cost reductions which may mean the difference between success or failure of these companies.

It is in the best interest of all concerned to maintain a healthy and vigorous private mass transportation industry which in addition to providing a vital public service, also pays taxes into Federal, State and local treasuries. The alternative to private transit operation has all too often been public ownership or operation with the resultant loss of these tax revenues. Thus, these measures can provide a degree of relief which may very well spell the difference between a viable private tax paying transit company and, as experience has shown, a less efficient public tax draining transit company.

Surely, the alternatives dictate that the Congress address itself, not only to these two measures, but to resolving the multiplicity of problems which beset private and public transit companies alike, in the realization that we are serving not only their needs, but the best interests of the public.

PLAUDITS TO MISS GRAZIANO, A DEDICATED TEACHER

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, as the society in which we live grows increasingly complex, the role of education becomes extremely crucial in enabling us to main-

tain and foster growth in both our personal and professional lives. Therefore, it cannot be overstressed that high educational standards and teaching competence must always be pursued. Indeed, the cultural, historical, and economic achievements, even the basic well-being of a State and Nation depend to a great degree on how well we educate each generation charged with the trust of carrying out its responsibilities and traditions.

It is clear that our educators must continue to serve with the dedication and selflessness that has produced so much success and achievement.

It is with great pride that I point to the educators of my district as examples of this. I am sure the National Education Association would join me in honoring Miss Linda D. Graziano as a case in point. In her seventh grade science class, Miss Graziano has effectively demonstrated her interest and ability in motivating students through the use of a cancer research project patterned after the experiments conducted at the Roswell Park Institute in Buffalo. Perhaps because of this project, one of the students will go on in this field and eventually become a researcher at Roswell. The influence that an educator wields cannot be underestimated.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include now for the benefit of my colleagues the editorial that appeared in the Buffalo Courier-Express concerning Miss Graziano.

The article follows:

PLAUDITS TO MISS GRAZIANO, SCHOOL TEACHER

Miss Linda D. Graziano, 7th grade science teacher at Hamburg Central Junior High School, has achieved something with a group of her students that is becoming all too hard to come by in these days of multiple-choice distractions. She has galvanized the interest of her charges with a classroom cancer research project. The project has liberated the imaginations of the pupils, and from there it has been a rocket flight to the joys of discovery. The group includes 14 youngsters, ages 12 and 13, from Miss Graziano's four general science classes.

Miss Graziano's idea came from summers spent working at the Orchard Park laboratories of Roswell Park Memorial Institute while she was attending college. The laboratory loaned 25 mice to the school for the project. While much of the equipment is homemade by the students themselves, their interest and zeal in conducting experiments in the school laboratory is hardly less sophisticated than that of the highly professionalized Roswell Park research staff.

The project, which began last February and was concluded last week, had among its aims, learning the relationship of smoking and air pollution to lung cancer. A smoking machine used on mice in the experimentation, was designed and built by the students. Somewhat amazing, and amusing, to the observer is the facility with which the students picked up and use the jargon of the professional researchers—words like "interperitium" and "subcutaneous."

Obviously, not all of Miss Graziano's charges will become medical researchers, but there is a message in her method. She has successfully skirted the wall of boredom and disinterest which is seen to rise all too frequently around teen-agers in today's complex world with its multiplicity of false beckonings, and lack of intellectual discipline. Miss Graziano has a rare talent indeed; the ability and—more importantly—the interest to motivate children.

MIKVA AND FREY PROPOSE NEW ETHICS LAW FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, on June 22, I introduced H.R. 15662, a bill requiring full disclosure of income, assets, and liabilities by all Members of Congress and professional staff earning more than \$22,000 a year. Joining me as a sponsor of this stringent reform measure is my colleague from Florida, Congressman LOU FREY.

The bill would require Members of Congress to publicly disclose each year the following financial information:

The amount and source of all items of income in excess of \$100, including gifts, honoraria, and the value of travel or entertainment received in kind;

The value of all assets and liabilities valued at more than \$5,000; and

Business transactions where the amount involved exceeds \$5,000, including the purchase and sale of stocks, commodities, and real estate.

Criminal provisions are provided for willful failure to file the required report, and for falsification of the information disclosed.

The bill goes considerably beyond the present disclosure requirements contained in the rules of the House. At present, Congressmen are required only to disclose major outside interests and sources of income. The public has no way of knowing the extent of those interests in dollars and cents, since the dollar amounts of income and business interests are held confidential.

I have included at the conclusion of my statement a table comparing the provisions of the Mikva-Frey bill with the present requirements imposed by House Rule 44, as well as the text of H.R. 15662.

A companion bill has been simultaneously introduced in the Senate by a bipartisan group of Senators, including Senators MATHIAS, CHILES, NELSON, PEARSON, EAGLETON, CHURCH, and BROOKE.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that this legislation would make a Congressman's or a Senator's personal affairs a matter of public record, but that is the way it must be if the people are again going to trust their elected officials. We are insisting on a double standard—a higher standard—for Members of Congress because so much is at stake. If the people cannot trust the men and women they elect to national office, Congress is not going to be able to develop the public support necessary to solve the Nation's problems.

H.R. 15662 would go far to dispel the all too common notion that Members of Congress are more concerned with their private financial interests than with the public interest. A more informed public would soon discover that the overwhelming majority of Congressmen and Senators have nothing to hide.

There is a serious crisis of confidence in Government. The only way we can begin to correct it is to insure that Con-

gressmen and Senators not only are above criminal and unethical behavior, but are above any suspicion of it as well. Public disclosure legislation such as Congressman Frey and I have proposed is the key to that.

The summary and bill follow:

SUMMARY AND COMPARISON—RULE 44 AND MIKVA/MATHIAS DISCLOSURE BILL

HOUSE RULE 44

Who files

Members, officers of House, principal assistants, Committee professional staff

Public disclosures required

Name, position of management, type of ownership interest in business doing business with or regulated by fed'l govt, IF ownership interest worth more than \$5,000 and produced \$1,000 income in previous calendar year. (Dollar amount not listed.)

Name, address, type of practice of any professional organization in which serves as director, officer, partner, and from which earned more than \$1,000 in previous year.

Source of income over \$5,000, capital gain over \$500 from single source, honoraria over \$300, and reimbursements over \$1,000. No dollar amounts.

Creditors to whom more than \$10,000 owed for more than 90 days during calendar year.

Confidential disclosures

Dollar amounts of all items required to be filed (listed above)

MIKVA/FREY BILL

Who files

Members and staff earning more than \$22,000/year

Public disclosures required

Amount and source of all income over \$100 (includes gifts, honoraria, fees for articles, value of travel and entertainment)

Value of assets worth more than \$5,000

Business transactions where amount involved exceeds \$5,000 (includes stock purchases and sales)

Confidential disclosures

None.

H.R. 15662

A bill to amend title 18, United States Code to promote public confidence in the legislative branch of the Government of the United States by requiring the disclosure by members of Congress and certain employees of the Congress of certain financial interests

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 225. Disclosure of financial interests by members of Congress and certain Congressional employees

"(a) Each member of Congress and each employee of the Congress shall file annually with the Comptroller General a report containing a full and complete statement of—

"(1) the amount and source of each item of income, each item of reimbursement for any expenditure, and each gift or aggregate of gifts from one source (other than gifts received from his spouse or any member of his immediate family) received by him or by him and his spouse jointly during the preceding calendar year which exceeds \$100 in amount or value, including any fee or other honorarium received by him for or in connection with the preparation or delivery of any speech or address, attendance at any convention or other assembly of individuals, or the preparation of any article or other composition for publication, and the monetary value of subsistence entertainment,

travel, and other facilities received by him in kind;

"(2) the value of each asset held by him, or by him and his spouse jointly which has a value in excess of \$5,000, and the amount of each liability owed by him, or by him and his spouse jointly, which is in excess of \$5,000 as of the close of the preceding calendar year; and

"(3) any business transaction, including the sale, purchase or transfer of securities of any business entity, commodity, real property or any other asset or any interest therein, by him, or by him and his spouse jointly, or by any person acting on his behalf or pursuant to his direction during the preceding calendar year if the aggregate amount involved in such transactions exceeds \$5,000 during such year.

"(b) Reports required by this section shall be filed not later than May 15 of each year. In the case of any person who ceases, prior to such date in any year, to occupy the office or position the occupancy of which imposes upon him the reporting requirements contained in subsection (a) shall file such report on the last day he occupies such office or position, or on such later date, not more than three months after such last day, as the Comptroller General may prescribe.

"(c) Reports required by this section shall be in such form and detail as the Comptroller General may prescribe. The Comptroller General may provide for the grouping of items of income, sources of income, assets, liabilities, dealings in securities or commodities, and purchases and sales of real property, when separate itemization is not feasible or is not necessary for an accurate disclosure of the income, net worth, dealing in securities and commodities, or purchases and sales of real property of any individual.

"(d) Whoever willfully fails to file a report required by this section, or knowingly and willfully files a false report under this section, shall be fined \$2,000, or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both.

"(e) All reports filed under this section shall be maintained by the Comptroller General as public records which, under such reasonable regulations as he shall prescribe, shall be available for inspection by members of the public.

"(f) For the purposes of any report required by this section, an individual shall be considered to have a member of Congress or an employee of the Congress during any calendar year if he served in such position for more than six months during the calendar year.

"(g) As used in this section the term—

"(1) 'income' means income from whatever source derived;

"(2) 'security' means security as defined in section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (15 U.S.C. 77b);

"(3) 'commodity' means commodity as defined in section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 2);

"(4) 'member of Congress' means a Senator, a Representative, a Resident Commissioner, or a Delegate;

"(5) 'employee of the Congress' means a Congressional employee, as defined in paragraph (1), (2), (3) or (5) of section 2107 of title 5, United States Code, who is compensated at a rate in excess of \$22,000 per year; and

"(6) 'immediate family' means the child, parent, grandparent, brother, or sister of an individual, and the spouse of such persons."

(b) The table of sections for such chapter 11 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following item:

"225. Disclosure of financial interests by members of Congress and certain Congressional employees."

(c) The chapter analysis for title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out the item relating to chapter 11 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"11. Bribery, graft, and conflicts of interest."

NONE DARE CALL IT CONSPIRACY

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, as I promised in my statement included in the Extensions of Remarks for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 19, prefacing an exchange of letters between a representative of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and myself, I now begin bringing before you, chapter by chapter, Gary Allen's most interesting and significant book "None Dare Call It Conspiracy."

Whether or not you now agree with or, by reading it, are persuaded to agree with its thesis, I would most solemnly and sincerely urge you to give careful, unbiased consideration to its facts and arguments, at least keeping your minds open to the distinct possibility that what it says is true. All of you have been in this Capital City long enough to know that there is more to what goes on in government than meets the eye, that there are "wheels within wheels" and forces at work which prefer the darkness to the light of day.

I recommend Mr. Allen's book not only to my colleagues who share many of my political views, but to those among you generally regarded as being "on the left," because some of you are particularly aware that conspiratorial forces are operating in Washington. Though we might differ widely on who and what they are, at least you would not deny a priori that they can and do exist.

Following is my introduction to "None Dare Call It Conspiracy" and the first chapter of the book, entitled "Don't Confuse Me With the Facts." The remaining seven chapters will be included one by one in subsequent issues of the RECORD:

NONE DARE CALL IT CONSPIRACY
INTRODUCTION

The story you are about to read is true. The names have not been changed to protect the guilty. This book may have the effect of changing your life. After reading this book, you will never look at national and world events in the same way again.

None Dare Call It Conspiracy will be a very controversial book. At first it will receive little publicity and those whose plans are exposed in it will try to kill it by the silent treatment. For reasons that become obvious as you read this book, it will not be reviewed in all the "proper" places or be available on your local bookstand. However, there is nothing these people can do to stop a grass roots book distributing system. Eventually it will be necessary for the people and organizations named in this book to try to blunt its effect by attacking it or the author. They have a tremendous vested interest in keeping you from discovering what they are doing. And they have the big guns of the mass media at their disposal to fire the barrages at *None Dare Call It Conspiracy*.

By sheer volume, the "experts" will try to ridicule you out of investigating for yourself as to whether or not the information in this book is true. They will ignore the fact that the author admits that some of his ideas are conjecture because the people who know the truth are not about to confess. They will find a typographical error or argue

some point that is open to debate. If necessary they will lie in order to protect themselves by smearing this book. Psychologically many people would prefer to believe those who pooh-pooh the information herein because we all like to ignore bad news. We do so at our own peril!

Having been a college instructor, a State Senator and now a Congressman, I have had experience with real professionals at putting up smokescreens to cover up their own actions by trying to destroy the accuser. I hope that you will read this book carefully and draw your own conclusions and not accept the opinions of those who of necessity must attempt to discredit the book. Your future may depend upon it.

JOHN G. SCHMITZ,
U.S. Congressman.

October 25, 1971.

DO NOT CONFUSE ME WITH FACTS

Most of us have had the experience, either as parents or youngsters, of trying to discover the "hidden picture" within another picture in a children's magazine. Usually you are shown a landscape with trees, bushes, flowers and other bits of nature. The caption reads something like this: "Concealed somewhere in this picture is a donkey pulling a cart with a boy in it. Can you find them?" Try as you might, usually you could not find the hidden picture until you turned to a page farther back in the magazine which would reveal how cleverly the artist had hidden it from us. If we study the landscape we realize that the whole picture was painted in such a way as to conceal the real picture within, and once we see the "real picture," it stands out like the proverbial painful digit.

We believe the picture painters of the mass media are artfully creating landscapes for us which deliberately hide the real picture. In this book we will show you how to discover the "hidden picture" in the landscapes presented to us daily through newspapers, radio and television. Once you can see through the camouflage, you will see the donkey, the cart and the boy who have been there all along.

Millions of Americans are concerned and frustrated over mishappenings in our nation. They feel that something is wrong, drastically wrong, but because of the picture painters they can't quite put their fingers on it.

Maybe you are one of those persons. Something is bugging you, but you aren't sure what. We keep electing new Presidents who seemingly promise faithfully to halt the world-wide Communist advance, put the blocks to extravagant government spending, douse the fires of inflation, put the economy on an even keel, reverse the trend which is turning the country into a moral sewer, and toss the criminals into the hoosegow where they belong. Yet, despite high hopes and glittering campaign promises, these problems continue to worsen no matter who is in office. Each new administration, whether it be Republican or Democrat, continues the same basic policies of the previous administration which it had so thoroughly denounced during the election campaign. It is considered poor form to mention this, but it is true nonetheless. Is there a plausible reason to explain why this happens? We are not supposed to think so. We are supposed to think it is all accidental and coincidental and that therefore there is nothing we can do about it.

FDR once said: "In politics, nothing happens by accident. If it happens, you can bet it was planned that way." He was in a good position to know. We believe that many of the major world events that are shaping our destinies occur because somebody or somebodies have planned them that way. If we were merely dealing with the law of averages, half of the events affecting our nation's well-being should be good for America. If

we were dealing with mere incompetence, our leaders should occasionally make a mistake in our favor. We shall attempt to prove that we are not really dealing with coincidence or stupidity, but with planning and brilliance. This small book deals with that planning and brilliance and how it has shaped the foreign and domestic policies of the last six administrations. We hope it will explain matters which have up to now seemed inexplicable; that it will bring into sharp focus images which have been obscured by the landscape painters of the mass media.

Those who believe that major world events result from planning are laughed at for believing in the "conspiracy theory of history." Of course, no one in this modern day and age really believes in the conspiracy theory of history—except those who have taken the time to study the subject. When you think about it, there are really only two theories of history. Either things happen by accident neither planned nor caused by anybody, or they happen because they are planned and somebody causes them to happen. In reality, it is the "accidental theory of history" preached in the unhallowed Halls of Ivy which should be ridiculed. Otherwise, why does every recent administration make the same mistakes as the previous ones? Why do they repeat the errors of the past which produce inflation, depressions and war? Why does our State Department "stumble" from one Communist-aiding "blunder" to another? If you believe it is all an accident or the result of mysterious and unexplainable tides of history, you will be regarded as an "intellectual" who understands that we live in a complex world. If you believe that something like 32,496 consecutive coincidences over the past forty years stretches the law of averages a bit, you are a kook!

Why is it that virtually all "reputable" scholars and mass media columnists and commentators reject the cause and effect or conspiratorial theory of history? Primarily, most scholars follow the crowd in the academic world just as most women follow fashions. To buck the tide means social and professional ostracism. The same is true of the mass media. While professors and pontificators profess to be tolerant and broadminded, in practice it's strictly a one way street—with all traffic flowing left. A Maoist can be tolerated by Liberals of Ivory Towerland or by the Establishment's media pundits, but to be a conservative, and a conservative who propounds a conspiratorial view, is absolutely *verboten*. Better you should be a drunk at a national WCTU convention!

Secondly, these people have over the years acquired a strong vested emotional interest in their own errors. Their intellects and egos are totally committed to the accidental theory. Most people are highly reluctant to admit that they have been conned or have shown poor judgment. To inspect the evidence of the existence of a conspiracy guiding our political destiny from behind the scenes would force many of these people to repudiate a lifetime of accumulated opinions. It takes a person with strong character indeed to face the facts and admit he has been wrong even if it was because he was uninformed.

Such was the case with the author of this book. It was only because he set out to prove the conservative anti-Communists wrong that he happened to end up writing this book. His initial reaction to the conservative point of view was one of suspicion and hostility; and it was only after many months of intensive research that he had to admit that he had been "conned."

Politicians and "intellectuals" are attracted to the concept that events are propelled by some mysterious tide of history or happen by accident. By this reasoning they hope to escape the blame when things go wrong.

Most intellectuals, pseudo and otherwise, deal with the conspiratorial theory of history simply by ignoring it. They never attempt to refute the evidence. It can't be refuted. If and when the silent treatment doesn't work, these "objective" scholars and mass media opinion molders resort to personal attacks, ridicule and satire. The personal attacks tend to divert attention from the facts which an author or speaker is trying to expose. The idea is to force the person exposing the conspiracy to stop the exposure and spend his time and effort defending himself.

However, the most effective weapons used against the conspiratorial theory of history are ridicule and satire. These extremely potent weapons can be cleverly used to avoid any honest attempt at refuting the facts. After all, nobody likes to be made fun of. Rather than be ridiculed most people will keep quiet; and, this subject certainly does lend itself to ridicule and satire. One technique which can be used is to expand the conspiracy to the extent it becomes absurd. For instance, our man from the Halls of Poison Ivy might say in a scoffing arrogant tone, "I suppose you believe every liberal professor gets a telegram each morning from conspiracy headquarters containing his orders for the day's brainwashing of his students?" Some conspiratorialists do indeed overdraw the picture by expanding the conspiracy (from the small clique which it is) to include every local knee-jerk liberal activist and government bureaucrat. Or, because of racial or religious bigotry, they will take small fragments of legitimate evidence and expand them into a conclusion that will support their particular prejudice, i.e., the conspiracy is totally "Jewish," "Catholic," or "Masonic." These people do not help to expose the conspiracy, but, sadly play into the hands of those who want the public to believe that all conspiratorialists are screwballs.

"Intellectuals" are fond of mouthing clichés like: "The conspiracy theory is often tempting. However, it is overly simplistic." To ascribe absolutely everything that happens to the machinations of a small group of power hungry conspirators is overly simplistic. But, in our opinion nothing is more simplistic than doggedly holding onto the accidental view of major world events.

In most cases Liberals simply accuse all those who discuss the conspiracy of being paranoid. "Ah, you right wingers," they say, "rustling every bush, kicking over every rock, looking for imaginary boogymen." Then comes the *coup de grace*—labeling the conspiratorial theory as the "devil theory of history." The Liberals love that one. Even though it is an empty phrase, it sounds so sophisticated!

With the leaders of the academic and communications world assuming this sneering attitude towards the conspiratorial (or cause and effect) theory of history, it is not surprising that millions of innocent and well-meaning people, in a natural desire not to appear naive, assume the attitudes and repeat the clichés of the opinion makers. These persons, in their attempt to appear sophisticated, assume their mentors' air of smug superiority even though they themselves have not spent five minutes in study on the subject of international conspiracy.

The "accidentalists" would have us believe that ascribing any of our problems to planning is "simplistic" and all our problems are caused by Poverty, Ignorance and Disease—hereinafter abbreviated as PID. They ignore the fact that organized conspirators use PID, real and imagined, as an excuse to build a jail for us all. Most of the world has been in PID since time immemorial and it takes incredibly superficial thinking to ascribe the ricocheting of the United States government from one disaster to another over the past thirty years to PID. "Accidentalists" ignore the fact that some of the more ad-

vanced nations in the world have been captured by Communists. Czechoslovakia was one of the world's most modern industrial nations and Cuba had the second highest per capita income of any nation in Central and South America.

It is not true, however, to state that there are no members of the intellectual elite who subscribe to the conspiratorial theory of history. For example, there is Professor Carroll Quigley of the Foreign Service School at Georgetown University. Professor Quigley can hardly be accused of being a "right wing extremist." (Those three words have been made inseparable by the mass media.) Dr. Quigley has all the "liberal" credentials, having taught at the Liberal Establishment's academic Meccas of Princeton and Harvard. In his 1300-page, 8 pound tome *Tragedy and Hope*, Dr. Quigley reveals the existence of the conspiratorial network which will be discussed in this book. The Professor is not merely formulating a theory, but revealing this network's existence from firsthand experience. He also makes it clear that it is only the network's secrecy and not their goals to which he objects. Professor Quigley discloses:

"I know of the operations of this network because I have studied it for twenty years and was permitted for two years, in the early 1960's, to examine its papers and secret records. I have no aversion to it or to most of its aims and have for much of my life, been close to it and to many of its instruments. I have objected, both in the past and recently, to a few of its policies . . . but in general my chief difference of opinion is that it wishes to remain unknown, and I believe its role in history is significant enough to be known."

We agree, its role in history does deserve to be known. That is why we have written this book. However, we most emphatically disagree with this network's aim which the Professor describes as "nothing less than to create a world system of financial control in private hands able to dominate the political system of each country and the economy of the world as a whole." In other words, this power mad clique wants to control and rule the world. Even more frightening, they want total control over all individual actions. As Professor Quigley observes: ". . . his [the individual's] freedom and choice will be controlled within very narrow alternatives by the fact that he will be numbered from birth and followed, as a number, through his educational training, his required military or other public service, his tax contributions, his health and medical requirements, and his final retirement and death benefits." It wants control over all natural resources, business, banking and transportation by controlling the governments of the world. In order to accomplish these aims the conspirators have had no qualms about fomenting wars, depressions and hatred. They want a monopoly which would eliminate all competitors and destroy the free enterprise system. And Professor Quigley, of Harvard, Princeton and Georgetown approves!

Professor Quigley is not the only academic who is aware of the existence of a clique of self-perpetuating conspirators whom we shall call *Insiders*. Other honest scholars finding the same individuals at the scenes of disastrous political fires over and over again have concluded that there is obviously an organization of pyromaniacs at work in the world. But these intellectually honest scholars realize that if they challenged the *Insiders* head-on, their careers would be destroyed. The author knows these men exist because he has been in contact with some of them.

There are also religious leaders who are aware of the existence of this conspiracy. In a UPI story dated December 27, 1965, Father Pedro Arrupe, head of the Jesuit Order of the

Roman Catholic Church, made the following charges during his remarks to the Ecumenical Council:

"This . . . Godless society operates in an extremely efficient manner at least in its higher levels of leadership. It makes use of every possible means at its disposal, be they scientific, technical, social or economic."

It follows a perfectly mapped-out strategy. It holds almost complete sway in international organizations, in financial circles, in the field of mass communications; press, cinema, radio and television."

There are a number of problems to be overcome in convincing a person of the possible existence of a conspiratorial clique of *Insiders* who from the very highest levels manipulate government policy. In this case truth is really stranger than fiction. We are dealing with history's greatest "whodunit," a mystery thriller which puts Erle Stanley Gardner to shame. If you love a mystery, you'll be fascinated with the study of the operations of the *Insiders*. If you do study this network of which Professor Quigley speaks, you will find that what had at first seemed incredible not only exists, but heavily influences our lives.

It must be remembered that the first job of any conspiracy, whether it be in politics, crime or within a business office, is to convince everyone else that no conspiracy exists. The conspirators success will be determined largely by their ability to do this. That the elite of the academic world and mass communications media always pooch-pooch the existence of the *Insiders* merely serves to camouflage their operations. These "artists" hide the boy, the cart and the donkey.

Probably at some time you have been involved with or had personal knowledge of some event which was reported in the news. Perhaps it concerned an athletic event, an election, a committee or your business. Did the report contain the "real" story, the story behind the story? Probably not. And for a variety of reasons. The reporter had time and space problems and there is a good chance the persons involved deliberately did not reveal all the facts. Possibly the reporter's own prejudices governed what facts went into the story and which were deleted. Our point is that most people know from personal experience that a news story often is not the whole story. But many of us assume that our own case is unique when really it is typical. What is true about the reporting of local events is equally as true about the reporting of national and international events.

Psychological problems are also involved in inducing people to look at the evidence concerning the *Insiders*. People are usually comfortable with their old beliefs and conceptions. When Columbus told people the world was a ball and not a pancake, they were highly upset. They were being asked to reject their way of thinking of a lifetime and adopt a whole new outlook. The "intellectuals" of the day scoffed at Columbus and people were afraid they would lose social prestige if they listened to him. Many others just did not want to believe the world was round. It complicated too many things. And typical flat-earthers had such a vested interest involving their own egos, that they heaped abuse on Columbus for challenging their view of the universe. "Don't confuse us with facts; our minds are made up," they said.

These same factors apply today. Because the Establishment controls the media, anyone exposing the *Insiders* will be the recipient of a continuous fusillade of invective from newspapers, magazines, TV and radio. In this manner one is threatened with loss of "social respectability" if he dares broach the idea that there is organization behind any of the problems currently wracking America. Unfortunately, for many people social status comes before intellectual

honesty. Although they would never admit it, social position is more important to many people than is the survival of freedom in America.

If you ask these people which is more important—social respectability or saving their children from slavery—they will tell you the latter, of course. But their actions (or lack of same) speak so much louder than their words. People have an infinite capacity for rationalization when it comes to refusing to face the threat to America's survival. Deep down these people are afraid they may be laughed at if they take a stand, or may be denied an invitation to some social climber's cocktail party. Instead of getting mad at the *Insiders*, these people actually get angry at those who are trying to save the country by exposing the conspirators.

One thing which makes it so hard for some socially minded people to assess the conspiratorial evidence objectively is that the conspirators come from the very highest social strata. They are immensely wealthy, highly educated and extremely cultured. Many of them have lifelong reputations for philanthropy. Nobody enjoys being put in the position of accusing prominent people of conspiring to enslave their fellow Americans, but the facts are inescapable. Many business and professional people are particularly vulnerable to the "don't jeopardize your social respectability" pitch given by those who don't want the conspiracy exposed. The *Insiders* know that if the business and professional community will not take a stand to save the private enterprise system, the socialism through which they intend to control the world will be inevitable. They believe that most business and professional men are too shallow and decadent, too status conscious, too tied up in the problems of their jobs and businesses to worry about what is going on in politics. These men are told that it might be bad for business or jeopardize their government contracts if they take a stand. They have been bribed into silence with their own tax monies!

We are hoping that the conspirators have underestimated the courage and patriotism remaining in the American people. We feel there are a sufficient number of you who are not mesmerized by the television set, who put God, family and country above social status, who will band together to expose and destroy the conspiracy of the *Insiders*. The philosopher Diogenes scoured the length and breadth of ancient Greece searching for an honest man. We are scouring the length and breadth of America in search of hundreds of thousands of intellectually honest men and women who are willing to investigate facts and come to logical conclusions—no matter how unpleasant those conclusions may be.

THE ART OF POSITIVE POLITICS

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, my constituent and friend from Montclair, N.J., Frederick Sontag, has recently coauthored the book "Parties—The Real Opportunity for Effective Citizen Politics."

Frederick Sontag and John Saloma have filled a void by writing a book that charts the course for citizens who want to make their vote and party count. One of the things that we need in this country is a revitalization of political life and an understanding that in a democracy political advocacy is necessary and healthy. Frederick Sontag's book calls for just such a revitalization.

I commend this timely work with its emphasis on positive politics to my colleagues who will enjoy reading it as much as I am now. The articles follow:

BOOK ON POLITICS CAMPAIGNS FOR PARTISAN SURVIVAL

(By Charles Q. Finley)

A clarion call to action for Americans frustrated by the political process has been sounded in the new book "Parties" co-authored by Frederick H. Sontag of Montclair.

The book, written in collaboration with John S. Saloma III, an associate professor of political science at Massachusetts Institute of Technology and published last Friday by Alfred A. Knopf of New York, reflects an abiding faith in the political party system. It not only outlines ways to remold the parties to meet the unique problems of today but includes a detailed guide for the average citizen who wants to participate but doesn't know where or how to begin.

The book also reflects the personality of Sontag, to whom research and the seeking of new ideas for improvement of the political system has become a way of life.

Relaxing in his spacious home with his wife, Edith, to whom he gives much credit for completion of the book, Sontag said the publication presents "hundreds of keys to open locks on doors leading to opportunities for the average citizen to participate in American politics."

"This country has been spending too much time in the blame business instead of using that time doing something constructive," Sontag said. "Instead of the attitudes of warfare and violence in the ghetto areas, for example, the people can work to clean things up themselves. This attitude in the cities is much more of a sickness than the broken buildings."

The theme of the book is indicated by the dedication on the flyleaf: "To the men and women of America—potentially the most gifted politicians of them all."

In the book the authors state: "We believe that American political parties, whatever their current limitations, offer the best political means for achieving broad citizen participation in politics and continuing citizen influence in the direction of government."

"A critical assessment of the political parties is sorely needed, not a justification for their abolition but as a basis for their reconstruction and revitalization."

"The parties are surrounded by opportunities. There is so much slack and room for improvement in American politics that it is possible for citizens to achieve whatever goals they set out to accomplish in politics."

The book contains an action guide, which specifies for different kinds of readers the topics they are likely to find especially valuable and indicates where they may be found in the book. The text outlines for each group what it can do to make the parties more responsive and dynamic.

The problems in the parties at all levels are examined in detail and proposals given for improvement.

The book takes an unusual stance in the matter of money in politics:

"Political finance is thought of merely in terms of campaign finance" but strategies for party modernization "will still require massive and concentrated funding if they are to change party performance measurably."

"Politics is and should be a major growth industry with expanding financial and human resources. Politics can have clout as well as color," the book states.

Sontag, who is 48, is a graduate of Phillips Academy in Andover, Mass. and Colby College. He took graduate work at Columbia University. A public relations consultant, he has served in presidential, state and local campaigns of both major political parties.

It took three years to research and write the book. Sontag said the first year and a

half was financed by the 20th Century Fund, a foundation for the study of political parties and that the authors carried on to finish the project themselves.

"If we can come up with 100 suggestions and 10 of them are adopted that's 10 per cent, higher than you can get in a return from any bank," Sontag said. "Lack of candor on the part of people bugs hell out of me—because of what they can accomplish if they but try."

One of his new ideas is the formation of a "contingency committee" by the parties to prepare for the unexpected, if a candidate should lose, or pull out of a race.

He feels the people of the United States will no longer allow the vice president to be picked by the President. "They want him chosen by the convention," he said.

He also believes there should be talent searches for Presidential possibilities and that an Institute on Politics should be established to train legislators and staffs.

He said an analytical newsletter, "a political tip sheet if you will," is needed, financed from year to year, to help encourage intelligent citizen political participation.

"The political processes are here to stay far beyond the readers of this book. The political parties are institutions, like police and fire departments. But let's not allow them to die on the vine. Let's build something."

DO-IT-YOURSELF POLITICS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Parties: The Real Opportunity For Effective Citizen Politics, by John S. Saloma III and Frederick H. Sontag. New York: Alfred Knopf, \$7.95.

This is an exciting and stirring book. It is the only contemporary book about party politics in America which wastes no time wallowing around in stupid pessimism.

The authors contend that representative governments can be made more representative. They cite concrete things which can be done to make government more responsive, and show what concerned citizens can do now to make the political parties better instruments of majority rule.

Both authors have good credentials. John Saloma, founder of the Ripon Society, is an M.I.T. professor of political science with pragmatic instincts. Frederick Sontag is an experienced professional in practical politics.

The need for crucial change in party operations is great. America's problems have outdistanced its answers, and our political institutions have shown themselves unequal to what needs to be done. Saloma and Sontag are convinced that people have become disturbed enough to do something about this.

The book is a citizen's handbook for political action. It deals with the inner workings of the parties and describes in detail how all of us can mobilize support and bring it to bear on the decisionmaking processes of government at every level. If you want to influence political decisions, elect candidates and promote the issues of your choice, "Parties" offers a wide range of do-it-yourself ways of getting it done. It is surprising how ready-to-hand these ways can be.

Professional politicians should also be interested in this book—they can't afford not to be. The American people don't want to tear down the existing political system. But I believe they are fed up with "politics-as-usual" groping its way through one of the most challenging and painful periods of history. They don't want totalitarian government; they want a more worthy and workable democratic government.

I think most people are also surfeited with negative criticism about America's problems. In the best sense, "Parties" deals with the art of positive politics.

The one thing we cannot afford is to let bad enough alone. This is why "Parties" is valuable and timely.

It doesn't take "no" for an answer.

FORMER CONGRESSMAN RICHARD L. OTTINGER CITED IN "GUIDE TO FEDERAL AID TO CITIES AND TOWNS"

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, it is a measure of the growth and complexity of our Federal Government that many of the municipalities which most need the economic and technical assistance that can be provided on the Federal level do not have the capability to cut through the massive amounts of redtape that are required to secure Federal grants and programs.

A significant effort has now been made toward making the understanding of the programs and processes of Federal aid more coherent and inevitably more effective with the publication of the New York Times "Guide to Federal Aid to Cities and Towns." Authored by Howard S. Rowland of Glassboro State College, part one of this massive work, "City in Action—Peekskill," cites the kind of results which can be achieved by a Congressman willing to fight for his constituents through the sprawling Federal bureaucracy.

The Congressman, Richard L. Ottinger of New York, a former colleague and friend well known to many of us, proved time and again that cities, towns and villages of all sizes can be helped to take advantage of Federal programs if the Congressman rolls up his sleeves and commits himself to action and results for his people. Since Mr. Rowland's example is so instructive I am including it in the record at this point:

THE NEW YORK TIMES GUIDE TO FEDERAL AID FOR CITIES AND TOWNS

(By Howard S. Rowland)

CONGRESSIONAL HELP

There was one other factor in the Peekskill "beginning" which was indispensable—a Congressman who cared. "If I need approval of a particular document and it's sitting on someone's desk in New York or Washington, I call his office and within a twinkling something happens—frequently a signature." David Ornstein was speaking of Congressman Richard Ottinger, a New York Democrat, a conservationist, a man known for getting things done. Periodically, Ottinger sent a newsletter to his constituents not only discussing his position on important national and local issues but also listing the specific grants and programs he had helped bring to each of the communities he represented. For example in July, 1969, he listed the following:

Westchester County: Federal grants of \$402,000 and \$135,000 to Westchester Association for Retarded Children for education, training, and vocational programs.

Dobbs Ferry: Participation in \$122,720 HUD grant for urban planning assistance.

Greenburgh: \$2,421,378 Federal loan for 115 low-rent housing units and \$337,642 Federal grant for parks adjacent to housing sites; \$9,000 for special youth programs.

Yonkers: \$50,000 grant to improve poverty program management; approval of lease plan for 50 low-rent homes.

Ossining: \$9,375 Federal grant for urban beautification program.

Briarcliff: \$5,000 federal grant to Briarcliff College for child development.

Tarrytown: \$97,540 federal contract to Union Carbide for saline water research.

Brewster: \$28,665 federal grant to JFK school to improve basic skills in younger pupils.

Peekskill: Federal grants of \$70,000 to convert Franklin Street school land to park use; \$56,160 for development of a Community Renewal Program; \$22,918 for a summer Head Start program.

It was Ottinger's office that noted that the Department of Defense had increased its prime contracts in Peekskill from \$30,000 in 1965 to close to \$2 million in 1968, and that federal funds for education jumped from \$90,766 to \$262,363 primarily as a result of Peekskill's belated discovery of its eligibility for federal impact funds.

After the summer of 1967 riots in Peekskill, Ottinger, a Democrat, arranged a meeting in Peekskill of HUD and state housing officials with the Republican mayor and Council and himself. Concrete activities such as a rehabilitation program and an FHA 221 (d) (3) project were agreed upon. However, as it turned out there was no one in Peekskill to coordinate the necessary action and nothing was done. It wasn't until Ornstein was hired that these ideas and many others were routinely checked through Ottinger's office and things began to happen. For example, Peekskill wanted a quick approval on its Neighborhood Parks project. So Ottinger had one of his staff members hand deliver the application to the regional office of HUD and discuss all the elements in the application to be sure they were satisfactory. It was no surprise that shortly thereafter the project was approved.

So, too, with Peekskill's waterfront development plan. Ottinger's office in 1970 was working very closely with Ornstein on this project. Ottinger's staff analyzed the different possibilities for federal grants, set up meetings with all federal departments, and was in the process of getting all federal agencies to precommit as to what they would be willing to do if the Peekskill bay borings, which were then being arranged, proved that the project was feasible.

But as an Ottinger staff member said, "It takes more than an active Congressman to get a community going. The community leaders have to be willing." She was referring to the neighboring city of Ossining, which had also experienced riots in 1967. Unlike the Republicans of Peekskill, the Republicans of Ossining had scorned the assistance of their Democratic Congressman. Even after the national TV film by the Maryknoll Sisters depicting the wretched housing conditions in Ossining, when Ottinger again offered his services, Ossining replied snippily, "There is no housing problem in Ossining." As of 1970 Ossining still had not built a single unit of public housing.

SOME GOOD ADVICE FROM MARVELLA BAYH

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the June 18, 1972, New York Times is certainly worthy of note. Mrs. Birch Bayh, wife of the junior Senator from Indiana, has through her faith and courage become a symbol of hope to many American women who have had to undergo, or must undergo, radical surgery for cancer:

TO FEARFUL WOMEN A SENATOR'S WIFE OFFERS GOOD ADVICE

INDIANAPOLIS.—Marvella Bayh, whose husband, Senator BIRCH BAYH, the Indiana

Democrat, withdrew as a presidential contender last fall to remain with her after she underwent surgery for cancer, has become a symbol of encouragement to many American women.

During her first trip back home to Indiana following a mastectomy, surgery for breast removal, Mrs. Bayh said in an interview that at the time of her operation last October she thought it was "rather unfortunate" that she, "had to have so much publicity."

"It is the sort of thing you would like to slip into the hospital, have the surgery, and then in a few months appear around again and only the people very close to you would ever know you had the surgery," she said.

"But in my case, when Birch was an unannounced candidate for the presidency, it did have a great deal of publicity which at the time I was wishing it didn't have," she remembered.

"Then I had so many letters from women who said, 'You can be our example,' that it made me feel that maybe I can bring a little bit of encouragement to women cancer has yet to strike. They can see that Birch and I are just as much in love as we ever were. I can go on and do things I always have done before and I can wear just the kind of dresses I wore before."

"Perhaps women who look at me can say to themselves, 'life does go on,' and I can give them the encouragement that wonderful Reach for Recovery gave to me."

Mrs. Bayh was referring to a program sponsored in some cities by the American Cancer Society. Before Mrs. Bayh left the Columbia Hospital for Women, in Washington, D.C., following her operation, she was visited by a woman she describes as "marvelous looking, like a model, wearing a suede skirt and a form-fitting blouse." The woman explained that she had undergone a breast operation several years before and instructed Mrs. Bayh in postoperative exercises.

According to the cancer society, approximately 71,080 women in the United States will develop breast cancer this year and 32,000 of them will die from it. Cancer of the breast represents about one-fifth of all cancer deaths and is the second leading cause of cancer deaths among women.

Mrs. Bayh said she had no particular warning in advance that she had cancer of the breast.

"I had had some soreness, an awareness of that particular part of my body," she said. "But there was really no lump or anything. Nothing showed upon the mammograms, which are X-rays. I was X-rayed four times. The doctor said it was very unlikely the mammograms were wrong but he did not feel he could take the 10 per cent chance that they were wrong."

The doctor arranged for a biopsy, which did show cancer, and the operation was performed the next day and was followed by cobalt-type treatments. Mrs. Bayh still is undergoing weekly chemotherapy treatments, an 18-month course of care.

"Wherever you are in the world on April 8, 1973, you are going to hear a world-shaking boom and that will be me celebrating the end of the chemotherapy treatments," Mrs. Bayh laughed.

"It is a chemical doctors have known about for six or seven years, as I understand it, but has been in common usage less time than that. It is a chemical they put in the veins that seeks out rapidly dividing cells and kills them. It is just in case at the time of surgery some cancer cells escaped into the blood stream and lodged somewhere."

Mrs. Bayh said that prior to her operation and because of her husband's campaigning he was seldom able to be at home. He did not discuss his decision to end his 1972 presidential bid with his wife.

"He just came to the hospital and told me his decision, Mrs. Bayh said." He let me read the statement he had written. He wrote every word of it himself and sat up most of the night writing it. I asked him if he felt this

was the right thing to do and he told me it was the easiest decision he ever made."

Mrs. Bayh said that her husband's gift of his own time now seems to be the force that gave her the strength to live during the difficult months following surgery.

"He has been my anchor," she said. "If I started to be blue, he was there to buoy me up. Birch was right by my side. He never took any kind of attitude but that we are going to lick this thing. He took the attitude that it was an illness just as if I had an appendicitis operation."

Mrs. Bayh found that her experience with cancer "helps you put things in a proper perspective. Time together as a family is more precious."

Mr. Bayh, who is 44 years old and has been a Senator since 1962, and his 39-year-old wife first met when she defeated him in a national oratorical contest. They have one child, Evan, 16, described by his mother as "a typical teen-ager. He is very involved in school work and sports and just starting to drive." Mrs. Bayh recalled that her husband briefed Evan on her illness.

"This was an extra difficult time for Birch because he lost his mother from cancer when he was 12," Mrs. Bayh said. "I don't know what his father told Evan, but Evan never lets me see anything from him but sunshine."

Mrs. Bayh now has almost forgotten about her false breast, although at first she felt other people might be aware of her surgery. She described her first public appearance after the operation.

"We were going to a black tie dinner. I looked at my formals in the closet and pulled out one with the lowest cut. I never have worn very low cut formals but I picked out the most revealing formal I had. Birch was laughing at me because I did that, but I got away with it."

"It's not the end of the world," Mrs. Bayh said. "If a woman must lose a part of her body, this is the most easily camouflaged. It is much better than losing an arm or a leg."

"I can't urge strongly enough for women of all ages just to be wise enough to have examinations regularly and to check themselves. If you get [check] cancer in the beginning, chances are it won't make all that difference in your future."

"This is not the first time we faced anything like this," she recalled. "In 1954 Birch and I were in a very bad auto accident. Then in 1964, we were in a plane crash in which there were five aboard and two were killed. We managed to come through that. [Their close friend, Senator Edward M. Kennedy, was injured in the same crash.] I used to laugh and say, 'In 1974 I am not even going to take a bath for fear I will fall.' But I am sure this cancer just came two years earlier and 1974 will be a fine year."

For the present, Mrs. Bayh has found her cancer experience "reinforces your faith in people. You pick up the paper and read about rapings and robberies and murders and you might begin to think the world is full of people who don't care. They are really so much in the minority. There is so much goodness and caring, one human being for another, it makes you so happy to be alive."

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 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?

A HIGH PRICE FOR BEEFSTEAK

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Washington Post editorialized on the price of beefsteak and the issue of food price control, concluding that "controls on food promise far too many troubles to be justified by the price of beefsteak alone."

I commend the Post for a sensible attitude on a highly volatile issue, and call the attention of my colleagues in the House to the following editorial:

A HIGH PRICE FOR BEEFSTEAK

The price of beefsteak is becoming, unfortunately, a symbolic test of the Nixon administration's ability to control food prices. It is a bad test, both because it is essentially uncontrollable and because it is a luxury. If the prices of the staples and the real necessities in families' diets begin to move steeply upward, then there will be a reasonable case for price controls on food even with all the risks of shortages and distortions that they entail. But Mr. Nixon ought not allow himself to be chivvied into controlling food merely because T-bone steaks and filets are going up.

The demand for the best cuts of red meat are rising rapidly because incomes are rising. The supply is limited to the animals already in the feed pens. The breeding cycle, in the case of steers, requires several years. As President Nixon remarked in his press conference, price controls during a shortage can result in a black market. Theoretically the answer lies in rationing and direct subsidies to producers. But it requires the kind of massive and permanent enforcement apparatus that, from the beginning of this experiment, Mr. Nixon has attempted to avoid.

He mentioned the possibility of abandoning the quotas that limit imports of beef, and of course the quotas should have been dropped long ago. But even this remedy is likely to have only small effects. Mr. Nixon, who has been well briefed on the difficulties of dealing with beefsteak, noted that demand is also rising in other countries. One might add that Americans like very tender beef. Most imported meat seems intolerably tough to American tastes, and we accept it only in hamburger and sausage. Custom does more than quotas to protect our meat markets from the rigors of world competition.

Mr. Nixon made it clear that he is considering controls on foods prices. But the case for controls rests mainly on the performance of meat prices. The other major categories of groceries have risen comparatively slowly over the past year. Bread and cereals were up half a percentage point. Dairy products were up 1.9 percent, and fruits and vegetables were up 2.1 percent. Other items average to an even lower rate. These figures represent a very modest rate of inflation. It is chiefly the price of red meat that has raised the food index 3.5 percent over the year.

Administering the controls is a process of

deciding what matters most and what matters least. One of the commodities that should matter least, in the management of the economy, is expensive meat. Steak is not necessary to sustain life. In a pinch, hamburger and chicken will do. Some items are sufficiently necessary to daily life that simple justice requires them to be controlled. Steak is not one of them. It is a luxury. The Democrats would doubtless like to make a campaign issue of the price of prime beef. But the Democratic candidates themselves have been lamentably vague and evasive on the hard choices that a control program requires.

If the grocery chains are forced to swallow the increases in wholesale meat prices, they will be under great pressure to make up their losses on other, less carefully watched items. That would amount to holding down the luxuries at the expense of raising the staples. If the staples, and the real necessities of a balanced diet, should join the inflationary rush upward, then there will be a real case for food price controls regardless of the dangers of shortages and black marketeering. But controls on food promise far too many troubles to be justified by the price of beefsteak alone.

U.S. POSTAL SERVICE

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as a small child, I used to engage in a game known as "post office," but more recently, the post office is now playing games with the American public. It is inconceivable to consider the curtailing of services to the American public that have been instigated in recent months. The sectional centers, which at one time we were told were the answer to all mail problems, are being consolidated, causing the mail from a given community to travel hundreds of miles to ultimately reach a neighboring community only a few miles away. There are many small cities in my district where it has come to my attention have ultimately no mail service from Friday until Monday. The displacement of many long-time employees is causing anguish and great personal sacrifice in leaving their homes in order to continue postal employment.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that other Members of Congress have been experiencing the same complaints which have reached my office. Referring to the U.S. Constitution, one of the prescribed duties of the Congress, as outlined in article I, section 8, is "to establish post offices and post roads." To my knowledge this has never been changed. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I raise the question, is the Congress performing its full duties as directed by the Constitution in sitting idly by and permitting the disintegration of the handling of the U.S. mail? I think it time that we reevaluate what we have done and through legislation or otherwise, provide the people of this Nation the postal service to which they have rightly become accustomed.

THE BALTIC NATIONS

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, each year Members of the House participate in ceremonies and statements marking the anniversary of a number of events surrounding the loss of freedom of the people of the Baltic States. We remember the historic events leading to the oppression and captivity of these freedom loving people and we also hold out some hope to them through our remembrance of their heroism.

The domination of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Soviet Union has not been an easy domination for the years have been filled with accounts of heroism by freedom fighters and others who will not forget the advantages of liberty. The reported death of some 30,000 Lithuanian freedom fighters between 1940 and 1952 is evidence of the kind of spirit which cannot be totally destroyed.

During the 89th Congress legislation was passed, House Concurrent Resolution 416, calling on the President of the United States to bring the domination of the people of the Baltic States to the United Nations and to bring world opinion to bear on behalf of restoration of the rights of the Baltic peoples. That resolution expresses the concern of Congress with this continued Soviet oppression of the Baltic peoples and I insert the full text of House Concurrent Resolution 416, 89th Congress, in the RECORD at this point:

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.

A YOUNG MAN WHO TAKES HIS RESPONSIBILITY OF CITIZENSHIP SERIOUSLY

HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, periodically the young people of this nation amaze me. Despite the efforts of some who grab the headlines and appoint themselves spokesmen for their contemporaries, members of the post-World War II generation continue to think for themselves, to evaluate the facts, and to arrive at their own conclusions.

One such man, Mr. Richard C. Wooley, who resides in Danville, Va., has been sufficiently thoughtful to set forth his feelings regarding the present situation as regards our involvement in Vietnam. Mr. Wooley knows whereof he speaks. He is a 28-year-old veteran of the U.S. Marine Corps, with service in Vietnam. He now is preparing for a civilian career, and as his letter reveals, he takes his responsibilities of citizenship seriously.

Mr. Wooley's letter speaks from the heart and—in my case—to the heart. At this point I submit this letter for inclusion in the RECORD, so that my colleagues may have the benefit of this young man's views:

DEAR MR. DANIEL: I have heard reports that the majority of mail received by U.S. Senators and Representatives, calls for opposition to Mr. Nixon's recent response to the North Vietnamese invasion of the south. This is a copy of one of several letters I am writing to Virginia's governmental representatives to express my vote for support of the president's policy.

Having been involved in Vietnam as a volunteer in the Marines, I support the Vietnam effort, or rather the effort as it should have been, had the American people put their full effort into backing the military, and instilling the will to win into political minds, by expressing that will themselves. This, rather than confusion, losing heart, and the subsequent desire to withdraw, would have inspired decisive military action in the beginning, and I believe, brought an end to the war long ago.

Though the president's recent action is long overdue, and perhaps not far reaching enough, I would like to see Congress and the House behind him all the way. My reasons being that the fact of the invasion itself, that by the North Vietnamese Regulars, proves the failure of the communists to win the South Vietnamese people. This coupled with the fact that refugees in South Vietnam did not receive the N.V.A. with open arms, and in fact fled to the south, is infallible evidence of that failure. Evidence seemingly ignored by the news media on a national scale. If the South Vietnamese are losing ground in their efforts to repel the invasion, I do not see this as a failure of Vietnamization, in that the N.V.A. have the advantage of having fixed targets to attack, and deciding which to attack, and when. They know where South Vietnam's cities, bases and supplies are while they operate under cover of the jungle, and store supplies in widely distributed and camouflaged areas. They also

have the advantage of the momentum built up over the years by little or no attempt to stem the flow of supplies to the south at the source. There was no blockade effort until now and thus they have months if not years of supplies at hand that have been stored over the past. In the north, by now, they are well fortified and have taken measures to circumvent the effects of such a blockade, as well as digging in against bombing attacks. We have sown the seeds of our own failure as we progressed, through lack of definite and decisive action, not by our initial involvement. I feel that it is entirely necessary that we give the president full support if we are to salvage any honor, and if we are to provide the South Vietnamese with the needed initiative to make Vietnamization work.

Dealing so far with the surface issues which, though seemingly obvious, are, even so, rarely observed nationally, the issues even more feared by both sides are the philosophical issues involving the concept of war as immoral, and killing as wrong. This expressed, those opposing the Vietnam effort have sold the news media, and the news media has sold much of the public, the idea that nothing more need be said. That the peace advocates point out these immoralities and assume them to be points in their favor is a fact rarely challenged by advocates of the war effort. "War is immoral", and "Killing is wrong", are easy things to say and wave as a banner of righteous indignation at the war effort, yet difficult to confront with opposition. Question: Have those who oppose the war in Vietnam and our involvement there indeed been innocent of killing? I can only express my own opinion which agrees with the obvious statements of the immorality of war, and killing but differs from that of the peace advocates in that I do not see it as a choice between right and wrong, morality and immorality. I chose to have on my conscience the wrong of having killed in the defence of the South Vietnamese, rather than the only other, and to my mind, more immoral alternative embodied in the peace advocates stand, which to me constituted killing by refusing to become involved in someone's defence. That it is possible to kill indirectly by refusal to act, is not a new concept. We hear reports of fifteen or twenty people witnessing murder and other crimes of violence on the streets of America, and refusing to become involved in the victims defence, even as a witness in court. I wonder if this is the new moralities idea of peace, love and brotherhood and if not, why draw the line for peace, love and brotherhood at the boundaries of the U.S. when we have signed agreements, such as S.E.A.T.O., stating our willingness to defend our allies against aggression. If war, or in the case of the U.S. in Vietnam, response to war and aggression, is immoral, the immorality of isolationism is to me much more obvious and demeaning. It is said "We can not police the world", and "Who are we to become involved in someone else's affairs?" Crime is steadily increasing in this country, and law enforcement officials haven't the ability to contain that increase, greatly, I feel, because of the aforementioned lack of public involvement but how many would advocate complete disbandment of law enforcement agencies in the U.S. for this reason. In spite of the complacent hostility toward law enforcement officials today, surely we still have the presence of mind to imagine the consequences of such an action.

I am not saying that the end justifies the means. If I have agreed that war and killing are immoral I also agree that such are not justifiable either in themselves or in comparison to something more immoral. In view, however, of our human fallibility and the fact that it is difficult to unite enough saints and martyrs to effect the only possible moral action in response to the communist in-

surgency in Vietnam I am saying that defense of the South Vietnamese people by military effort was the closest to the right and moral action within our human potential. The only purely right and moral action I can see, which I believe to be outside our potential, would be for the peace advocates, if they truly believe in peace, love and brotherhood, to form an army of volunteers, armed only with skills they might teach the Vietnamese, and to send that army to Vietnam, putting their lives in jeopardy as those in the military effort have done. Being unarmed with weapons, they might speak out in a meaningful way against killing and violence, though many seem to have trouble refraining from violence even in their "peaceful" demonstrations. The hitch is, of course, that they would have to be willing to die for their beliefs as we were. For those who suffered in isolated incidents in demonstrations against war, their suffering was perhaps significant, as all suffering should be, but the odds of one's really losing his life in an anti-war demonstration are slight compared to those who backed up their convictions in Vietnam voluntarily. If in professing such moral issues as peace, love and brotherhood, they are to be worthy of those issues, these peace advocates must be the saints and martyrs they ask us to be and should be willing to make such a sacrifice. If they can, let them do it and stop passing judgment on those who, if they participated in violence, were willing to give their lives for their convictions and who pretended to no such saintly potential.

If this sounds like tooting my own horn, having been a volunteer in Vietnam, let me remind you that I have, because of my involvement been accused of being a "Blind Nationalist," "Puppet and pawn of the military establishment," "Warmonger," "Killer of women and children," and various other things which are too familiar to need mentioning. I have been accused of these things directly by the radicals of the peace movement and indirectly by those who attacked the effort which I supported. If I am rightly subject to these accusations simply because they have a right to their opinion then my accusation that their weakening of unified effort behind the war, causing breakdown of morale and desire to withdraw has prolonged the war, and is responsible for the death of more Americans than any action by the N.V.A. or Viet Cong, is valid for the same reason. There was no significant effort, if any, by the peace advocates to organize such an army of saints and martyrs, and I do not equate the efforts to bribe North Vietnam as anything related.

If I have written a lot of my opinion I have heard quite a lot of the opposing opinion. This because so many public officials are afraid to oppose the seemingly moral stand against the defense of Vietnam. I feel that I have a right to express my opinion not just as a citizen but because I feel the arguments I have presented to back it are valid, at least they are there for critical analysis, and I detect little but whining and crying on the part of the opposition with little but accusations to back it up, and hardly any attempt to approach the subject with logic or reason. Witness the recent confrontation between Mr. Fulbright and his committee, and Secretary of State Rogers. Mr. Fulbright seemed to receive his greatest applause by expressing his wonder at how the president allowed us to get into this situation as though wishing the problem away would constitute a valid rebuttal to the war effort.

There are many things concerning this issue on which I would like to express my opinion but I'm sure this is sufficient to express my vote of support for the president. For those of Virginia's governmental representatives who have supported America's stand in the Vietnam conflict I am deeply grateful. Thank you.

Sincerely,

RICHARD C. WOOLLEY.

THERE IS A WAR GOING ON

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, we get many reports from the battlefield, some through Government channels, others from the press. In either of the two mentioned sources bias can be observed. Bias is a likely, if not inevitable element of a free citizen's reaction to a war involving his nation's blood and treasure. One such bias which ought to have a claim on the country's attention is that of those chosen to participate in the struggle. A young constituent, stationed in Guam, has written me his impressions of our current involvement. He is disappointed at our continuing failure to extract ourselves from the conflict, but not yet devoid of hope that somehow the Government, with the prodding of Congress, can achieve that desired result. Letters containing similar or contrary points of view can undoubtedly be produced. I simply submit this one to share the passionate sense of responsibility of its author, a young American, who reminds us that "there is a war going on," and who believes his government could, if it would, bring our participation in it to an end without damaging our security. Both that reminder and that belief merit our consideration. The letter follows:

GUAM, June 19, 1972.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SYMINGTON: There is a war going on. If you find what you read in the next few lines rather fantastic, if you can't believe it, come out here and see for yourself. There is a war going on. You can see it in the faces of the men, perhaps thousands of them, who are "living" in the tent cities here. Ask them how they like what they're doing and they'll answer with any one of a number of four-letter words. Ask them what it's like to live in a tent where the sun bakes down and it rains five or six times a day. They'll tell you, and won't waste any time trying to white wash it.

They're from all over the U.S., TDY-ed (that's Temporary Duty) here from bases in the States. Orders say they'll be here for 179 days. That's one day short of six months. That's one day short of a PCS, permanent change of station. That's one day short of being away from their wives a full six months. But if they were here permanently, their wives could be, too.

There's a war on. You can see it each day, as the huge B-52's take off over the bluff and climb into the sky, headed away on their missions. You can see it in the loads of bombs dropped—loads which come in continually from who knows where.

The base is so large, you need a bus to get around. That can be disturbing during a rainstorm and between buses. The base runs all the time. But if you talk to nearly any shop chief, he'll say he's overmanned. Why separate families if the man is going to sit around here waiting for work? Why send anyone here at all? Why spend millions per day to obliterate the people and the country of North Vietnam? Why force people to fight or work who don't believe in this deadly game of death, dealt out by demagogues and so-called "statesmen"? Why spend a fortune destroying when so much else can be done? Why have a war in Southeast Asia? Why isn't Congress tightening the purse? Why?

This war, this operation has placed the so-called welfare of a sick foreign policy of a bunch of bunglers who haven't learned the meaning of the peace they give lip service to supporting, over the welfare of the people who are ordered to carry it out. We didn't ask to be in this war, this military service. We were told. Letters to Congress apparently haven't brought about the end, but I have faith they may. I will continue to write, to let you know about us. We are Americans. Those of us who don't believe in this war, and the number is growing, are often looked upon by the military career people as less than American. Show us that's not true. Let's get some pressure on the people in the Pentagon, the White House and the Capitol. I want to come home.

Sincerely,

TAKING CARE OF THE NEEDS OF THE DEAF IN EMERGENCIES

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, during the past year several students with hearing impairments and speech difficulties have been hard-working members of Senator KENNEDY's and my congressional staffs in Washington. Because of Judy Leah Williams of my office, who recently graduated from Gallaudet College, we discovered that persons with such impairments are not able to benefit from the television bulletins concerning emergencies and disasters like the devastation caused by tropical storm Agnes.

Miss Williams indicated to us that many of the important announcements concerning utility shutoffs, water treatment, and evacuation were transmitted verbally but almost never in print on the screen. Therefore, it was virtually impossible for the 100,000 deaf and hearing-impaired people in Washington to be properly alerted to this essential information.

As a result of Miss Williams' report, our offices contacted many of the Washington area television stations to determine whether they would screen simultaneous sign language translation of such emergency announcements.

Beginning at 6 p.m. on Friday, June 23, WTOP television station began such an effort on an experimental basis. The whole Washington community owes a deep debt of gratitude to WTOP-TV and to Mr. Dan Gold, its vice president, and Mr. Larry Israel of that station for their community-minded spirit in the face of this obvious emergency. During the entire weekend emergency WTOP-TV continued to provide this invaluable service in a professional manner and with great efficiency to those people in need. Miss Cynthia Saltzman, the translator, who has been called up on short notice, is to be congratulated for her work.

This new public service pioneered by WTOP-TV was an inspiring educational experience which gave the media a new dimension.

ON TO THE MOON

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, man has not always chosen to be progressive. There were those who denied the possibility of man flying through the air. There were those who said that man's voice could never be transmitted over a wire. These same doubters also believed that man's voice could never transverse the air. Our space program also has these doubters.

As with other astronauts in the Apollo lunar landing program, Lt. Col. Charles M. Duke, Jr., quoted in a recent editorial of April 14, 1972, of the Atlanta Journal, points out the value of searching into the unknown. This significant editorial goes on to discuss the importance of our search for knowledge and the development of science and technology through a strong national space effort. I commend this editorial to the reading of my colleagues and the general public.

The editorial follows:

ON TO THE MOON

Another chapter in the enthralling history of both science and adventure will be opened Sunday when Apollo 16 is launched from Cape Kennedy to the moon.

To the phlegmatic and to those cursed with short vision, the event will be nothing more than a waste of money, time and effort. To the easily bored it will be merely a repetition of what we have done before. And, undoubtedly, there will be those who will continue to contend that we have never really gotten to the moon but the whole thing is done in a television studio.

But Apollo 16 represents the last great frontier open to living man. The exploration of the awesome void of space is the greatest challenge facing man's intellect and strength.

Capt. John W. Young, Jr., Lt. Col. Charles M. Duke Jr., and Lt. Cdr. Thomas K. Mattingly II will be taking the next to final scheduled shot to the moon. Capt. Young and Lt. Col. Duke will explore areas which have never been trod by man. And they will seek evidence which should broaden our knowledge and understanding of how the moon, this planet and this solar system were created.

Lt. Col. Duke put it into proper context when someone commented on his getting "just another bag of rocks."

"It is not just another bag of rocks," Lt. Col. Duke pointed out. "It is a bag of rocks that helps unravel the secret of the whole creation of our solar system."

What has brought man from the caves and primitive conditions in which he once lived to the sophisticated age in which we now reside was his unerring and constant quest of the unknown.

There were undoubtedly those in the times of cave men who preferred to remain in caves, who preferred to use the "comfortable" stone implements, who saw no reason for seeking something better.

This reluctance to change, this hesitation to go forth into the unknown has been characteristic of some people in all ages and in all lands.

But it is the inner drive that makes some men continue to quest for the unknown that has brought us to our level of civilization

today. And this is no time to stop, to hang back, to call a halt to the quest.

Stagnation and death are synonymous. Life and the quest for knowledge is what Apollo 16 is all about.

ARMS LIMITATION AGREEMENTS
WILL NOT MEAN REDUCTION IN
MILITARY SPENDING

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, the best information I can obtain is that President Nixon's Moscow agreements regarding arms limitation will not mean any reduction in military spending.

In fact, it appears that the treaty limiting both Russia and the United States to two ABM sites will cost the United States more money than the four sites which the administration previously had recommended.

Two letters tell the story—one by the senior Senator from Virginia to the Secretary of the Army, the other the Army's reply. I ask unanimous consent that the letters be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

JUNE 13, 1972.

HON. ROBERT F. FROEHLKE,
Secretary of the Army, Department of the
Army, The Pentagon.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Press reports last week indicate that the Defense Department now estimates that the projected cost of two Safeguard anti-ballistic missile sites is \$8.5 billion.

This estimate is for the sites which would be permitted under the proposed arms limitation agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union.

You testified in February that the cost of four Safeguard sites would be \$8 billion. Thus, the projected cost for two sites is \$500 million greater than your recent estimate of the cost for four sites.

I understand that some costs would be incurred in connection with closing out the sites which would not be built. However, I am at a loss to understand how the total projected cost can rise under these circumstances.

I hope you will be able to explain this increase in estimated outlay for the ABM. I shall appreciate any light you can throw on this matter.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

JUNE 21, 1972.

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: The Secretary of the Army has asked me to reply to your inquiry concerning Safeguard cost estimates.

As you stated in your letter, the Safeguard 4-site cost estimated in February 1972 was \$8.0 billion. This is still the estimate for a 4-site deployment, but the \$8.0 billion was then, as it is now, stated as a DOD acquisition cost; i.e., the RDTE, procurement and construction cost through completion of the last site. This DOD acquisition cost does not

include the operating accounts, OMA and MPA, which would bring the total DOD direct cost to \$8.9 billion.

In your letter, you asked for a justification of the difference between the 4-site cost estimate of \$8.0 billion and an \$8.5 billion cost estimate for a 2-site deployment (Grand Forks plus NCA). On 13 June 1972, in testimony before the Defense Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Secretary Laird estimated that the total DOD direct costs, including OMA and MPA, of the Grand Forks site plus the least costly of the NCA deployments under consideration, would be \$8.7 billion. The DOD acquisition cost of this deployment would be \$7.7 billion. Hence, the \$8.0 billion 4-site acquisition cost estimate should be compared to the \$7.7 billion acquisition estimate for two sites, not to the \$8.7 billion total 2-site cost. Conversely, the \$8.7 billion estimated total cost for the two sites can be compared to an estimated \$8.9 billion total cost for four sites. Either way, the current preliminary estimate for this particular 2-site deployment is slightly less, rather than somewhat greater, than the corresponding estimate for 4 sites. However, I must emphasize that there are a variety of NCA configurations under consideration and, if one of the more costly options is finally selected, the 2-site costs could, in fact, exceed the estimated 4-site costs.

There are a number of reasons why even the least costly Grand Forks plus NCA deployment estimate closely approaches estimated 4-site costs. First, as you mention, our 2-site estimate reflects in construction and hardware costs the lost effort expended for the 4-site deployment but not needed for the 2-site deployment. This includes contract termination costs as well as site restoration costs. Second, schedule differences also come into play. While one would ordinarily believe a 2-site deployment would be completed considerably earlier than a 4-site deployment, in this case the opposite is true because of the relatively late decision to change to NCA in favor of the Minuteman defense sites that were scheduled for earlier completion. The stretchout of the program adds significantly to the 2-site costs. Third, because the threat to NCA varies considerably from that to the Minuteman sites, particularly as it affects system software, significant additional development and testing is required. Last, this same consideration dictates increases in hardware requirements for an NCA deployment, for data processing equipment, for example, thus further increasing the cost. Taken collectively, the reasons cited above account for an increase of approximately \$1.5 billion in DOD acquisition costs for the least costly Grand Forks plus NCA deployment as compared to a 2-site deployment consisting of Grand Forks plus Malmstrom.

I hope this information is of value to you.
Sincerely,

W. P. LEBER,
Lieutenant General, GS,
Safeguard System Manager.

LET'S NOT BETRAY AMERICAN
PRISONERS OF WAR

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the judicious indignation felt by the San Diego County Federation of Republican Women's Clubs and other Americans at the remarks made on a recent television

program is well expressed in the following resolution:

RESOLUTION ON THE CENSURE OF CONGRESSMAN PAUL N. McCLOSKEY'S TV REMARKS ON POW'S

Whereas, on June 7th, 1972, California's Republican Representative from the 11th Congressional District, Paul N. McCloskey, Jr., made remarks on NBC's nationally televised "Today" show which were treacherous in that they offered "aid and comfort to the enemy"; and

Whereas, his remarks, which suggested that if he were the North Vietnam General Giap he would put an American POW in the town square of each of 700 of his largest towns, so that when American planes bomb North Vietnam they might very well be bombing our own POW's, were offensive and shocking to Americans of both major political parties; and

Whereas, these remarks were especially repulsive and humiliating to Republicans whose national administration is making every effort to end the war in Indochina by severing the enemy's supply lines; and

Whereas, public attention was called a second time to these remarks on June 8th when a representative from the National League of Families of American Prisoners and Those Missing in Southeast Asia on the "Today" show justifiably asked for an apology from Rep. McCloskey; and

Whereas, on June 10, 1972 California's Governor Ronald Reagan publicly called the McCloskey remarks "reprehensible and utterly ridiculous";

Therefore be it resolved that the San Diego County Federation of Republican Women's Clubs call upon responsible Republican leadership to take all necessary steps to censure Rep. McCloskey, including loss of his Party affiliation, if that is deemed necessary; and

Be it further resolved that Governor Reagan be thanked for his public rejection of the McCloskey remarks; and

Be it further resolved that copies of this Resolution be forwarded to President Nixon; Governor Reagan; Senator Dole; all levels of the California Republican Central Committees; all levels of the California Federation of Republican Women's Clubs; to all Congressmen including Paul McCloskey, and to the public press.

Adopted unanimously by the San Diego County Federation of Republican Women's Clubs at a county board meeting on June 12, 1972.

HEALTH LEGISLATION

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, during the 92d Congress, the Public Health and Environment Subcommittee, of which I am a member, initiated a variety of legislation attacking the crisis America faces today in its health-care system. I believe that the members of the subcommittee, particularly its chairman, PAUL ROGERS, are to be commended for their fine efforts in improving the health of the Nation and lowering the cost of medical care.

SEVEN NEW HEALTH LAWS

As of mid-June, seven of the bills reported by the subcommittee this session have become law.

The National Sickle Cell Anemia Prevention Act (H.R. 13592)—now Public

Law 92-294—provides for the prevention of sickle cell anemia through diagnosis, research, and treatment. H.R. 13591—now Public Law 92-305—changes the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases to the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases in order to intensify the investigation of digestive diseases. The National Cancer Act of 1971 (H.R. 11302)—now Public Law 92-218—enlarged the authority of the National Cancer Institute and National Institute of Health in order to mount an effective attack on cancer. The bill establishes new centers for clinical research, training, and demonstration of advanced diagnostic and treatment methods.

In response to the need for more manpower and facilities to serve the sick of America, the subcommittee initiated three bills which improve the delivery of health services. H.R. 7736—now Public Law 92-174—extended for 1 year the student loan and scholarship provisions of the Public Health Service Act, thereby supporting first year medical, dental, and other students of the health profession. H.R. 8629—now Public Law 92-157—a comprehensive Health Manpower Act, assists in training the medical personnel so badly needed to meet America's health problems. The law provides scholarships, loans, and fellowships for medical students, grants and loans for construction of medical schools, and grants to improve the quality of medical schools. This law incorporated H.R. 1175, which was intended to encourage doctors and other medical personnel to practice in areas where there was less than adequate health care. H.R. 1175 provided for the payment of outstanding educational loans of students who promised to work in such areas. Finally, the Nurse Training Act of 1971 (H.R. 8630)—now Public Law 92-158—promotes the training of increased numbers of nurses.

The subcommittee also reported out the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (H.R. 12089)—now Public Law 92-255—which created a Special Office for Drug Abuse Prevention in the White House to coordinate the Federal effort against drug abuse.

SIX MORE HEALTH BILLS TO BE LAW

In addition to these seven new health laws, the subcommittee initiated six other bills which are very likely to become law before Congress adjourns this year. One of the most far-reaching is the Health Maintenance Organization Act (H.R. 11728), which provides for physician services, emergency care, and hospitalization to enrollees in the prepaid group practice offered by the Health Maintenance Organization—HMO. The HMO will assure the patient of quality health care at reasonable prices when he is in need of emergency, preventive, or long-term treatment. Perhaps most important, the HMO will focus on the patient as a single human being with a continuing variety of health problems, rather than taking an impersonal attitude and considering only the immediate symptoms. The Senate subcommittee has already reported the bill, while the House subcommittee is in the process of marking up a comparable measure.

Equally important are four bills providing for research into heart and lung disease, multiple sclerosis, communicable diseases, and Cooley's anemia. The National Heart, Blood Vessel, Lung, and Blood Act of 1972 (H.R. 15081) expands existing National Heart and Lung Institute programs. The bill authorizes the development of 30 clinical research and training centers to intensify the battle against heart and blood vessel diseases, chronic lung diseases, and chronic respiratory diseases. A comparable bill has passed the Senate, and the House Commerce Committee reported the bill to the Rules Committee where it is awaiting a hearing. The National Advisory Commission on Multiple Sclerosis Act (H.R. 15475) establishes a National Advisory Commission to determine the most effective means of finding the cause of and cures and treatment for multiple sclerosis. The Public Health Subcommittee reported a clean bill on June 12, 1972. H.R. 14455 extends and revises the Public Health Service Act programs for the control and prevention of communicable diseases. The bill provides grants for vaccination programs and other communicable disease control programs in such areas as venereal diseases, TB, and measles. The bill is now before the Rules Committee. National Cooley's Anemia Control Act (H.R. 15474) supports programs for the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of Cooley's anemia. The bill is now pending for executive consideration by the full Commerce Committee.

Lastly, the subcommittee initiated H.R. 14424, which creates a new National Institute on Aging and a new National Advisory Council on Aging. The bill has been reported out of the Commerce Committee, and the Senate Labor and Welfare Committee will soon report a comparable measure.

HEALTH BILLS IMPROVING THE DELIVERY OF SERVICES

To improve the availability and accessibility of health care, the subcommittee initiated two pieces of legislation. House Concurrent Resolution 370 expresses the sense of Congress that the Public Health Service Hospitals should remain open, and be considered an integral part of the national health care system. The Medical Emergency Transportation and Service Act (H.R. 12563) authorizes the establishment of medical emergency transportation and service programs using military ground vehicles and aircraft to aid civilian victims of accidents. This measure, once enacted, could save the lives of 1,000 Missourians each month. Members of the subcommittee also cosponsored H.R. 14199, which establishes a Department of Health.

PROTECTION OF THE CONSUMER

The effective prevention of disease requires a program which focuses not only on the individual patient, but also on the public health dangers in our environment. I was proud to sponsor the National Water Hygiene Act of 1972 (H.R. 14260) which assures the public of an adequate supply of safe water for drinking, recreation, and other purposes. The Food Processing and Inspection Act of

1972 (H.R. 14498) also initiated by the Public Health Subcommittee, provides increased protection from the consequences of interstate shipment of adulterated and unfit food. The bill requires the registration and inspection of all establishments in which foods are manufactured, processed, or packed.

THE HEALTH OF OUR CHILDREN

Members of the Public Health Subcommittee answered our hopes for a strong and healthy future generation of Americans by cosponsoring or initiating a number of bills. The Comprehensive Child Care and Child Development Act of 1972 (H.R. 14000) provides quality child and health care services with an emphasis on children of preschool age and children of working mothers. Another bill, H.R. 7657, extends for 5 years maternal and infant health care programs. The Children's Dental Health Act of 1972 (H.R. 13659) increases the availability of dental care for children. Lastly, House Joint Resolution 1070 promotes research into the cause and prevention of sudden infant death syndrome.

Children are often exposed to lead-based paint that possesses a potential health danger. H.R. 1752 appropriates money to carry out the lead-based poisoning prevention program for 1971 and 1972, and H.R. 12466 increases funding for the Lead-Based Poisoning Prevention Act. H.R. 12466 has been included in the omnibus housing bill for 1972.

THE AGED AND THE HANDICAPPED

The young, of course, are not the only segment of our society who have need of better medical care. The handicapped and aged are often neglected. Two bills cosponsored by members of the subcommittee give the handicapped a fair chance in life. H.R. 15162 amends the Education of the Handicapped Act to provide programs of comprehensive education for the severely and profoundly mentally retarded children. H.R. 13306 amends the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to prohibit discrimination on the basis of physical or mental handicap in federally assisted programs.

In the area of care for the aged, the Public Health Subcommittee initiated the Glaucoma Examination and Prevention Act (H.R. 14627) which provides grants to States and local communities to pay for the costs of eye examination programs to detect glaucoma in the elderly. Finally, members of the subcommittee cosponsored House Joint Resolution 1146, which recognizes the problem of arthritis, and authorizes the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the month of May as "National Arthritis Month."

SUMMARY

Until we can implement much of this legislation, the Nation's health care system will remain in critical condition. This year we will spend close to \$80 billion on this system. In order to benefit fully from this enormous expenditure, we must end the growing patchwork of inadequate, overlapping, and uncoordinated health programs by establishing a new Department of Health. Moreover, in order to reduce medical costs for individuals, we must move on legislation to

establish some form of national health insurance, and health maintenance service system.

While the Federal Government cannot and should not attempt to solve all health problems by itself, certainly it should take the leadership role in the Nation's medical programs.

MAKING GAS AND OIL—SOLAR SHINGLES AND CROPS OF CLEAN ENERGY

HON. MIKE GRAVEL

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, in accordance with the new rules of the Joint Committee on Printing with respect to printing material exceeding two Record pages, I have obtained the printers' estimate on the probable cost of printing this material. The estimate is \$315. I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding the additional cost, that my statements and insertions may be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MAKING GAS AND OIL, PART II

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, fuels like natural gas and methane are among our cleanest and most popular sources of energy. One of the easiest and most elegant ways to help meet our energy needs might be to grow our own gas. When fast-growing algae, for instance, are digested by bacteria, the major product is methane.

Would the cost of grow-it-yourself gas be competitive with natural gas? Is the price of natural gas going to increase? How much of our energy could we obtain from farming algae and other high-energy plants, which also can be burned directly without methanization?

We could get at least enough energy to make all our electricity and maybe a great deal more.

GETTING 100 PERCENT OF OUR ENERGY FROM 4 PERCENT OF THE LAND?

The biological process of fuel production was recently discussed before the Senate Interior Committee by Dr. Alfred Eggers, Assistant Director for Research Applications at the National Science Foundation:

Solar energy can be utilized through photosynthesis and bacterial fermentation processes to produce fuel gases, such as methane or hydrogen, to augment the Nation's dwindling supplies of natural gas. Fuel gases can be produced from organic materials in municipal, industrial, and agricultural wastes, or from plants grown and harvested on land, in fresh water ponds, or in ocean areas.

It has even been suggested, for example, that all of the world's energy requirements in the year 2000 could be met by combustion of high-energy plants cultivated on only about 4 percent of the world's land surface.

Land accounts for 30 percent of the globe's surface; 70 percent is covered with water, where high-energy plants can also be cultivated.

SOLAR ELECTRICITY FOR MINNESOTANS FROM 0.2 PERCENT OF THEIR LANDS?

The cultivation of algae may be an attractive proposition even in a very north-State like Minnesota, where the sunlight is less intense than in the South. The algae grown on only about one-fifth of 1 percent of the land in Minnesota could probably produce power equal to all Minnesota's 1971 electrical power requirements at peak consumption.

That estimate has been made by Prof. A. G. Frederickson of the University of Minnesota Chemical Engineering Department. He postulates the cultivation of algae—Chlorella—in greenhouses, and their direct combustion in a conventional pulverized-coal furnace to produce electricity. Ash, carbon dioxide, and water would be recycled.

In his calculation, he states that the most optimistic figure for solar energy fixation efficiency by Chlorella algae is 20 percent, and for furnace efficiency, 40 percent. This would make the most optimistic overall system efficiency 8 percent. Therefore, he chooses 2 percent as a realistic figure to use.

Relating that figure to electrical demand in Minnesota, he estimates a requirement of 80 square miles of algae—9 miles by 9 miles—per million people.

We could have solar power in Minnesota.

SOME EARLY COST ESTIMATES

Cost estimates on an algae power system were made as early as 1960 by Professors William J. Oswald and Clarence G. Golueke, of the University of California School of Public Health, Berkeley.

Their system, which includes the methane step, was described in an article, "Biological Transformation of Solar Energy," in the journal "Advances in Applied Microbiology."

Unfortunately, few utility and gas people were reading that journal in 1960. I was not reading it either. I am grateful to Dr. John W. Gofman of the University of California Department of Medical Physics, Berkeley, for calling it to my attention.

In answer to one of my questions about algae, Dr. Oswald wrote me in February 1972:

In the laboratory, these organisms may fix up to 35% of the visible light-energy they absorb. Out of doors, we rarely attain efficiencies greater than 10% and often average as little as 4%. Thus there is room for great improvement.

Even at 4% efficiency, the yields of fermentable organic matter are prodigious compared with the normal growth of land plants, but improvements are necessary to decrease the unit cost of production.

A brief summary of the Oswald-Golueke algae power proposal was published in the February 1964 issue of Mechanical Engineering.

Mr. President, because so many of my colleagues are concerned with the country's future energy situation, I ask unanimous consent that the article from Mechanical Engineering entitled "Solar Power Via a Botanical Process," be printed at the end of my remarks.

Using their extensive experience with algae production both indoors and outdoors, plus the assumptions stated in

the article, the authors estimated the cost of electricity from the algae-methane system in 1960 prices to be 16 milligrams per kilowatt-hour, of which 11.5 milligrams would be the cost of producing methane.

They said this estimated cost of algae electricity in 1960 compared favorably with the approximate cost of nuclear electricity at that time.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR SIGNIFICANT COST REDUCTION

In their calculation, Oswald and Golueke assumed a powerplant conversion of 8,500 B.t.u.'s per kilowatt-hour, and production of 4,500 kilowatt-hours per year by each installed kilowatt of generator capacity.

The authors also discussed ways to achieve significant cost reductions from 16 milligrams:

First, subtract about 5 milligrams if you can increase the conversion efficiency of algae energy to methane in the digester to 80 percent.

Second, subtract about 2 milligrams if you can design a cheaper digester especially for a biological conversion system, which does not require the complexity of conventional digesters.

Third, subtract about 2 milligrams if you can raise the light conversion of algae in a pond from 6 percent efficiency up to 10 percent or to 16 percent levels routinely obtained in the laboratory.

ADDITIONAL POWER FROM ORGANIC WASTES

The power we could produce by cultivating algae would be additional to the methane which could be produced from the digestion of animal and urban wastes by anaerobic organisms. That same waste, which could be converted to oil instead of methane, could satisfy nearly half of this country's present oil demand. The calculations on that were presented in part I of these remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 117, part 35, pages 46342-46348.

The growing of our own gas and oil looks like a more attractive proposition every day.

NATURAL ENERGY FROM A SAFELY INSTALLED SUN

Sunlight, algae, methane, power.

The concept is clean and simple, certain and safe. And it leaves no radioactive legacy to haunt our descendants. Consider the billions of dollars this country has invested since 1960 to make nuclear fission competitive. Had we invested the same amount in the perfection of grow-your-own gas and other solar-power systems during the past 10 years, we would probably have no gas shortage and no electric power shortage and no nuclear headaches.

It is almost impossible to believe that people are promoting and submitting to an experiment as undeniably dangerous as nuclear fission, when a variety of gentle solar solutions are ours for the asking. Dr. Eugene Ralph, of Textron's Heliotek Division, has described our energy opportunity very well:

We should think of the sun as our controlled fusion reactor which is safely installed and operating with essentially an unlimited source of fuel, and which has no operating or maintenance requirements. All we need to do is tap a portion of this energy.

Solar energy on earth is so plentiful that all the conceivable energy requirements of mankind could be satisfied by manipulating a small fraction of it.

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

[From Mechanical Engineering,
February 1964]

SOLAR POWER VIA A BOTANICAL PROCESS (By W. J. Oswald and C. G. Golueke)

(An approach to solar power that goes back to nature's sequence—solar energy, to plant life, to fuel—but without the age-long time lag. The secret: Fast-growing algae, with bacterial fermentation producing methane.)

Finding a combined technically and economically feasible way of collecting and using a substantial portion of the vast amount of solar energy that reaches the earth's surface has been the dream of engineers and scientists for many years. Unfortunately, the realization of the dream has been frustrated, chiefly because the supply of solar energy is intermittent, comes in low concentration, has only a limited utility in its directly available form, and its storage as heat is extremely expensive and of brief duration.

In recent years progress has been made in the direct conversion of solar to electrical energy and in improving the conversion of solar energy to living substances. The latter achievement has led the authors to reinvestigate some new methods and some well-established ways of converting living material to electrical energy.

As presently conceived, one of the more promising methods involves trapping and fixing solar energy into the cellular energy of rapidly growing algae, and releasing of the transformed energy through a bacterial fermentation in which that part of the energy not converted into cellular material and heat is transformed into the chemical energy of methane and other combustible gases [1, 2]. In the latter form it can be burned and otherwise be directly available for heat or chemical power production.

A schematic diagram of a plant designed to produce heat power from methane obtained from an algae-bacteria system is shown in Fig. 1. Because of their efficiency in converting visible light energy into cellular energy under a wide range of conditions, because they can be grown in liquid suspension, are readily amenable to handling and storage, and can be produced under closely controlled conditions suited to maximum yield, algae are used as the green plants in the system.

The major components of the conversion plant are the algae or solar-energy collection-pond, a separator, and a digester tank.

Algae grown in the pond are harvested, and then placed in a digester for fermentation. Methane gas produced in the digester is burned and the heat energy is used in a conventional plant to generate electricity. Carbon dioxide and digester residue are returned to the pond. Heat wasted during power production is used to maintain the digester at the desired temperature.

POWER CAPACITY OF THE SYSTEM

Because power production by a pond-digester system is a function of algae production, sunlight conversion efficiency of the algae, and available solar energy, a prediction can be made of the amount of power to be expected under a given set of conditions.

The relationship between algae production and available solar energy may be expressed as

$$W = K F S_r \quad (1)$$

in which W is the algae produced per day per unit of area, S_r is the solar energy in langley (cal/cm²) per day, K is a constant for

converting cal/cm² and areal factors to the desired units for W , and F is the visible light conversion efficiency of the algae expressed as a whole number.

Values for light energy conversion, F , of algae grown in a properly designed pond usually range from 3 to 8 percent, provided the temperature is above 15 C.

The amount of solar energy available at a given location can be determined from information contained in meteorological publications or from a table published by Oswald and Gotaas [3].

Since the line electrical power output of a conversion plant ultimately will be a function of the power obtained in processing a given amount of algae, the equation

$$P_o = 0.10 F S_r \quad (2)$$

may be used in estimating the amount of power that can be expected. In the equation, F is the light energy conversion efficiency of the algae; P_o , the daily power output in kwh per acre; and S_r , the available solar energy. The value 0.10 for the factor K results from the fact that the potential gross power production is approximately 0.67 kwh per lb of algal volatile matter introduced into the digester.

In estimating this yield it is assumed that 5700 Btu as methane is obtained per pound of volatile matter, and that the power plant conversion is 8500 Btu per kwh.

An estimate of the total power to be expected each month may be obtained by multiplying the appropriate value for available solar energy by the number of days in the month. Thus, the monthly power P_m may be expressed as

$$P_m = 3 F S_r \quad (3)$$

and the annual power as

$$P_A' = \int_{\text{Jan}}^{\text{Dec}} 3 F S_r \quad (4)$$

in which P_A' is the gross annual line power in kwh per acre, and F and S_r are as defined previously.

The net annual yield of power is

$$P_A = P_A' - 3650 \quad (5)$$

The value 3650 represents the annual total energy required for the internal power requirements for plant operation, and is based on studies which indicate that the average daily internal power requirements for mixing cultures and for operating the separation plant and the digester would be about 10 kwh/day per acre of pond surface. Estimates of net annual power yield at various latitudes and at various photosynthetic efficiencies are indicated by the curves in Fig. 2.

Since each kw of installed generator capacity normally is called upon to produce about 4500 kwh per year, the annual output of a pond-digester system may be expressed in terms of capacity per year per acre according to the equation

$$C_a = P_A / 4500 \quad (6)$$

in which C_a is the average capacity per acre per year of the pond-digester system and P_A is the net annual power yield, Equation (5).

Although the capacity of an installed power plant should exceed the average output because of seasonal variations in demand, the rated capacity of the pond-digester system may be considered to be the same as the installed capacity of the steam plant it would serve. The reason is that a half day or more of gas storage is included in the assumed pond-digester design, and because algae easily may be stored and readily added to the digester.

POWER COSTS

The estimates of the cost of the electrical energy as given in the discussion to follow are based on information obtained in our

studies on algae and methane production, on that available on power plant construction and operation, and upon the price structure prevailing in the U.S. in 1959 and 1960. An independent evaluation would have to be made for each country other than the U.S., since savings in the form of lower costs and wages may be offset by higher material charges and interest rates.

In arriving at a capital cost estimate, a 2000-acre algae production pond is assumed. The cost of construction, maintenance, and operation of such a pond and its accessory digesters would be about \$4400 per acre prorated. Since the capacity per acre varies with collector efficiency and latitude, the capital costs also vary, the approximate relationship being

$$D = 4400/C_0 \quad (7)$$

in which D is the capital investment in dollars per kw of installed capacity, C_0 the plant capacity as determined according to Equation (6), and 4400 is the estimated fixed costs in dollars per acre. The addition of \$150 to the value for D as obtained in Equation (7) would then also include the capital cost of the generator station.

Thus, a pond-digester fuel system having a capacity of 15 kw per acre would entail an expenditure of \$295 per kw; and of the fuel system plus power plant, \$445 per kw.

The cost of interest, depreciation, and operation, as well as fixed costs, and the per-acre capacity of the 2000-acre plant are combined in Equation (8) to arrive at the cost of producing methane in the plant.

$$M = \frac{44R + 285}{4.5C_0} \quad (8)$$

In the equation M is mills per kw of line power; R , the rate of depreciation plus interest expressed as a whole number; 44, the fixed cost per unit of depreciation and interest; and 285, the estimated cost of operation and maintenance of the system. C_0 is the variable capacity in kw per acre of collector pond and 4.5 is the capacity factor divided by 1000 to convert dollars to mills.

The ultimate cost of line power in mills per kw would be equal to the sum of generator plant cost and the value obtained according to Equation (8). Using a 15 kw per acre plant as an example, the total line power cost would be 16 mills per kw. Of this amount, 11.5 mills per kw would be the cost of producing methane, as determined according to Equation (8)—combined interest and depreciation, 10 percent per annum—and 4.5 mills per kw would be the generator plant cost, assuming a modern steam plant heat rate of 8500 Btu per kw.

An estimate may be made of the cost of generating power at a given geographical site with the use of cost data derived according to Equation (8) and capacity data obtained according to Equation (6).

Thus, if a visible light energy conversion efficiency of 6 percent can be attained in a pond-digester system situated at 20 deg north latitude, the annual capacity of the plant would be 10.8 kw per acre, Equation (6); and methane would be produced at 15 mills per kw of line power at an interest and depreciation rate of 10 percent, Equation (8).

To keep the power cost in the range of 10 to 20 mills per kw, a biological conversion plant would have to be located in a region where the visible light energy is at least approximately 200 langley per day, and the conversion efficiency of the algae would have to be at least 6 percent.

POWER PLUS SEWAGE TREATMENT

The power costs as derived according to the previous equations do not include the monetary savings—probably about 10 mills per capita per day—that would accrue from the sewage treatment accomplished as part of the process. The resulting reduction in

power cost would be from 1 to 2 mills per kw, depending upon the per capita power production.

The estimates of the power costs given are conservative, since possible significant reductions brought about through future improvements in equipment and operation are not taken into consideration.

For instance, if the conversion efficiency of algae energy to methane in the digester were increased to 80 percent, the output energy per pound of algae volatile matter would be stepped up from 0.67 kw per lb to 1.0 kw and the total cost of line power accordingly would be reduced to 11 mills per kw.

Through the application of advances in power technology at present in the research stage, the equivalent power output from each acre of algae culture eventually can be increased by 50 percent, while the power cost is reduced to 7 mills.

Power costs could also be reduced by using digesters designed especially for a biological conversion system, since the complexity of conventional digesters exceeds that required for a biological conversion system. An example of indicated simplification is the use of a simple paved pond covered with a vinyl dome. Such an adaptation would decrease the power cost by about 2 mills per kw.

Increasing the photosynthetic efficiency of the pond culture would also lower power costs. Thus, if the light conversion efficiency of a pond were raised to the levels routinely attained in the laboratory, namely, 10 to 16 percent, a reduction of 3 mills per kw would be effected in fuel cost.

Inasmuch as fossil fuels are inexpensive and are available in enormous quantities, at present the biological conversion plant certainly cannot compete economically as a power producer in the U.S. with plants using fossil fuel. The biological power plant not only must produce power, it must also produce its own fuel, whereas power plants using fossil fuel need only produce power.

On the other hand, the indicated power cost approaches that obtained from nuclear reactors. However, power production by way of nuclear reactors has the advantage of being accompanied by technical know-how, while the biological system has only recently passed from the small pilot-plant stage in some of its phases.

In its favor, the requirements for a pond-digester plant are much less complex than those for a nuclear reactor. Hence, in certain areas where fossil fuels are in short supply, it may be advantageous to study the system more extensively as a possible alternative to presently available sources of power.

REFERENCES

1. C. G. Golueke and W. J. Oswald, "Biological Conversion of Light Energy to the Chemical Energy of Methane," *Applied Microb.*, vol. 7, 1959, pp. 219-227.
2. W. J. Oswald and C. G. Golueke, "Biological Transformation of Solar Energy," *Advances in Applied Microbiology*, II, Academic Press, New York, N.Y., 1960.
3. W. J. Oswald and H. B. Gotaas, "Photosynthesis in Sewage Treatment," *Transactions American Society Civil Engineers*, vol. 122, 1957, pp. 73-105.

SOLAR SHINGLES AND CROPS OF CLEAN ENERGY

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, there are many ways we can convert the energy of sunlight either to electricity or to nonpolluting fuels like methane and hydrogen. Today I would like to concentrate on the exciting potential of solar cells, also called photovoltaics.

These devices, which power 90 percent of our unmanned space vehicles, convert sunlight directly into electricity.

Since solar cells have no moving parts,

their reliability is high and their maintenance is low. Their presently high cost, which is preventing their use on earth today, can probably be reduced so greatly that we may be roofing our homes with solar shingles 10 years from now.

In fact, if we were to put solar cells on a fraction of 1 percent of our land, they could generate the country's entire electrical power supply in 1990. We could have solar-cell power even sooner, if we accelerate our current miniefforts to reduce solar-cell cost.

Solar cells together with other solar-power technologies could have the capability to meet all of our energy needs with clean, safe systems which might even be popular. Therefore I am appalled that the administration plans to limit its funding in fiscal 1973 to about \$6,000,000 for all solar technologies combined. Perhaps this error could be corrected in an election year by some mail to the White House Office of Management and Budget, where the fiscal 1974 budget will soon be in preparation.

ARTICLES PLACED IN THE RECORD

I think my colleagues would be particularly interested in two recent articles about solar cells. The first is entitled "Will Solar Cells Shine on Earth?" from the May 22, 1972 issue of *Electronics* magazine. The second is entitled "NSF to Fund Cadmium Sulfide Project in Search for 'Cheap' Solar Cell," from the May 31, 1972, issue of *Energy Digest*.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two articles be printed in the Record at the end of my remarks.

RUSSIAN EXPERIMENTS UNDERWAY

The article from *Electronics* magazine describes important breakthroughs in solar-cell cost reductions already made by Hughes Aircraft and Lockheed in California, Tyco Labs in Massachusetts and Dow Corning in Michigan.

The article also quotes L. S. King of Centralab in El Monte, Calif.:

If the Government is willing to pump \$30 to \$50 million a year into the technology, it'll take off.

He is telling us that we could develop a whole energy system for a trivial annual investment, equivalent to the cost of two 747-irliners.

Russia, according to the article, is already experimenting with large-scale solar-cell energy farms, which were seen on a recent visit by N. J. Rappaport from the David Sarnoff Research Center in Princeton, N.J.

Since I am not ordinarily a reader of *Electronics* magazine, I am grateful that it was brought to my attention by Wilson Clark of the Environmental Policy Center in Washington, D.C. Mr. Clark is currently writing a book for Doubleday on solar and other energy technologies.

SOLAR SHINGLES FOR ALL-SOLAR HOMES

The article from the *Energy Digest* briefly describes the project of Dr. K. W. Boer, who is director of the University of Delaware Energy Conversion Institute in Newark, Del.

Postulating modifications and improvements in existing technology, Dr. Boer is optimistic that, within 5 years, cadmium sulfide solar cells arrayed on

the roof of a typical Delaware home could produce electricity at about 3 cents per kilowatt-hour. By comparison, the selling-price of residential electricity today in Washington, D.C. is about 2½ cents per kilowatt-hour.

Not just electricity, but also heat and air conditioning for homes can be provided by solar energy. According to Dr. Eugene Ralph of Textron's Heliotek Division in Sylmer, Calif., preliminary calculations indicate that a normal home has more than enough roof area to supply the energy for all three needs.

Discussing two of the needs before the Senate Interior Committee, Dr. Alfred Eggers of the National Science Foundation recently said:

Technology is available for using solar energy to heat and cool residential and commercial buildings. Such systems are approaching economic feasibility. . . . An increase in fossil-fuel costs by about a factor of two over present costs could make solar energy economically attractive using existing technology in many regions of the country. Even at this time, solar heating of residences compares very favorably cost-wise with electrical heating in some parts of the U.S.

A totally solar home, including solar electricity, could be built with today's technology, but it would be expensive. Dr. Ralph says:

Significant progress can be shown in a very few years. Demonstration homes can be designed and built incorporating the total-solar-home concept within five years; however, it may take ten years to refine the designs and realize the economics of mass-producing devices and systems.

Could all-solar homes help significantly in controlling the proliferation of electric powerplants? Yes.

The residential use of electric power will probably continue to account for about 25 percent of the Nation's electrical demand, according to the Federal Power Commission. It seems reasonable to estimate that all-solar homes could eventually render one out of every 10 powerplants unnecessary.

Solar technology could also be applied to commercial buildings, which consume another 20 percent of the Nation's electrical power.

If one considers all forms of energy, electrical and other, then the combined household and commercial consumption is expected to account for about one-third of the country's total energy demand in the year 2000.

SUNSHINE MEGAWATTS FOR INDUSTRY

The development of cheap solar cells could provide solar electricity—or hydrogen—for all of the country's industry, too. I would like to cite the calculations of two experts, Eugene Ralph of Heliotek and William Cherry of NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center.

In a paper entitled "The Generation of Pollution-Free Electrical Power from Solar Energy," dated March 1971, Mr. Cherry states:

A pollution-free method of converting solar energy directly into electrical power, using photo-voltaics on the ground, shows that sunlight falling on about 1% of the land-area of the 48 states could provide the total electrical power requirements of the U.S. in the year 1990.

His statement is based on the routine 7 percent energy-conversion efficiency of solar cells, although 14 percent has been achieved in the lab, 20 percent is expected in the very near future, and 40 to 50 percent efficiencies are theorized.

Obviously, with routine achievement of 14 percent efficiency, the land required would fall to one-half of 1 percent, and at 50 percent efficiency, it would fall to about one-seventh of 1 percent.

With solar cells, a valuable "crop" of electricity could be harvested even from some of the most desolate land. Mr. Cherry envisions a potential net yield of about \$2,000 per acre, and notes that "farmland yielding such a net return is considered premium."

Mr. President, so that my colleagues can study the assumptions behind his estimates, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from William Cherry's paper mentioned above also be printed at the end of my remarks.

TECHNICAL AND ECONOMIC SUCCESS IN 10 YEARS?

The prospects for reducing the cost of solar-cell systems are considered very good by Drs. Boer, Ralph, Cherry, and others in the field. Dr. Ralph says:

Preliminary studies indicate that the probability of reducing solar-cell array costs by at least 100-fold is very high.

Even a modest effort, he believes, is likely to produce a solar-cell powerplant design which is both technically and economically successful within 10 years. He estimates large-scale demonstration plants by 1985, and operational plants by 1990.

I placed a paper by Dr. Ralph, entitled "Large-Scale Solar Electric Power Generation" into the RECORD July 8, 1971, pages S10649-63. It includes a brief discussion of cost-reduction possibilities.

SOME ECOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

In case there are ecological reasons for not covering even a tiny fraction of land with solar-cell arrays, Dr. Ralph suggests that there may be some suitable ocean areas. Since there are ways to tap sun-power without covering any land at all—for example, windmills and sea-thermal plants—it is unlikely that we will ever want to make 100 percent of our electricity from solar cells in any case.

The earth's heat inventory might eventually become an ecological consideration, too. Dr. Ralph states as follows:

Solar energy can be converted into electricity without pollution of the earth's biosphere. The electricity is converted into heat as we use power to run machinery, but this level of heat can be adjusted to the same ratio as would have been absorbed by the earth naturally. All we have done is transformed some of the [solar] energy into electricity and used it to power our machines prior to its being converted to heat, instead of its making heat directly.

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

[From Electronics magazine, May 22, 1972]

WILL SOLAR CELLS SHINE ON EARTH?

(By William F. Arnold, Aerospace Editor)

Despite their bright promise in converting sunlight into electricity, solar cells have until now achieved measurable success only in

powering Air Force and NASA satellites. If this technology is to become a major market, it will have to find its future on the ground as a pollution-free source of power, prophesy industry spokesmen.

The nation's threatening power crisis should provide that thrust, particularly when conventional power sources such as coal, gas, and nuclear fuel become more scarce and expensive. Then, solar cell advocates say these second cousins to semiconductors could help fill the power gap. Even though there have been some recent improvements in technology, it will take Government-supported research, they say, to push solar cells past their two biggest technical problems: high cost and low efficiency.

"If the Government is willing to pump \$30 to \$50 million a year into the technology, it'll take off," says K. S. Ling, engineering and marketing manager of space products for Centralab, of Globe Union Inc., El Monte, Calif., whose company splits most of the annual \$5 million market with Heliotek division of Textron Inc. Confirming Ling's estimate of needed research money, William Cherry, a leading solar cell authority from NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center, says that a White House Solar Energy Panel will submit its recommendations in July.

While solar power won't supplant conventional power, Cherry says the panel visualizes three major areas where it could be supplemented:

Heating and cooling homes. This is the largest potential use, Cherry says. "Solar energy can eventually account for more than 50% of the space conditioning in houses," he claims.

Producing fuel. Here, solar energy would serve double duty by consuming wastes and by generating methane or hydrogen for power, Cherry says. He estimates that a few square miles for use as a solar plant could supply cooking gas for a city of 40,000.

Generating electrical power. Right now, solar power is three to five times more expensive than conventional means, but in the future, solar cells should become cheaper and conventional fossil fuels more expensive, Cherry predicts.

"The terrestrial area is the one we're all watching," says Ling, who adds that if solar energy is used on the ground, "the semiconductor manufacturers will jump in because the technology is so similar." Already an impressive roster of the major aerospace companies, electronics systems manufacturers, NASA, and the Department of Defense are doing solar cell work inhouse, or funding research.

Solar cell developers encounter many of the technical and materials problems faced by the semiconductor industry. But, while integrated circuits have compressed more and more functions into smaller space, the trend in solar cells is to make them larger.

Other problems include purity, photoetching, junction formation and interconnections—just as with semiconductors. Since fabricating solar cells in nearly a handcrafting process, making 2-by-2-centimeter cells and mounting them by soldering or welding into a typical spaceborne array is also a meticulous and expensive process.

It takes more than 80,000 welded connections to make a 1-kilowatt solar array, explains John V. Goldsmith, group supervisor for photovoltaic power sources, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, Calif. And since cells cost about \$4 each, plus another \$4 to \$6 for assembly, solar array costs match the precision it takes to manufacture them.

Recent developments. Meanwhile, several recent developments have helped solve some problems of cost, efficiencies, and weight. Lockheed Missiles and Space Co., Sunnyvale, Calif., has developed a 100-kilowatt solar array that employs new cell and bonding technology. The four-section unit unfolds

from a compact 14-by-15-foot package into a 10,000-square-foot array.

Larry G. Chidester, program manager, solar array technology program, explains that assembly can't be automated because most solar cells have both front and back contacts—one for each electrode. But Lockheed has invented a technique whereby both contacts are on the back of the cell and can be induction-soldered automatically to a printed-circuit board.

An edge-defined, film-fed growth (EFG) process, developed by Tyco Laboratories, Waltham, Mass., promises to lower silicon solar cell processing costs about 300-fold, says C. G. Currin, manager of solid state research and development, Dow Corning Corp., Hemlock, Mich., which is continuing development of EFG under license. EFG is a proprietary ribbon-crystal growth process that would actually make cell production cheaper in small volumes, rather than obtaining lower unit costs through mass production.

The Hughes Aircraft Co. flexible rolled-up solar array (Frusa), built under an Air Force Aero Propulsion Laboratory contract, has been flying successfully since its launch last October, says program manager George Wolff. Frusa's importance is that the two 5½-by-16-foot solar panels extend from a single 8-inch-diameter drum, thus making a new step in reducing the weight of satellite solar arrays, he says.

A fully operational system would be capable of providing 1,500 watts of power, which means that compact, lightweight solar arrays of 20 kilowatts and beyond are now achievable, he says.

By far the most startling proposal to generate solar power for earthly uses is the satellite solar power station (SSPS), which would use two 25-square-mile arrays of power spot-beamed by microwave to the earth, where a station would convert the energy into usable current. Proposed by economist Peter Glaser of Arthur D. Little Inc., Cambridge, Mass., the concept is being studied by a team of ADL, Raytheon Microwave & Power Tube division, Waltham, Mass. (microwave systems); Grumman Aerospace Corp., Bethpage, N.Y. (hardware); and Heliotek (solar systems).

The bold proposal calls for SSPS to collect solar energy efficiently in atmosphere-free outer space, use practically no land (compared to ground-based systems), consume no diminishing fuels, and direct power to where it would be needed.

SOLAR ENERGY ACTIVITY ABROAD

While the United States continues to develop more efficient solar cells for spacecraft and ponders the uses of solar cell technology for terrestrial applications, Russia, Japan and Europe are pushing its development.

The Soviet Union "is working on practically everything you can think of in this field," says Paul Rappaport, director, process and materials applied research, RCA's David Sarnoff Research Center, Princeton, N.J. Rappaport is a solar cell expert who had a rare opportunity to inspect Russia's solar-cell technology late last year. Russian scientists told him that they've flown over 400 spacecraft with solar cells and have operated solar-cell-powered pumping stations. During his visit, he saw experiments toward large-scale solar-cell energy farms.

Rappaport says the Russians told him they've flown four space vehicles using gallium arsenide solar cells in the 300-to-400-watt range. Soviet scientists claim 15% efficiency on laboratory cells and 9% on arrays.

In Japan, Nippon Electric Co. Ltd., Sharp Corp. and Matsushita dominate a fledgling solar cell market directed toward pollution- and maintenance-free power sources for lighthouses around the island nation. Both

companies also make some solar cells for Japan's slowly developing space program. The Japanese companies report that they don't foresee large-scale applications of solar power to generate pollution-free electricity because it's economically unjustified with present silicon-cell technology.

European companies seem to be concentrating their R&D efforts in areas U.S. companies are neglecting, thus being able to enjoy the benefits of both U.S. R&D and their own. Europe appears to be hitting development of cadmium sulfide and gallium arsenide techniques. For example, France's space agency, CNES (Centre National d'Etudes Spatiales), Société Anonyme de Télécommunications (SAT), and La Radiotechnique-Comptec (RTC) have worked together on experimental cadmium-sulfide and cadmium-telluride cells which are being tested on the Russian-launched French satellite SRET-1 [Electronics International, Jan. 31].

In other spaceborne arrays, Germany's AEG Telefunken has fabricated large solar-cell arrays for the Helios sun probe and Britain's Ferranti Ltd.—in the forefront of silicon-cell technology—has operating cells on the Intelsat-4 communications satellites. In earth applications, France's RTC, a Philips subsidiary, has produced a silicon-cell-powered 50-watt air navigation beacon that has worked since 1968 with no breakdowns. The company also has in operation a 12-watt telecommunications relay station and is pointing toward educational television power sources with installation of some units in Latin America, India and Africa. RTC prices its peak output 8-watt unit at \$50 each in small quantities and \$20 in large quantities. Overall, "what we're working on are ways to get the cost of existing technology down to the lowest possible level," says an RTC spokesman.

[From the Energy Digest; May 31, 1972]

NSF TO FUND CADMIUM SULFIDE PROJECT IN SEARCH FOR "CHEAP" SOLAR CELL

The National Science Foundation is reportedly planning to fund a proposal aimed at making cadmium sulfide solar cells economically feasible for electric power generation. Funding announcement is expected within a few days.

Among other considerations in funding the project is the hope that the cost of solar cell technology can be reduced by the "factor of 100" which NSF Dir. Dr. Guyford Stever has said would make solar cells economically feasible for widespread electric power generation (see article above).

The proposal is based on a concept developed by Dr. K. W. Boer, director of the Energy Conversion Institute at Univ. of Delaware. Dr. Boer outlined his proposal at the 1972 meeting of the U.S. Section of the International Solar Energy Society in Gainesville, Fla. in April. Based on modifications and improvements to existing technology, Dr. Boer asserted that cadmium sulfide cells arrayed on a typical residential rooftop in Delaware could produce electricity to power lights, appliances, etc. within 5 years at costs comparable to electricity rates now paid to utilities.

However, such a system would supplement, rather than replace, power from electric utilities, Boer stressed, and any surplus power produced by the home solar generator could be fed back into the utilities grid for consumption by other electricity users.

Thus the utilities could serve as "a big storage battery to give electric energy back to the house during nights and cloudy days," Dr. Boer speculated.

Dr. Boer has requested \$1.6 million over a 3 yr. period to fund experiments to test out the whole concept, but NSF plans to underwrite only the cadmium sulfide technology aspects, at least at the present time, at a considerably lower funding level of "sev-

eral hundred thousand dollars," an NSF official said.

Cadmium sulfide technology is not without some major problems, Dr. Boer acknowledged. Degradation is a severe problem at the present time, and manufacturing techniques have not been perfected for producing the cells in large quantities. For instance, of one batch of 30 cells, only 3 were suitable for use. Glass encapsulation may well prove necessary for protection, adding to complexity and costs. Cadmium's other problems include its toxicity, its scarcity, and its low conversion efficiencies, Dr. Boer said. Nevertheless, "cadmium sulfide is the only cell which has some promise in the near future of being produced at a price we can afford in terms of kilowatt hours which we can sell," he asserted.

Dr. Boer said Delmarva Power & Light has already funded some solar research at the University, and there is "some indication" that the company might be willing to work with Boer's group to fund a working experiment of this concept, though the utility's high cost of money—16%—would be a disadvantage, he said.

Dr. Boer's proposal calls for covering a home roof with solar cells with heat collectors on the reverse side to collect heat in the 60° C range. There would be a DC-to-AC power conversion unit to convert DC electricity produced by the cells into 115 volt AC current for meshing with commercial electricity in the home. The by product heat could be used for space and water heating, he said.

Assuming mass production at a rate of from 10 million to 100 million sq. ft. per year, Dr. Boer estimated the price could be reduced to \$1-\$1.50/sq. ft. With the heat collector on the reverse side, the units could be built for about \$15/sq. meter, he estimated. Thus the cells, the collector and units for processing and storing could be installed on the roof of the average residence for about \$3,000. Assuming a 10° Btu capacity and 10% cost of money to the homeowner, Dr. Boer estimated solar energy from the system could be produced for about \$1 per million Btus, "which compares with something between 50c and \$1.50 per million" for other systems, "depending on where you are in the U.S. and what kind of oil or gas you're using." The electrical energy itself would be produced at about 3c kwh based on 1971 dollars, he said. With maximum development of existing technology, deployment of such a system could begin in 5 years, he contended.

As for the relative scarcity of cadmium, assuming the cells can be reduced in thickness to 5 microns, "then the newly discovered zinc mine in middle Tennessee would be sufficient to cover all the U.S. roofs with these cadmium sulfide layers," he said.

Some have questioned Dr. Boer's cost assumptions, but there appears to be some enthusiasm both in NSF and AEC for the concept, though AEC has ruled out any funding for it at the present time (see AEC solar funding article, p. 113, this issue).

For further information, contact Dr. K. W. Boer, Energy Conversion Institute, University of Delaware, Newark, Dela.

[Excerpts]

THE GENERATION OF POLLUTION FREE ELECTRICAL POWER FROM SOLAR ENERGY

(By William R. Cherry)

MARCH 1971.

SOLAR ELECTRICAL POWER COSTS

Today the direct conversion of solar energy into electricity is very expensive and confined to those applications where conventional processes are impractical. Solar cells have found wide application on long life unmanned spacecraft. The solar cells manufactured for the space program are subjected to stringent specifications and high quality

control measures, both of which involve expensive hand operations. Further, the demand for solar cells is quite small amounting to some 2 million devices per year with a total market value of between 6 and 8 million dollars. Also the demand is sporadic.

This involves numerous start-ups and shutdowns of the production line, resulting in considerable waste in manpower and materials. Finally, no standard design has been agreed upon by the users, forcing the manufacturers to rely heavily on many hand operations simply because it is economically unfeasible to invest in automation.

Because of all this, oriented space solar arrays, like the large Apollo Telescope Mount illustrated in Figure 6, cost about \$2,000,000 per KW. A recent study (E. L. Ralph) has shown that cells for terrestrial applications can be made now for about \$15,000 per KW using existing silicon solar cell manufacturing methods, by relaxing the stringent space cosmetic and performance specifications, changing the cells' shape for better utilization of the single crystal silicon, and automating many of the processes for large scale production. By using simple concentrators, as illustrated in Figure 7, which would require fewer cells to generate the same electrical power, the cost would be nearer to \$10,000 per KW.

The next big step in cost reduction would be the utilization of inherently inexpensive processes, such as evaporation or deposition on long sheets of substrate. This film solar cells made of cadmium sulphide in 3" x 3" sizes are in pilot production now and might be massed produced for \$2,500 KW.

Figure 8 illustrates a process where many thousands of square feet of solar array might be produced at costs around \$50 per KW under space simulated conditions or \$50 per square foot. Thus a square mile of array would cost about \$14 million. Construction of the necessary groups support structure and conductor might amount to \$1.00 per square foot or \$28 million per square mile. Batteries for a 1,000,000 KWH storage facility might cost \$10 per KWH or \$10 million when purchased in large quantities, and the necessary buildings and switching gear might add another \$20 million over a 20 year period, including two battery replacements.

Since the solar array is a direct energy conversion system and has no fuel costs associated with it, its operating costs should be considerably less than any of the dynamic systems; perhaps as low as \$1.00/ft² over 20 years or \$28 million per square mile which would include 2 array replacements.

Table 4 shows that a 1 square mile solar array power station, built after techniques are developed to produce low cost solar arrays and batteries, would cost about \$100 million to build, operate and maintain over a 20-year period. A solar array in the sunny S.W. part of the U.S., using a 70% sunshine factor, would generate at least 2.1 x 10⁶ KWH/mi²yr. If the power were sold for 3¢/KWH, about twice today's rates, the gross return over a 20 year period would be \$1.26 x 10⁶/mi². Subtracting the installation, maintenance and operating costs of \$1.0 x 10⁶/mi² leaves about \$26 million net income per square mile over 20 years.

This land is then producing a "crop" which yields about \$2,000 per acre per year. Farm land yielding such a net return is considered premium.

TABLE 4.—Cost of 1 Square Mile Solar Array Power Station

Solar Array \$0.50/FT ²	\$14 x 10 ⁶
Site Construction.....	\$28 x 10 ⁶
Storage and Switching Facility....	\$10 x 10 ⁶
Maintenance of Storage Facility (2 Replacements in 20 Years)....	\$20 x 10 ⁶
Maintenance and Operation of Station (2 Array Replacements in 20 years).....	\$28 x 10 ⁶
Total 20 Years Construction Main- tenance and Operating.....	\$100 x 10 ⁶

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have just recently returned from Stockholm, Sweden, where 114 nations assembled for the world's first International Conference of the Human Environment, from June 5-16, 1972. Congressmen FRANK CLARK, ROBERT MCCLORY, SEYMOUR HALPERN, and I were members of the U.S. delegation and had the honor of representing the House of Representatives at the Conference in the capacity of congressional advisers.

The U.S. delegation was headed by Russell E. Train, Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality, and its vice chairman was Christian A. Herter, Jr., Special Environmental Assistant to the Secretary of State. The other principal members of the delegation were William D. Ruckelshaus, Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency; Secretary of the Interior Robert C. B. Morton, Senator HOWARD BAKER, Jr., who headed the State Department Advisory Committee for the conference; and Laurance S. Rockefeller, Chairman of the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality. Other representatives of the 35-member delegation consisted of 18 alternate delegates and 11 Congressional advisers and alternates.

Although the Conference was a frustrating event for many, and many feared it would not succeed, the conference must be counted a success and most significant. Despite all their differences, the participants, representing about 90 percent of the world's population, reached a consensus on more than a hundred recommendations.

I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the entire U.S. delegation for their dedicated and untiring efforts in making this Conference a tremendous success. It is a conference in which all of us can take great pride.

I feel—and I think the U.S. delegation will agree with me—that the following recommendations are among the more important ones that were adopted at the Conference:

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Recommended unanimously the creation in the UN of a permanent high level environmental unit to coordinate UN environmental activities, and a UN Environment Fund expected to be funded at \$100 million over the first 5 years. The U.S. has pledged up to \$40 million on a matching basis.

2. Urged completion in 1972 of a global convention to restrict ocean dumping.

3. Recommended steps to minimize release of such dangerous pollutants as heavy metals and organochlorines into the environment.

4. Recommended a global "Earthwatch" program to be coordinated by the UN, to monitor and assess environmental trends in atmosphere, oceans, land and human health.

5. Called for early completion of conservation conventions, including the World Heritage Trust for natural and cultural treasures and a convention restricting international trade in endangered species.

6. Called for world programs to collect and safeguard the world's immense variety of plant and animal genetic resources on which stability of ecosystems and future breeding stocks depend.

7. Urged strengthening of the International Whaling Convention and a 10-year moratorium on commercial whaling.

8. Recommended creation of an Environmental Referral Service to speed exchange of environmental know-how among all countries.

9. Urged steps to prevent national environmental actions from creating trade barriers against exports of developing countries.

10. Recommended higher priority for environmental values in international development assistance, e.g. more emphasis on conservation, land use planning, and quality of human settlements.

11. Urged greater emphasis on population policy and accelerated aid to family planning in countries where population growth threatens environment and development goals.

12. Issued a Declaration on the Human Environment containing important new principles to guide international environmental action, including Principle 21 that states are responsible to avoid damaging the environment of other states or of the international realm.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I naturally was particularly pleased to be assigned to Subject Area II of Committee II, which dealt with Environmental Aspects of Natural Resources Management. Subject Area II was also assigned a number of Conservation Conventions for consideration which ordinarily would have been considered by Subject Area IV of Committee II.

At this time I would like to comment briefly on several of the recommendations adopted at the Conference and supported by the United States and which I consider of great importance to the conservation and protection of our world's valuable fisheries and wildlife resources.

No. II-81 recommended that the Secretary-General insure that effects of pollutants on wildlife be considered within environmental monitoring systems. Most monitoring of the quality of water and air tends to be oriented toward the effects of pollutants on humans. These programs can be strengthened and have greater validity if the needs of other organisms are considered as well. It is important to know the effects of pollutants on wildlife, both because pollutants may produce losses of valuable species and because certain species provide an early warning system for the effects of pollutants on humans. Thus, wild species can play a valuable part in global monitoring systems.

No. II-82 recommended an international program to assess the total economic value of wildlife resources. Wildlife and supporting habitat are essential to man's well being, both in terms of his natural and financial economy. Wildlife destruction often occurs in the absence of information as to the true value of this resource. Wildlife provides low-cost protein for native populations, provides natural controls over various insects and other pests, and provides a variety of recreational opportunities. The habitat that supports wildlife also assists materially in maintaining ground water

supplies, provides natural flood storage areas, and provides areas for natural improvement of water quality.

The United States has evidenced a strong interest in conservation of wildlife and habitat by enacting and proposing legislation to improve the abundance and quality of water supplies, protect endangered species, protect estuaries, discourage wetlands drainage, and require consideration of environmental effects and alternatives to programs carried out by the Federal Government.

The collection and publication of statistics on wildlife and other values by an international organization would be useful to wildlife managers of many nations and would be of valuable assistance in charting future conservation policies.

No. 11-83 recommended that U.N. agencies cooperate with governments of developing countries to develop wildlife management training courses.

The United States has a history of rendering help in this field. It is my understanding that U.S. resources in wildlife management training have been made available to foreign personnel in the past, without charge, from the National Park Service, the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife and the Bureau of Land Management. These organizations already have international activities specialists whose duties include coordination of foreign training programs and supervision of the training of foreign participants.

Even with the assistance already being provided by the U.S. Government, trained personnel in developing countries are in very short supply. Therefore, I feel that it is essential that wildlife management courses should be developed in these countries at the earliest possible date.

No. II-84 recommended that governments consider enacting international conventions and treaties to protect species inhabiting international waters or those which migrate from one country to another, and that a working group be established without delay to develop a broadly based convention on game regulations, and so forth, to avoid over-exploitation of wildlife resources.

Migratory species or those which inhabit international waters are in fact resources which belong to all the people of the world. Such resources can sustain rational harvests indefinitely. However, if they are over exploited they can provide only short-term profits to the exploiter at the expense of future generations. Because these species move from one nation's territory to another territory, or inhabit international areas, no nation alone can provide for their conservation, protection or wise use. To insure their rational management it is essential that nations using these resources, or within those territories they occur, must reach mutual agreements concerning their conservation and management. Consequently, international action in this area is required.

No. 11-86 recommended that governments agree to strengthen the International Whaling Commission—IWC—increase international whale research ef-

forts, and as a matter of urgency, call for an international agreement for a ten-year moratorium on commercial whaling.

The United States initiated this recommendation and strongly supported it against vigorous opposition by Japan. It was strengthened by a U.S. amendment which called for direct recommendation for a moratorium under the IWC: the U.S. amendment, which also called for increased international research efforts, was supported by many other countries that are not members of the IWC.

Despite regulation by the IWC, world whale populations have drastically dropped, to where all exploited whale species are immediately or potentially endangered or greatly depleted. Present trends under the IWC would not allow rebuilding of completed stocks and probably would result in further reduction.

This recommendation reflects worldwide recognition that whales, inhabiting the international seas, are the concern of mankind as a whole—not solely for economic reasons but also for their role in marine ecosystems and for their distinction as the largest and possibly the most awe-inspiring members of the animal kingdom. This recommendation was considered as one of the big U.S. victories at the Conference.

No. II-131-135: These recommendations call on governments and the Secretary-General, in cooperation with EAO and other UN organizations, to: First, support information exchange, monitoring and assessment of fishery resources, and more efficient international management of fish stocks; second, ensure an adequate role for fishery agencies in preparing for the coming UN Law of the Sea Conference; third, help prevent national resource utilization from harming international fishery resources; and fourth, strengthen—and in some areas create—international machinery for developing and managing fisheries.

The importance of these recommendations can be gaged from such facts as these: In 1970, world fish catches came to 57 million tons; proteins from the sea are being harvested at a rate that is increasing 6 percent a year; but potential resources are jeopardized by overfishing, pollution of coasts and inland seas, coastal land reclamation, dredging, offshore oil operations, etcetera. To protect these living resources which so largely inhabit the international realm, improved international cooperation is increasingly urgent.

In the United States view, better knowledge acquisition is especially important; to this end, a fisheries data center, in which all nations using fishery resources would cooperate in research and furnish data on their catches, would be most desirable.

No. IV-125(c) invites all interested governments to sign the Convention on Conservation of Wetlands of International Importance, approved at the Conference of RAMSAR—Iran.

The Convention is not entirely satisfactory in that it does not go far enough in the protection of wetlands. Nevertheless, the United States supported the recommendation as a step in the right direction. This is one of the two treaties

which emerged from the Conference, both of which are designed to protect wildlife.

No. IV-125(e) recommended that a plenipotentiary conference be convened as soon as possible to prepare and adopt a convention on export, import and transit of certain species of wild animals and plants in order to protect them from over-exploitation or extinction.

Under the terms of the Endangered Species Act of 1969—which was reported on the House side by my Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation—the United States is to hold such a conference and has been working with IUCN and interested governments to develop a draft convention.

It is my understanding that the Conference is scheduled to be held in Washington, D.C., in October 1972, and it is most urgent that this Conference be held at the scheduled time as it has already been postponed several times since the passage of the Endangered Species Act, which instructed the Secretary of State to convene such a conference prior to June 30, 1971.

Mr. Speaker, how effective any of these recommendations will be remains to be seen. The recommendations that were approved in Stockholm will now go to the U.N. General Assembly for adoption this fall. Although the difficulties on obtaining agreement on the various measures appear great, I sincerely feel that the Conference was a highly successful one and produced a number of positive accomplishments.

I am enthusiastic that all nations will now join together—regardless of politics, ideologies or economic status—and take appropriate action to see that the global environment is given the attention and protection to which it is entitled.

GENERAL WESTMORELAND COMMENDED

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to commend a great American such as General Westmoreland.

General MacArthur said in his farewell address to the cadets at West Point "The long, gray line has never failed us." And once again from that long, gray line has emerged a great soldier who for over 36 years has served his country proudly and well.

I would like to quote from a message he sent to the officers of the Army, which exemplifies the man:

As the Vietnam era draws to a close, we must look to the future—both to the anticipated world-wide missions the Army will likely be given and to the capability of the Army to accomplish those missions in a professional manner. The goal we must all seek is that of assuring that our country has the finest Army in its history: an Army based on the highest standards of professionalism, upon willing self-discipline, and upon individual dedication and pride. But, as we ac-

cept the challenge to build a finer Army, we must preserve the fundamental qualities which have made our Army great. The commitment of selfless service to our country that these qualities represent is the principal reason our profession is truly a way of life rather than just a job.

For the man who has dedicated his life to his country and inspired many others to do the same, history will find a place among its heroes. Today the Congress of the United States and a grateful country offer him a sincere expression of thanks.

INTERVIEW WITH KIM IL SUNG

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 26, Washington Post carried an article and interview by correspondent Selig S. Harrison with North Korean Premier Kim Il Sung. In response to questions submitted in advance, Kim said he would be willing to meet with South Korean President Park Chung Hee, "If he desires to meet me," and expressed a willingness to negotiate directly with South Korean authorities on mutual troop reductions and eventual peaceful reunification of North and South Korea.

Specifically, if the South Koreans are ready to negotiate, North Korea would propose a mutual evacuation of military personnel and installations from the demilitarized zone and a mutual reduction in armed forces by 150,000 to 200,000. North Korea would then propose a peace agreement providing for a further mutual reduction in forces down to 100,000 or fewer, and guarantees for the eventual peaceful reunification of the North and South by elections or transitional confederation. The implementation of the agreement would be conditioned upon complete withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Korea. Kim explicitly rejected any international or third-party supervision of the military reductions or withdrawals or elections. He went on to say that the U.N. could assist in the reunification by revoking all resolutions which obstruct the peaceful reunification, and by abolishing the U.N. Commission for the Reunification and Rehabilitation of Korea—also an obstacle to reunification, according to Kim.

Yesterday, our State Department issued a cautious "wait-and-see" response to the Kim interview, saying:

Concrete actions are always a more meaningful indicator of a government's intentions than statements to newspaper correspondents.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that those concrete actions will be forthcoming. It is true that there has often been a disparity between what is proposed to journalists and other third parties, and what is actually presented officially through diplomatic channels. Whether Kim's proposals represent an honest trial balloon or simply a diplomatic decoy, we are not in a position to judge at this time. Only

time and diplomatic followthrough will tell.

I would hope that Kim is sincere about his avowed desire to ease tensions between the North and South and to get on with negotiations to effect this. Obviously, a logical first step would be to conclude an agreement on the humanitarian issues now being discussed in the Red Cross talks, including the reunion of divided families.

If this new spirit of conciliation proves to be genuine, I think it can be attributed in large part to the overtures and initiatives taken by President Nixon in relaxing tensions with the Communist world by his journeys for peace to Peking and Moscow. While we should not be euphoric about the prospects for instant peaceful coexistence, I think Kim's apparent new stance is but one more indicator that President Nixon's efforts are paying off indirectly as well as directly.

I include in the RECORD the Harrison article and interview from Monday's Post, and the article from Tuesday's Post on the State Department reaction. The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, June 26, 1972]

KIM SEEKS SUMMIT, KOREAN TROOP CUTS

(By Selig S. Harrison)

PYONGYANG, June 21.—Premier Kim Il Sung of North Korea said today that he is willing to meet President Park Chung Hee of South Korea for summit talks on a major new plan to demilitarize the buffer zone along the Panmunjon armistice line and reduce the armed forces of the North and South by between 150,000 and 200,000 men. "If the South Korean authorities are ready to have negotiations with us, face to face, we intend to advance various new proposals," the premier said in an interview.

"To begin with, we consider it possible to evacuate military personnel and installations of the two sides from the Demilitarized Zone under an agreement between the two sides with a view to easing tension."

North and South Korea are now in a confrontation "fraught with the danger of a war breaking out if the trigger is pulled," he added, "and to relax such a war atmosphere, I think they can reduce their armed forces by 150,000 men respectively under an agreement between the two sides. It would be still more gratifying to reduce by 200,000 men respectively."

This would be followed by a "no war" agreement between North and South, he said, and finally by mutual troop cutbacks to a common level of 100,000 men or fewer "on the condition that U.S. forces are withdrawn from South Korea."

Asked whether he would be willing to meet President Park personally for a discussion of these issues, Premier Kim replied that "I can meet him if he desires to meet me." Gesticulating and waving a cigarette, alternately frowning and grinning expansively, the premier spoke for 80 minutes in response to a list of questions negotiated in advance. He then entertained several impromptu questions, ending the interview by proposing a toast of Korean-made champagne to "friendship between the Korean and American peoples."

The premier's proposals went far beyond previous North Korean peace gestures to the South and underlined Pyongyang's new readiness to pursue a relaxation of tensions with Seoul despite the continued presence of U.S. forces in South Korea.

This also marks the first time Kim has explicitly indicated his readiness to meet Park, long reviled here for prewar service to

the Japanese colonial regime while a military officer in Manchuria and for his alleged subservience to the United States in recent years.

Until January, North Korea treated the withdrawal of U.S. forces as a precondition for conclusion of a "no war" agreement with the South. Kim offered then to discuss a peace pact with "South Korean authorities" pending a U.S. pullout. But he did not offer specific interim proposals for force reductions in the absence of a U.S. withdrawal, and he spoke of a single jump from existing troop levels to reduced forces of 100,000 if U.S. troops were removed.

Now the premier has added two new preliminary negotiating proposals for discussion with the South without insisting on a prior U.S. withdrawal. Both of these proposals embody new approaches to a North-South accommodation.

TALKS WITH SEOUL

By proposing talks with Seoul on the removal of military installations from the Panmunjon truce zone the premier has attempted to brush aside two decades of angry recriminations over alleged violations of the armistice agreement in which Pyongyang has been pitted against the United Nations.

In effect, Pyongyang is not against demilitarizing the buffer zone but wants to link this with the larger objective of unification by reaching an understanding directly with the South rather than with U.S. officers under the U.N. flag.

An equally important objective of bypassing the U.N. Command and the military armistice commission at Panmunjon for direct dealings with Seoul would be to undermine the entire status of the United Nations in Korea. Pyongyang could argue that North-South talks invalidate past U.N. resolutions on Korea and make further U.N. presence unnecessary.

The 2.5-mile-wide truce area was originally conceived in the 1954 Korean armistice as a demilitarized buffer zone but has been the scene of continual armed clashes. Both sides have accused the other at various times of introducing illegal fencing, fortifications and weaponry on its side if the military demarcation line running through the middle of the buffer area.

Ironically, the former senior member of the U.N. Command, Maj. Gen. F. M. Rogers, told a newsman following his departure from Korea last year that "it is time for Koreans to talk to Koreans" at Panmunjon.

But the idea was quickly disowned by Washington and received coolly by South Korean leaders.

"Kim has made no effort to gloss over the fact that both North and South have 'military installations' within the Demilitarized Zone. 'Now, both sides have many military personnel and military installations in the Demilitarized Zone,' he said. 'The tense situation there will be eased if these military personnel and military installations are removed.'"

By offering to reduce North Korean forces by 150,000 to 200,000 men in return for corresponding South Korean reductions, Pyongyang has agreed to retain the present military balance pending an overall agreement bringing both sides down to common levels of 100,000 or fewer.

ARMED FORCES

The best available estimates suggest that the South has 672,000 men in its armed forces, including its troops in South Vietnam, while the North has slightly fewer than 400,000. Kim's offer would appear to envisage maximum reductions leaving North Korean strength at roughly 200,000, while the South would retain its present superiority with 472,000.

Seoul has often dismissed North Korean proposals for troop cutbacks by charging that Pyongyang maintains 1.3 million men in parttime "worker-peasant-student Red

Guard" militia units far more intensively trained than the South's own "homeland Reserve."

The premier anticipated this response by volunteering that "if necessary, the civil defense forces can also be reduced in the future under the agreement of the two sides."

The proposals today followed a major breakthrough last week in 10-month-old talks at Panmunjom between Red Cross officials of North and South on the reunion of divided families. After months of stalemate, the two sides agreed on the agenda for full-dress talks to be held in Pyongyang and Seoul.

Predicting that the talks would be held "at an early date," the premier said that "a door, though narrow, had been opened between the North and South which have remained separated for a long time. So both sides value this very much. Although the talks progress slowly, their prospect is very bright."

The interview was notable for a relative lack of anti-U.S. invective, by North Korean standards.

At one point, he volunteered that "when the American people joined the common front against Fascism and fought against the Hitlerite Fascists and Japanese imperialism during World War II they won high praise and support from the Korean people. The subsequent aggravation of relations between Korea and the United States is attributable to United States intervention in the internal affairs of Korea and its hostile and aggressive policy toward the Democratic People's Republic of Korea."

This takes some of the sting out of the propaganda charge greeting an American visitor here that "U.S. imperialism has been the sworn enemy of the Korean people for more than a century."

Kim is presented in national museums as the liberator of his country from Japanese rule. Only passing credit is given to the Soviet role here at the end of World War II, and no mention is made of the American defeat of Japan, which the premier indirectly acknowledged in his statement today.

"We Korean people distinguish the American people from the U.S. imperialists," said the premier, "and the Korean people wish to promote friendship with the U.S. people not only now but also in the future."

EXCHANGE OF NEWSMEN

Past North Korean statements on "people to people" relations have stressed that Pyongyang would bar all official contacts with the United States until American troops were withdrawn from Korea.

In response to a question, the premier said that if North Korean journalists are ever invited to Washington, he would not be "opposed to our journalists meeting with U.S. officials if an opportunity is afforded."

Since leading publications and journalists here speak for the state or for the ruling Workers Party, this appears to open the way for semi-official contacts.

The premier also said that he would "have no objection to establishing trade and economic relations with the U.S., but would welcome it" if U.S. troops are withdrawn from Korea.

He said he also looks forward to trade with Japan "if they want it."

U.S. THREAT

Kim sidestepped a question about whether he saw growing differences between Japan and the United States and rated either of the two countries as a greater threat to Korea than to the other. He repeated previous statements lumping "the U.S. imperialists and the revived Japanese militarists" together and said that "as for the contradictions between Japan and the United States, I think the Americans or the Japanese know them better than we."

Reaffirming his stand that the United Nations should withdraw its umbrella for the U.S. military presence in Korea, he urged that the U.N. should annul resolutions branding North Korea as the aggressor in the Korean War and dissolve the U.N. Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (UNCURK).

In a slight softening of the tone of past attacks on the U.N., he urged that the world body "should take measures helpful to the reunification of Korea now that all the people in North and South Korea aspire to the reunification of the country and a tendency toward peaceful unification is surging high among them."

Although he did not elaborate on what "measures" he had in mind, he made an oblique reference to a possible change in the status of U.S. troops in Korea by suggesting that it is "high time" not only to dissolve UNCURK, but also "to take the caps of the 'U.N. forces' off the U.S. troops stationed in South Korea under the cloak of the 'United Nations.'"

Kim spoke animatedly about the benefits that would flow from reduced defense spending in the event of a "no war" agreement, mutual force cutbacks and the withdrawal of U.S. forces.

"The people would be greatly benefited by this," he said. "If defense spending is cut to 5 or 7 per cent in the state budget and the expenses thus released are spent on raising the living standards of the people in the future, our people will be benefited much more by it than now. Demobilized veterans could participate in the labor front, and this will bring us several times greater returns than the benefits we get in terms of state budgetary disbursement."

"With a greater number of young and middle-aged people participating in the labor front, we will be able to construct more and extract more natural wealth. More factories and more dwellings will be built. We have still a lot to do."

The interview was held in a corner of the vast audience room of the cabinet building, located in the center of a lightly guarded complex of government office buildings on the edge of central Pyongyang.

A phalanx of aides was present, including the secretary of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party and the editor of the Workers' Party organ, Rodong Shinmun.

A hefty, commanding man with puffy cheeks and penetrating eyes, Kim wore tortoise shell glasses and a dark gray suit with a coat suggestive of a Mao jacket.

He smiled confidently, almost smugly, and spoke with theatrical pauses, wrinkling his brow, raising his eyebrows periodically, settling back jauntily after marking a point that he liked.

The premier turned 60 on April 15, but his wavy black hair is intact and has only a few gray streaks around the ears.

Kim has ruled North Korea since 1945 and is near the top of the list among world leaders for longevity in office.

This was the second interview the North Korean leader has given to an American correspondent. Pyongyang was completely closed to American newsmen until last month.

[From the Washington Post, June 26, 1972]
TO RELAX A WAR ATMOSPHERE

(NOTE.—The following is a partial transcript of the interview of North Korean Premier Kim Il Sung by Washington Post correspondent Selig S. Harrison.)

Kim. I am sorry to have kept you waiting for me for a long time. I would have received you earlier if we had been able to meet before my departure on an official mission to local areas. But something unexpected prompted my departure. Various matters

kept me there longer than anticipated. These reasons prevented me from meeting you earlier. I would like to ask you excuse me for this. We have been looking forward to meeting you as you have come here through the introduction of the General Association of Korean Residents in Japan. Do you feel in good health after your stay in our country?

HARRISON. Yes, I have received excellent hospitality, and I am most grateful for the opportunity I have had to visit factories, co-operative farms and other institutions in various parts of your country. I am glad to see that you have completely recovered and have made substantial progress.

Kim. Thank you. I have seen your questions. You seem to want me to answer you, avoiding a repetition of what I have said in my previous interviews. In my talk with you, I will try to avoid repeating what I have said earlier, so I have no choice but to begin by touching upon our future work. After all, you American newsmen come here to know all our future policies.

PEACE ACCORD

To begin with, I would like to answer you briefly about the questions of concluding a peace agreement between the North and the South in this country, reducing armed forces of both sides and improving the relations between the North and the South.

As you know, the North and the South had no contacts due to their long partition before they made the first contact last year through the talks between the representatives of the Red Cross organizations of the North and the South. Later, however, the South Korean authorities declared a "state of emergency." This made the situation tenser in our country.

If the South Korean authorities had wanted to behave properly, they should have striven to ease tension since the North and the South were beginning contacts after a long separation. But they aggravated tension by declaring the "state of emergency."

The important thing today is how to relax the tension created in the country. We have proposed on many occasions to conclude a peace agreement between the North and the South, but it has not yet been concluded owing to the refusal of the South Korean authorities. We have been making all possible efforts to ease this tense situation. We think that by relaxing tension, we should also be able to make the South Korean authorities dispel misunderstanding toward us and prevent them from threatening, blackmailing and suppressing the South Korean people, inventing lies regarding our "southward aggression."

If the South Korean authorities are ready to have negotiations with us, face to face, we intend to advance various new proposals.

To begin with, we consider it possible to evacuate military personnel and military installations of the two sides from the Demilitarized Zone under an agreement between the two sides with a view to easing tension.

DMZ FORCES

Now, both sides have many military personnel and military installations in the Demilitarized Zone. The tense situation there will be eased if these military personnel and military installations are removed.

To proceed, the two sides are now in a situation fraught with the danger of a war breaking out if the trigger is pulled, and to relax such a war atmosphere, I think, the North and the South can reduce their armed forces by 150,000 men respectively under an agreement between the two sides.

It would be still more gratifying to reduce by 200,000 men respectively. In my opinion, this will enable us to avoid the danger of a possible war. The above-mentioned are new proposals. I am telling you about our new

proposals of which no mention has been made so far.

Next, in order to relax tension in our country, I think it necessary to conclude a peace agreement between the North and South which affords a guarantee for peacefully reunifying the country and against resorting to use of force. When the peace agreement is concluded, the U.S. troops must pull out of South Korea. When the peace agreement is concluded, the danger of war will be removed, and accordingly there will be no more pretext for the U.S. troops to stay on in South Korea, and we propose that the armed forces of the North and the South should be reduced to 100,000 or fewer respectively, on the condition that the U.S. troops are withdrawn from South Korea.

REDUCTION OF TROOPS

If the armed forces of the North and South are reduced to 100,000 or fewer respectively under the conditions that a peace agreement is concluded and the U.S. troops are withdrawn from South Korea, then it will provide a firmer guarantee for the peaceful reunification of our country.

The civil defense forces, if necessary, can also be reduced in the future under the agreement of the two sides.

I think these are some steps we are going to take for the peaceful reunification of our country. These problems cannot be solved through the Red Cross talks between the North and the South. These problems, I think, should be solved through negotiations between the authorities of the North and the South or through negotiations between the deputies of our Supreme People's Assembly and the members of the National Assembly of South Korea.

Besides, to remove the misunderstanding and distrust between the North and the South, it is necessary, I think, for the representatives of the political parties and public organizations embracing broad sections of the masses and the personages of the political circles to travel and make contact with each other and hold bilateral or multilateral negotiations.

NARROW DIFFERENCES

By so doing, in my view, we can raise concrete problems for narrowing down the differences of views existing between us and achieving the peaceful reunification of the country. I believe the reunification of our country should on all accounts be achieved by the Korean nation itself without the interference of any outside forces on the principle of national self-determination and on a democratic principle.

The peaceful reunification of the country can be attained by way of establishing a unified government through the elections to be held throughout the whole of Korea or by setting up a confederation system as a transitional step.

The elections we demand should be free elections without the interference of any outside forces. It is desirable to set up the unified government through democratic elections based on universal direct principles and principles of equality.

But if the unified government cannot be set up right away, it may be good, as well, to achieve the reunification through a confederate system slowly, leaving the present systems in the North and the South intact. In this way, the reunification of the country may be realized gradually. We think to settle all the problems for the peaceful reunification of the country, it is necessary first of all to achieve a great unity of the nation, transcending the differences of systems, belief and political views, and for this purpose, it is essential to remove misunderstanding and distrust between the North and the South and create an atmosphere of mutual understanding, respect and trust. This is our contention.

As for other problems, I have referred to them on other occasions before. I will say no more about them. Can you understand me well?

HARRISON. I am very much interested in your statement. The question of the reduction of armed forces, in particular, is worthy of study. May I ask you a question to have a clearer understanding of what you have proposed? In cutting back the armed forces of North and South, do you mean to reduce the forces of the two sides by two stages, that is, by 150,000 or 200,000 men, respectively, at the initial stage and later to reduce them to 100,000 men or fewer at the second stage?

KIM. Yes, we mean to reduce the armed forces of the North and South to fewer than 100,000 men, respectively, at the second stage under the condition in which a peace agreement is concluded between North and South and U.S. troops are withdrawn from South Korea.

HARRISON. Would you be prepared to meet President Park Chung Hee of South Korea to discuss such problems?

KIM. I can meet him if he desires to meet me.

You asked me how to improve the relations between Korea and the United States. I would like to make a few remarks on this matter. As for the relations between Korea and the United States, the U.S. government must not meddle in the internal affairs of Korea.

It should not encourage the division of our country but help its reunification. In order not to hinder the reunification of our country, it should first of all withdraw its troops from South Korea and should not make any aggressive threat against us. Then the relations between the United States and our country can be improved soon, I believe.

I will not relate the long history of U.S. aggression against Korea because time does not permit me to do so. When the American people joined the common front against Fascism and fought against the Hitlerite Fascists and Japanese imperialism during the Second World War, they won high praise and support from the Korean people. Subsequent aggravation of relations between Korea and the United States is attributable to the United States intervention in the internal affairs of Korea and its hostile and aggressive policy towards the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

If the United States gives up its hostile and aggressive policy towards us even now and does not encourage the division of Korea or obstruct the reunification of Korea, we are also ready to change our policy towards the United States. We Korean people distinguish the American people from the U.S. imperialists.

The Korean people wish to promote friendship with the U.S. people not only now but also in the future. Then you ask me about the relations between Japan and the United States and my view as to . . . growing contradictions between Japan and the U.S., and you asked me which of the two countries . . . poses a greater menace to the Korean people.

The political program of the government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea states that we will promote friendship and solidarity with those countries which want to establish relations of equality and mutual benefit and express goodwill towards us, but we cannot show goodwill towards such countries as treat our country with hostility and inequality and adopt an aggressive policy against . . . Therefore, we think both the U.S. imperialists and the revived Japanese militarists are dangerous forces to us.

U.S. POLICIES

The relations between our country and the United States or Japan depend on what

policies the government of the United States or the government of Japan would take towards our country.

As for the contradictions between Japan and the United States, I think the Americans or the Japanese know them better than we.

As regards the question on Korea and the United Nations which you asked, I think the United Nations should strive to help the Korean people in their endeavours to realize the peaceful reunification of the country. The United Nations should take measures helpful to the reunification of Korea now that all the people in North and South Korea aspire to the reunification of the country and a tendency towards peaceful reunification is surging high among them. In other words, it should revoke all the resolutions which obstruct the peaceful reunification of Korea, that is the resolutions which encourage the division of Korea.

The Korean nation wants to achieve reunification of its country. So the obstacles in the way of its reunification should be removed, shouldn't they? It is high time to dissolve the "United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea," an obstacle to peaceful reunification, and to take the caps of the "U.N. forces" off the U.S. troops stationed in South Korea under the cloak of the "United Nations."

WANT TO NEGOTIATE

The Korean people want to negotiate and won't fight among themselves, so there is no need for the United Nations to "super-vise." The Korean people desire peaceful reunification, and the North and the South are making contacts and doing efforts to realize free travel and why is the "United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea" necessary and what necessity do the U.S. troops have to remain in Korea under the signboard of the United Nations and play the role of police? Such obstacles should all be removed, I think.

Korea's unification should be achieved on the principle of national self-determination and no one can meddle in the internal affairs of Korea.

You can find new proposals here, too. . .

To tell something about the North-South Red Cross talks, the Red Cross talks are going on well. There had been arguments on the question of the agenda of the full-dress talks but a full agreement was reached on the agenda some time ago. A door, though narrow, has been opened between the North and South, which have remained separated for a long time. So both sides value this very much.

We think the full-dress talks between the representatives of the North and South Red Cross organizations will be soon convened. The entire people of North and South Korea are all looking forward to it. Though the talks progress slowly, their prospect is very bright.

You asked me about the question of our journalists visiting the United States. We have no objection to it. We have no objection to sending our journalists to the United States nor are we opposed to our journalists meeting with the U.S. officials, as you asked, if an opportunity is afforded.

You asked me to express my view on the visits of Nixon to Peking and Moscow. We will only watch how Nixon is going to translate into practice the statements he made during his visits to Peking and Moscow and the joint communiques announced there.

I think I have answered all your questions. Have you any more questions to ask.

HARRISON. I would like to ask several clarifying questions. The first one is related to your comments on the United Nations. You have previously said, as you did today, that it was necessary for the United Nations to dissolve the "United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea."

Yet you have said that there are also new proposals in your comments today. Could you clarify these?

KIM. I think it is important first of all for the U.N. to desist from any act of creating obstacles to the reunification of Korea and annul all resolutions hampering the reunification. The United Nations refuses to deal with both sides equally and interferes in the internal affairs of Korea. It is evident that it hampers Korea's unification, isn't it?

HARRISON. You have said before that if South Korea would abrogate its military pacts concluded with foreign powers your country, too, would abrogate its military treaties concluded with foreign countries. Would this happen in the foreseeable future in your concept or in the long term? Do you propose it as part of negotiations between the North and the South or after the conclusion of a peace agreement between the North and the South or at the stage of the confederation?

KIM. That should be agreed upon by the North and the South. In my opinion we can abrogate all these treaties if they hinder the reunification of our country. It is not a matter of the present stage, but a matter to be settled in the future under the agreement by the both sides. The question as to which of the military treaties is necessary and which is not may be discussed when the country is reunified in a peaceful way. I think it is possible to nullify whatever is standing in the way of peaceful reunification if both sides agree to do so even now.

So much for the answers. Lastly, you asked me whether I have any words to ask you to convey to the American people upon your return home. Please convey to the American people my hope that they will unite with the Korean people and the peace-loving people of the world to fight against wars of aggression and wage a common struggle so that all may live in peace. The people, be it Korean or American, always want to promote friendship. Our people have bad sentiments toward the United States. These bad feelings are directed toward the U.S. imperialist aggressors and the reactionary U.S. government, but not toward the U.S. people.

I am pleased with your long stay in our country and I am grateful to you for having waited for me patiently. I regard this as a manifestation of your trust for us.

[From the Washington Post, June 27, 1972]
UNITED STATES WEIGHS KIM'S BID; EXPERTS VOICE INTEREST

(By Ronald Koven)

The State Department officially characterized its reaction yesterday to North Korea's new detente proposals as "wait and see."

Privately, however, specialists expressed much interest in North Korean leader Kim I Sung's proposals, in an interview with The Washington Post, to demilitarize the heavily fortified Demilitarized Zone between the two Koreas and to reduce the rival Korean armies without evening out the present military imbalance in favor of South Korea or insisting on an immediate U.S. military withdrawal.

For the record, U.S. officials said, in State Department spokesman Charles Bray's words, "Concrete actions are always a more meaningful indicator of a government's intentions than statements to newspaper correspondents."

Other officials said they had such "concrete actions" in mind as ceasing the construction of fortifications inside the DMZ and halting infiltration into the South.

Bray pointed out that demilitarization of the DMZ "appears on the face of it to be quite similar to a proposal that has already been made several times, I believe, by the United Nations Command and, independently, by the Republic of Korea.

"The North Koreans have always rejected this idea. But it is one that is on the table. We shall have to wait and see what North Korean intentions in this regard are," he added.

At another point, Bray rejected the suggestion by North Korean leader Kim I Sung that Northern journalists should visit the United States.

The cool U.S. official reaction to the Kim proposals was apparently at least partially related to reluctance to upstage any reaction by South Korea.

U.S. officials said that any diplomatic follow through would have to be conducted by Seoul, and that it seemed unlikely that the South Koreans would move until Pyongyang communicates its proposals directly.

There seemed to be general agreement in Washington that Kim's making his proposals publicly through non-Korean journalists at least raised questions about his sincerity.

Some officials professed to be confused about Kim's true position. They noted that he dropped a U.S. military withdrawal from Korea as a precondition for political progress between the two Koreas when he spoke with Japanese journalists in January, but that he reintroduced that demand several weeks ago in an interview with Harrison Salisbury of the New York Times.

When speaking more recently with Sellig S. Harrison of The Washington Post, Kim again dropped the condition.

But some specialists said Kim's proposal on the DMZ seemed on the surface to provide a basis for agreement. They were also intrigued by Kim's willingness to reduce armed forces in a first stage on a one-for-one basis by between 150,000-200,000 men.

A 200,000-man reduction would leave the North with about 200,000 under arms and the South with about 470,000.

Among the pressures on Kim at least to appear more accommodating analysts here said, are that his belligerence has been counterproductive and that China, Pyongyang's chief ally, has been preaching rapprochement with the United States both by example and in diplomatic contacts. Kim is also said to be convinced that he would win out in any peaceful political competition with the South.

SALT—NEXT STEP IN DISARMAMENT

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Thomas S. Power, in "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 salable product to sell—peace without 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 the 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 limitations 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 U.S. 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 U.S. 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 Armed 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 to 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 percent 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 three-fold 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 them.

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.

THE PROPOSED FEDERAL VALUE-ADDED TAX

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, some months ago the administration went on a fishing trip. It went looking for a fish which has become extremely rare and exceedingly elusive. It went fishing for the solid support of the American public for a new administration tax program, one involving a major increase in revenue to support Federal expenditures.

Because it was after an extraordinary fish, the administration needed a super-duper lure; one which would make a fish, grown wary over the years through bitter experience with governmental promises, throw caution to the winds, and hit the hook hard. The administration came up with a beauty. It hid the tax hook beneath an almost irresistible delicacy—the suggestion that if the American public supported the administration's proposed Federal value-added tax, there was the chance school property taxes on the local levels could be eliminated.

Now, that is quite a tasty morsel to dangle before the tax-laden American public of today. The school property tax is by far the most oppressive of all taxes. Because it is the highest, it is the hardest to pay, and it hurts everybody. It turns off young people from buying property for a home because they cannot pay the school tax tab. It squeezes the elderly who are fighting a losing battle trying to pay rising taxes with fixed and limited incomes. It really wallows the man in the middle, the one already paying for a home and trying to pay for educating his family as well.

I was most curious to see if the hungry taxpayer would take the administration's bait, hook, line, and sinker, so I did some fishing on my own. I furnished more than 3,000 residents of my 20th Congressional

District in Pennsylvania with a summation of the value-added tax and its pros and cons. Later, each of them were contacted by telephone to discuss the issue and obtain their personal opinion about it.

The results were overwhelmingly lopsided and confirmed my own belief that the American public today is not to be easily "hooked" again. It has taken the bait too often in the past and learned the hard way that what the Government attempts to pass off as a plum is apt to taste like a lemon.

The results of my telephone poll showed 77 percent of the people contacted opposed a Federal value-added tax; 13.5 percent of them favored it; and 9.5 percent were undecided.

I sent these findings to President Nixon on May 15, and called his attention to the fact that, many of those who opposed the value-added tax also expressed the deep-rooted doubt that school property taxes would ever be eliminated. They simply no longer believe in promises or pie-in-the-sky suggestions. Furthermore, many of those favoring the value-added tax emphasized they did so only in the hope the hinted tax reform would be forthcoming.

I believe these comments reflect a serious erosion in the credibility of our Government and a disturbing distrust by the public in what Government says it will do and what it actually does.

A few days ago, I received a letter from Joel Segall, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Treasury, informing me the results of my telephone poll had been forwarded to him. Mr. Segall mentioned the timeliness of the poll and said the results will be given "full consideration in our work on the subject." In other words, until the administration decides whether to continue fishing or cut bait.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting Mr. Segall's letter, along with supplemental material dealing with my telephone poll on the value-added tax, into the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.

To: Phone Poll Participants.

From: Congressman Joseph M. Gaydos.

Today, the United States has a one trillion dollar economy, a \$220 billion plus budget and, from all indications, a need for additional Federal revenues to support them. The question, of course, is where to get the extra money. Increase corporate or individual income taxes? Enact a new tax?

It is the latter proposal which is causing considerable interest and controversy. The type of tax most often mentioned is a Value Added Tax (VAT), particularly since President Nixon's announcement that it might be used to eliminate school property taxes.

But what is VAT? Briefly, it is a tax imposed on the value added by each successive step in a production process. For example, a loaf of bread begins as a seed of grain, is harvested as wheat, converted to flour, baked to bread, sold to a grocer and purchased by a consumer. With each step the value of the bread has been increased and is reflected in the cost. The Government would obtain its revenue by taxing the added value of the product as it moves along the line.

VAT proponents say that while any major tax increase is distasteful, a value added tax is the "least bad" and, therefore, "the best

available" source of new revenue. It would cause less confusion, they feel, and could improve the nation's ability to compete in the area of world trade. The alternative to VAT, the proponents claim, is to increase corporate or individual income taxes. In either case, they believe adverse effects will result from such action.

Opponents of VAT refute these claims. In their opinion, VAT is a national sales tax in disguise. They say it is a levy which will not improve the present Federal tax system but will, instead, make it worse. They also contend VAT will do little or nothing to bring the U.S. any significant advantages in international trade.

That, in a nutshell, is VAT. The attached sheets will acquaint you with some of its "pros" and "cons." Additional information will be furnished. I am sure, by the news media, and in the near future my office will contact you for your opinion.

Thank you for your continued cooperation and interest.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, M.C.

THE CASE FOR VAT

Interest in the value added tax was heightened in the United States by its adoption in the European Common Market, as a principal source of revenue. It is also the basis in the EEC for border taxes on imports and tax rebates to exporters competing for a share of the American domestic market. No such incentive, the VAT advocates claim, is offered U.S. exporters.

The possible increase of our major sources of tax revenue here—corporate income and payroll taxes—and the resulting adverse effects have added to VAT's attractiveness. Proponents claim VAT could be used as a partial substitute for these existing taxes or as a new source of revenue.

Increased corporate taxes, they point out, would further distort conditions that levy already has created. Furthermore, it would worsen our ability to compete in international trade. Any hike in the individual income tax is most unlikely, VAT advocates acknowledge, in view of increased exemptions and reductions provided by federal tax reform legislation in 1969. Even with these reductions, they argue, the rates in the middle and upper brackets are still so high that any increase in this tax would trigger perverse effects.

A value added tax, they contend, could act as a partial substitution for corporate taxes, alleviating some of the present burden and, at the same time, give the U.S. the opportunity in international trade competition to counter some advantages enjoyed by other nations through border tax adjustments. VAT also could be used as a partial substitute for the individual income tax or as a completely new tax.

In either case, proponents of VAT predict some form of this tax will be enacted within a decade. According to them, "The sooner, the better."

THE CASE AGAINST VAT

Opponents of VAT have labeled the levy a "regressive" tax, a step backward which will worsen our present situation if enacted and which will not give the U.S. any significant advantage in international trade. The name itself, they claim is a smokescreen, an attempt to hide a tax the American public has rejected for 40 years—a national sales tax.

Claims of VAT's success in Europe are discounted. European nations, it is said, have had national sales taxes in one form or another for many years. VAT merely is an attempt to harmonize the different tax systems within the European Economic Community. Furthermore, they claim, the tax is not uniform, varying from area to area as well as from country to country. Some nations exempt food or services; others favor financial

activities, newspapers, schools, etc., with reduced or special rates.

Nor do the opponents of VAT buy the idea it can be used to reduce corporate or individual income taxes. Heavy reliance on indirect taxation does not mean low corporate taxes, they claim, and no European nation (some with higher corporate levies than the U.S.), has reduced its corporate tax as a result of adopting VAT. Any increase in individual income tax exemptions or in welfare payments, they predict, will be felt by the middle class wage earner. VAT, they point out, is a tax levied on consumer expenditures and a federal study revealed groups earning under \$10,000 a year accounted for 82.5 percent of overall consumer expenditures. The advantages, if any, to be gained by VAT in International trade are so minor as to be discounted by the opponents of the tax.

In conclusion, those against VAT declare that IF a national sales tax does come about, it should be a retail sales tax, not an added value tax. Under the former, the retailer collects the tax from his customers and pays the Government in full. Under VAT, the revenue would be collected in bits and pieces during the production process, resulting in heavy paper work and additional administrative chores.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.

To: Phone poll participants.

From: Congressman Joseph M. Gaydos.

DEAR CITIZENS: During the past several weeks you have been participating in a phone poll survey to determine public opinion regarding the proposed federal value added tax (VAT). This proposed source of revenue was suggested by the administration and was linked to the possible elimination of existing school property taxes.

I am sure you, as a phone poll participant are interested in the final results of this poll. A majority of those polled indicate an overwhelming opposition to the suggested VAT tax. Here are the final results:

Against: 2,337 or 77.0%.

For: 409 or 13.5%.

Undecided: 288 or 9.5%.

Total: 3,034 or 100%.

Since this question stirred great interest among our citizens, I sincerely felt the President himself should be informed of the results. Therefore, I have written a letter to the President and I have enclosed a copy for your information.

I am sure you agree that this is another effective way of transmitting the voice and opinion of our district citizens to Washington.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH M. GAYDOS,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 15, 1972.

THE PRESIDENT,
THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Several months ago, the news media informed the American public the administration was considering a value added tax (VAT) in order to provide the Federal Government with additional revenues to meet increasing governmental operating costs. This announcement triggered national interest, particularly since it linked the adoption of such a tax with the possible elimination of local school property taxes.

I was most interested in this proposal since I represent the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, which is a highly taxed area and where the school property tax has long been the most burdensome of all real estate taxes. I, too, have long advocated the elimination of local school property taxes and have introduced legislation to permit an income tax credit for payment of school taxes.

In order to determine the opinion of our constituents on this far-reaching question, I took a personal phone poll of 3,034 residents of the 20th District. The following are the results of this poll and are included for your study and consideration:

Against: 2,337 or 77.0%.

For: 409 or 13.5%.

Undecided: 288 or 9.5%.

Totals: 3,034 or 100%.

I think it proper I call attention to the fact that while this poll was in progress many of those who opposed VAT expressed a doubt that school property taxes would ever be eliminated. This, I believe, reflects a disturbing distrust in the credibility of elected officials. It appears that the public no longer believes in promises regardless of the sincerity of such promises or proposals. Many of those participating emphasized that they voted for VAT only in the hope that additional tax reform would be forthcoming.

Mr. President, I have relied upon this personal phone poll on several past occasions in order to determine local reaction to various national questions and issues. I have found the poll to be an extremely rapid and reasonably accurate method of obtaining public opinion in my district. For example, a like phone poll survey made last summer following initiation of your new economic program proved astonishingly accurate. My district showed overwhelming support for your actions at that time which were reflected a short time later in the results of a national poll. The results in my 20th Congressional District differed by less than 1% from those compiled nationwide.

Mr. President, I believe I speak on behalf of all our district citizens when I state that we are anxious to help and support our President whenever possible. Likewise, I hope your administration will give serious consideration to the results of this phone poll survey during deliberations regarding the proposed federal value added tax.

Respectfully submitted,

JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, M.C.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 23, 1972.

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GAYDOS: I would like to acknowledge and thank you for your letter to the President presenting the results of the poll you conducted in your Congressional District to determine the reaction of your constituents to imposition of a value added tax.

You may be assured your letter will be brought to the President's attention upon his return and in the meanwhile will be shared with the appropriate members of the staff.

With cordial regards,
Sincerely,

RICHARD K. COOK,
Deputy Assistant to the President.

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C.

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GAYDOS: Mr. Richard K. Cook, Deputy Assistant to the President, referred to this Department your May 15, 1972 letter to President Nixon, so that we might have the benefit of the results of a poll you conducted to determine the reaction of your constituents to the imposition of a value added tax.

As you noted in your letter, the substitution of a value added tax for residential school property taxes is one alternative that is being considered as part of a study requested by President Nixon of ways to reform the financing of our public education system.

The results of your poll certainly are timely and will be given full consideration in our work on the subject.

Sincerely,

JOEL SEGALL,
Deputy Assistant Secretary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 22, 1972.

To: Phone poll participants.

From: Congressman Joseph M. Gaydos.

DEAR FRIENDS: Last month I sent President Nixon the results of our telephone poll survey on the proposed new federal Value Added Tax (VAT). You will recall the findings showed overwhelming opposition to this new form of taxation: 77 percent against, 13.5 percent in favor and 9.5 percent undecided.

I am now pleased to forward you a copy of the Administration's response to the poll. You will note that Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Joel Segall, makes mention of the timeliness of the poll and offers assurance it will be given "full consideration" in his work on the matter.

I would like to personally thank each of you for taking the time to participate in our phone poll and for your willingness to help make our Government work. The interest and cooperation you have displayed makes me extremely proud to serve as your representative in Congress.

Thank you all very much.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, M.C.

DOING SOMETHING ABOUT DRUG ABUSE

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the illicit drug problem in these United States has become a national tragedy.

It is for this reason that I am particularly proud that the Florida Medical Association is doing something about the problem.

They have formed an ad hoc committee on drug abuse that is composed of representatives of the professions of pharmacy, education, law, law enforcement, the clergy and others in addition to medicine.

At one of the FMA meetings in Orlando last January, Dr. Robert P. Johnson of Tallahassee, who was chairman of the committee at that time, gave a very concise report of its activities.

I insert his report here because of the seriousness of the problem and in commendation for this group for what they are doing to assist in finding a solution. The report follows:

ACTIVITIES OF FMA'S Ad Hoc COMMITTEE ON DRUG ABUSE

(By Robert P. Johnson, M.D.)

The House of Delegates of the Florida Medical Association, at its meeting in May of 1970, created an Ad Hoc Committee on Drug Abuse. In doing so, it was acting on recommendation of the Association's Committee on Child Health.

From its very inception this has been a unique committee of the FMA because of its general structure. It is an interdisciplinary group of professional men and women who have a vital interest in this tremendous problem of drug abuse in our State, both

personally and through the organizations and professions they represent.

Since the first meeting in Jacksonville on November 17, 1970, its membership has increased from 15 to 20. Three representatives of state government agencies serve as consultants. What originally started as a one-day meeting every five or six weeks is now a two-day meeting with subcommittee meetings taking the first day and the full Committee the following day.

The Committee is composed of representatives of the FMA and its Woman's Auxiliary, Florida Pharmaceutical Association, State Department of Education, State Board of Regents, Bureau of Comprehensive Health Planning, State Division of Health, Florida Bar, Juvenile Court Judges, Law Enforcement, Florida Education Association, Florida Pediatric Society, State Board of Medical Examiners and the Clergy.

Our consultants represent the Drug Abuse Program of the Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services, the Governor's Office and the Attorney General's Office. These representatives give freely of their time and in many cases personal expense to add their input to our deliberations and I am sincerely gratified to report that the meetings are always well attended even though they are held in various parts of the State. I cannot speak highly enough of their diligent and conscientious service.

The Committee is advisory in nature and offers its expertise to any agency which desires this assistance; on occasion, we give it even though we have not been specifically requested to do so when, in our opinion, the need is sufficient to warrant investigation.

One of the first agencies to ask for our assistance was the State Department of Education, which requested that we formulate a set of guidelines to be used by school personnel in elementary and secondary schools concerned with drug use and abuse. These guidelines were drawn up by a Subcommittee on Education after many months of work and hearings with law enforcement officials and educators. They have now been accepted by the Department of Education and have been circulated to all county school systems and are being almost unanimously accepted and implemented.

We have been active in the field of State Legislation, both in an advisory capacity to the Legislature and the institution of recommendations for subsequently passed legislation. We feel this to be an extremely important function of the Committee.

We have done extensive investigation into several areas where there would appear to be a need for a re-assessment and perhaps controls. First of all, we support unanimously the recommendation of the AMA and the Board of Governors of the FMA that physicians be urged to limit their use of amphetamines and other stimulant drugs to specific, well recognized, medical indications. This is a very generalized recommendation but I believe the intent is self-explanatory. We strongly recommend that some control be placed on the dispensing of disposable needles and syringes. Metropolitan Dade County has an ordinance forbidding sale without a prescription. We would favor such legislation but would accept a lesser control which would accomplish the same purpose. We can no longer continue to place this paraphernalia in the hands of young people indiscriminately.

We also must urge all physicians to insure non-usability of these items when disposed of in the office refuse. The Committee still remains in favor of a triplicate narcotic prescription plan for Florida but is continuing its investigation of the plan before beginning any further thrust in this direction.

There is a need, in our opinion, for expanded laboratory facilities within the Division of Health for analysis of urine specimens particularly for Methadone Clinics in the

State. These clinics have specific requirements from the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs for spot checking of urine on a weekly basis and at present existing funds for this purpose are limited. This possibility is currently being explored with the Division. We supported legislation in the past session of the Legislature relative to a change in the marijuana laws in Florida. On the basis of existing evidence, we do not now see any basis for a further liberalization of this law. We favor the establishment within Florida of a uniform controlled substance act and we have been working with the Legislature on this matter.

We have acted as the intermediary on numerous problems existing between the government and private segments of the drug abuse problem in Florida and are continuing to do so.

For the past several months we have been very concerned with the problem of youthful drug offenders and facilities and methods for their treatment. A Subcommittee on Youthful Drug Offenders was appointed and it proceeded through its chairman, Mrs. Arnold Spanjers, to survey the governors of the other 49 states as to what programs they had, how they were funded, and their shortcomings. The response was tremendous as 46 governors replied to our inquiry and voluminous amounts of helpful material were received.

Next it was felt that we should survey the Juvenile Court Judges in Florida to determine their feelings and needs in this area. We received replies from 60 per cent representing a good statewide distribution, and almost unanimously they felt that facilities available to them were inadequate. This, then, identified the need, and work is continuing very vigorously to attempt to correct this situation. The Subcommittee is working very actively with the Division of Youth Services of the Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services, and we anticipate much improvement in the area of drug education and rehabilitation to update an already excellent program within the Division of Management of Youthful Offenders.

For approximately one year now the Committee has been working very actively on a project that we feel to be of utmost importance. Through the help of the New York State Department of Health, a grant from the Drug Abuse Program of the Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services, and the work of the members of the Committee, you have received in the mail a Desk Reference on Drug Abuse. We believe this to be one of the most important pieces of information that a physician can have available to him. The manual covers diagnosis and emergency treatment of drug overdoses, a section on the legal responsibilities of the physician in treating cases of drug abuse, and a section listing the names, addresses, structural make-up, and the directors of referral facilities in all areas. There is also a section on laboratories that will analyze urine specimens for dangerous drugs and an up-to-date bibliography for those who would care to look further into specific drug problems. Lastly, but by no means least, is a dictionary of drug culture language. This has been a major undertaking on our part but we believe that the rewards to be gained by its use make our efforts worthwhile. We sincerely hope that all of the physicians in Florida will keep this reference handy in their offices and refer to it freely.

In the very near future the Committee is going to be asked to provide its services and experience to the Attorney General's office for a very challenging project which will have a far-reaching effect on drug education in Florida and the nation. Final details are being formulated and an announcement will probably be made in April. This will be a giant step forward and will very likely be the Committee's greatest undertaking to date.

The Committee has always been concerned about the role of the private physician in dealing with the drug problem in his community. More and more youngsters and distraught parents are looking to him for guidance and help. To quote a portion of an editorial appearing in the January 11, 1971, issue of the American Medical News, "A more realistic approach to the problem is needed, and the medical profession must lead the way. Because of his education and his standing in the community the physician is the ideal individual to educate those who would use drugs about the dangers, and to educate the public about ways to meet the problem." Bertram S. Brown, M.D., Director of the National Institute of Mental Health, has stated that "Physicians must be deeply knowledgeable and effective advocates for upgrading care in order to treat drug addicts successfully." We feel so strongly about the need of the medical profession to become more involved in the drug problem that we have established a Subcommittee on Physician Involvement. You will receive in the mail a survey to fill out and return to us, so that we may attempt to find out why more doctors are not involved in the program, and to ascertain in what way we can assist you in becoming more knowledgeable in volunteering your services in the field of drug treatment and education. A recent survey of 5,000 high school students reveals some very interesting results. I think perhaps for the purpose of this discussion one question has the greatest significance. The question is asked if you had or have a drug problem and wish assistance, to whom would you go. Number one on the list was a former drug addict. Number two on the list was the personal physician and at the end of a long list of others, including clergymen, attorneys, etc., was a drug counselor. I think the results of this survey speak for themselves. It has been my experience personally and the experience of many others that when you go to talk to young people about the drug problem they listen to a physician with more interest and respect than to anyone else. The logical place for the parents of a young person who is abusing drugs to turn is their family physician.

You must be able to meet this challenge. And a challenge it truly is. I recently addressed a conference in Jacksonville and heard a former young drug user make this statement: "Unless you are involved in trying to help stop the problem you must consider yourself part of the problem."

The Board of Governors of this Association has requested that all county medical societies establish ad hoc committees on drug abuse. If this has not yet been accomplished in your society, let me urge you to do this without delay. I tell you now that we are being criticized for not taking a more active role in this problem and this attitude must be changed. Appoint physicians to your committee who are genuinely interested in the problem and will be willing to work with the community leaders when asked. Believe me when I say they are very much in need of and desirous of your services.

It is time for the medical profession in Florida to stand up and be counted, for this is not a problem that is going to disappear by itself. The fact that Miami is now the largest single port of entry of illegal drugs in the United States and the fact that we now conservatively estimate 15,000 hard core heroin addicts in the southeast Florida area are reasons enough for us to become involved.

The profession has never failed in the past to come to the aid of the public during a period of crisis. The drug crisis is upon us and no one can ever convince me that this profession will not rise to meet the challenge once again.

COMMENTS ON IMPORTANT FOLLOWING TWO IMPORTANT VOTES

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, recently the House has voted twice on important matters relating to education. The first of these votes was on the conference report on the Higher Education Act of 1972. I voted against the report—June 8, 1972, 218 yeas to 180 nays. The second to which I refer was on the so-called Hathaway amendment to the Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1973. This vote occurred on June 15, 1972—yeas 212, nays 163—and I voted in the affirmative.

Because many of my constituents are interested in education—including authorization acts and funding bills—I want to take this opportunity to discuss my votes and some of the reasons for casting them as I did. Since most of my constituents are very interested in issues, I make it a policy to try to keep them informed, and when appropriate to explain important votes.

On the issue of education, most people are for quality education and better educational opportunities. Fortunately, many of them realize that when omnibus amendments come up for a vote there may be a mixture of good and bad, so do not expect from me an automatic "yea" to every proposal which is offered in the name of education.

Before discussing the specifics of the two votes I have mentioned, I think it's appropriate to offer a few observations in the way of background.

CHANGES IN FEDERAL PARTICIPATION IN EDUCATION OVER THE YEARS

Since I first came to Congress in 1963, Federal funds appropriated for student assistance programs have increased from \$91,330,000—strictly for NDEA loans in those days—to the 1972 level of \$1,327,100,000; the appropriation for the Office of Education has increased from \$652,449,000 to \$5,776,213,000; and the total Federal funds spent for education and other related activities has gone from \$5,430,900,000 to \$13,922,315,000—in 1971. The higher education bill authorizes over \$18 billion for educational assistance, over a 3-year period.

These figures indicate the tremendous financial investment the Government has made in education and the importance that has been placed on improvements and assistance in this field. But I would submit that a thorough evaluation of where this money has gone and will go is in order. Many people have accepted as absolute the premise that the quality of education is directly related to the quantity of money spent on it. Experience has shown, on the other hand, that this is not necessarily true.

TOO MUCH BUREAUCRACY AND PAPERWORK

A great deal of money has been spent on some programs with very few apparent results. In addition, as time has

passed and more money has been spent, more and more bureaucracy has been created to disperse the funds.

Program has been added to program, resulting in a jungle of waste and duplication. Many institutions of higher education have even hired specialists on the procurement of Federal assistance, the system has become so complicated and huge. This in turn has aggravated a tendency, so often the case with Federal grants; for the money to go to the richer and larger institutions, those that can afford such specialists and to allow some faculty members to do research instead of teaching. I have even had educators in my district complain to me bitterly about the amount of Federal paperwork which is often more expensive than they can afford. Indeed in some cases the expense of paperwork exceeds the amount of the requested grant.

Another effect these massive programs are having on education is that they breed a disturbing conformity. Institutions fall over each other, like sheep to pasture, chasing the bureaucratic buck. And that buck is too often dispensed by a coconformist. Is this helping the quality of education?

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Some areas of education have received less attention and less aid than they merit. Vocational education is one of these. I have long supported efforts to assist this field. Last year in my annual questionnaire to my constituents, I asked if they felt that liberal arts education had been over-emphasized at the expense of vocational-technical education. An overwhelming 68 percent of those who answered did so in the affirmative.

Recently, I received a very encouraging report from the New Hampshire Department of Education on the New Hampshire Technical Institute and Vocational-Technical Colleges. This report reaffirmed my belief that vocational and technical schools are serving a vital role in our educational and economic systems. One of the significant facts pointed out in the report was that only 10 percent of the graduates of these schools in New Hampshire, who had sought full-time employment, were still hunting jobs as of August 30, 1971. This was despite their lack of experience and the high level of unemployment at the time. It was also found that these well-trained, highly motivated young men and women are staying in New Hampshire. Fully 79 percent of the graduates employed full-time remained in the State and 83 percent of these actually commute to work from their home towns. This is extremely important for the economic and social well-being of rural States and says a great deal for the relevance of this type of education.

It is also noteworthy that in the past few years while student unrest has been the story in many colleges across the country, vocational and technical schools have remained relatively untouched. I believe this is because there is greater motivation on the part of the students, and because they find their studies more relevant and interesting. Vocational and technical education is obviously one area where money spent is well spent.

ANOTHER APPROACH TO STUDENT AID—TAX CREDIT

A different approach to student aid, which I have actively supported over the years, is the concept of giving a tax credit to parents who have dependents in colleges, universities, and private schools. This, it seems to me, is a fair way to assist most students, regardless of economic status.

All in all, I believe aid to education should be high on our list of national priorities. However, we should not allow the number of programs and bureaucracy to get out of hand. We should not be afraid to discard old programs, which have proven unproductive, and try new ones that show signs that they might work. And we should not accept any bill in preference to a really good bill. A little common sense and reason, the kind experience teaches, should be exercised.

THE HIGHER EDUCATION BILL

Mr. Speaker, let me now discuss in some detail my reasons for voting against the conference report on the Higher Education Amendments of 1972. At the outset, I would like to point out that I voted for passage of the House version of the legislation last November.

BUSING

Much of the debate and discussion concerning the conference report centered on the busing issue. My only comment in this regard is that I think it is unfortunate that we have not spoken more clearly on the subject. The conferees ignored the will of the House on busing. They permitted the inclusion of \$100 million for the Commissioner of Education to draw up a plan for metropolitan school districts. This type of school district could not operate without busing. They also did not follow the explicit instructions of the House on the busing amendment itself. As a matter of procedure, I think it is regrettable that they did not follow our instructions. A good deal is being said these days about the House not performing its function, or doing its job. It seems to me that to permit the conferees to ignore expressed instructions contributes directly to the weakness and inefficiency of the House, which seems to concern so many.

However, this particular aspect of the matter and my own feelings that Congress should act decisively to prevent forced busing to achieve racial balance in schools, are not the only reasons for my dissenting vote on the conference report. The arguments presented by the gentlewoman from Oregon, EDITH GREEN, particularly impressed me. This distinguished member has a long and outstanding record in support of education. Therefore, it is especially significant that many of the questions she raised during the debate were not answered to my satisfaction by the proponents of the bill.

In addition, I was impressed by the large number of college presidents who spoke out against the report. I know some of them personally and have great respect for their judgment. The gentleman from North Carolina (EARL RUTH) who has spent a lifetime in education, also made some interesting and persuasive points.

BASIC OPPORTUNITY GRANTS

One of the most important of these was the disclosure that if all the programs in the bill were fully funded a student could receive \$7,900 in Federal aid a year. That would be \$1,400 under BOG, \$1,500 under EOG, \$1,500 under NDEA, \$1,000 under CWS, and \$2,500 under GSL. Surely a college education has not become that expensive.

Another of his points was that the lure of \$1,400 would make it quite profitable for a youngster to emancipate himself totally from his family. Some of our welfare programs have created a situation where a father is encouraged to leave home so that his family can get welfare. Are we going to do something similar with the children as well?

Speaking of the \$1,400 grants to each student, I am not convinced that every student is entitled as a matter of right to this money. Is this not an economic magnet to less qualified and poorly motivated students to go to college? Should not our aid be based on motivation and achievement as well as need? And is this not a form of class legislation which discriminates against middle income students?

Recent studies indicate that there may be too much emphasis on college education, and that many students who graduate from college with high hopes are suddenly faced with the fact that there are just not enough jobs available for their particular skills. With this \$1,400 lure the situation can only get worse.

ANOTHER EMPTY PROMISE

Our present aid to students is based on the theory that they earn it by achievement, and must demonstrate a need. There is no implication that they are entitled of right to so much of the taxpayers' money. It should be noted that, if these older programs were fully funded, there would be no need to guarantee each student \$1,400.

This brings me to another of my major objections to this legislation: It will probably turn out to be another empty promise, contributing even more to the disillusionment of the young. The basic \$1,400—Pell—grants depend on the full funding—\$653 million—of the EOG, work study, and NDEA programs. Forty-five percent of the institutional aid, in turn, depends on the funding of the basic grants, to the tune of \$450 million.

Based on past performance, there is serious doubt that Congress will fully fund any of these programs. It is just unfair to make empty promises.

INSTITUTIONAL AID: WHAT HAVE WE WROUGHT?

I also object strongly to tying institutional aid to student financial assistance. This is incentive for colleges to seek out needy students, many of whom might have little motivation and less ability than middle income youngsters. This discriminates against the latter group and might lower the standards of many of our educational institutions. As the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. EDITH GREEN) so eloquently stated on pages 20282-20285 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

In a GAO audit made 2 years ago, the level of academic achievement for the special class of students at one college was fifth grade. I am advised that at CUNY, compensatory education is provided at the fourth and fifth grade level. Is this the role of the university—to provide classes at the elementary and secondary level in order to prepare the youngsters to go to the university? I do not happen to believe that we serve the individuals or the Nation by following a policy that has as its purpose to try to persuade colleges to take students unprepared for college.

I was appalled by these facts and in agreement with the gentlewoman's conclusion.

She went on to quote Bob Clark, president of the University of Oregon and former president of San Jose State College, who also made some very interesting points:

To keep young people off the job market our society has made the college or university a holding operation for some of our students—a kind of advanced baby sitting enterprise. Higher education should be available to all qualified aspirants who can profit therefrom; but they who do not want higher education should not be coerced to enter—we all believe that society has oversold itself on the value of college education for all youth and undersold the importance and dignity of socially productive and useful work of other forms.

In addition, the provisions in the higher education amendments which concern veterans will also cause a similar tendency to seek out this group. I am in favor of assisting the veteran in getting an education, but is a veteran really better off if he is sought out and enrolled by an institution where he is ill-equipped to compete? Would it not be better to give the assistance to him directly and not to the institution? The fact that the bill requires a Veterans Office and officer and that approximately one-half the funds are to be used in counseling and office operation seems to me to be a questionable expenditure of money, particularly as it is an unproven venture. This is a situation, typical of many, that cries aloud for a pilot project, at least.

SMALLER INSTITUTIONS SUFFER

It should also be noted that this provision and many others in the bill hurt rather than help the smaller private institutions. One hundred universities, 5 percent of the total, are now receiving almost 70 percent of the Federal moneys. As I mentioned earlier in my remarks, the rich get richer, for these are the very institutions that can afford to set up the programs required under the veterans section of the bill and also to recruit from low income families. Are we doing a service to education by helping the few giants and not assisting the others?

It is estimated that 350 private 4-year colleges will be forced to close by 1980 if they do not receive Federal aid. The House bill, for which I voted last year, provided for such assistance by basing 66 2/3 percent of institutional aid on a per capita formula. The conference committee eliminated all but 10 percent of this direct assistance and this 10 percent goes only to institutions with graduate

students. This will only serve to hasten the demise of these small undergraduate schools.

A real and dependable program of institutional aid should be based upon a formula having to do with the needs of the institution and should then be financed by itself, not dependent upon other programs. I believe that the small and private colleges make a major contribution to the American educational system, providing a balance to the giant university. These institutions offer uniqueness, character, and personalized instruction; factors often missed on the larger campuses. They are also more flexible when it comes to trying something new and, therefore, offer the best testing ground for innovations in the field of education.

PILOT PROJECTS

This brings me to the last point which I would like to make concerning the higher education bill. I believe that programs with such far-reaching consequences should be first proven by pilot projects. This would serve to bring a better perspective to the plans and would save money, which would then be spent on the best programs.

I think it would have been far wiser to have voted to continue the educational programs now in effect, spend more time considering the new provisions in the higher education bill, and try pilot projects with some of these new programs.

QUALITY EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS
AMENDMENT

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on the quality education appropriations amendment, better known as the Hathaway amendment.

I voted for this amendment the primary purpose of which was to help the people throughout this country who have been disadvantaged with regard to the education they have received. The amendment, which we passed—212 yeas to 163 nays—on June 15, 1972, provides an additional \$363.8 million over the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee. These funds will go to the areas of greatest need, including \$212.5 million under title I ESEA for disadvantaged children, \$27.6 million for vocational education and \$23.7 million for adult education. Several other important programs including libraries and impacted aid will receive increases under this amendment.

Generally, I dislike package amendments which affect several programs. When confronted with this type of legislation one must make a choice based on whether the good sections outweigh the bad. In this particular case, I felt that most of the programs included were important and successful enough to receive the additional funds.

Under the committee bill many of the programs were to receive exactly the same funds they did in the previous fiscal year. This, I believe, was unrealistic, since inflationary costs would cause a 5-percent cutback in existing programs now being conducted in local school districts. Also, because of revisions in the formula under which such funds are allocated, many States stood to lose ESEA

funds so that they would have less than last year.

Mr. Speaker, the aim of this amendment was quality education. This, I feel, should be the ultimate goal of Congress. Quality education is the major issue, not quantity spent on education nor busing to achieve racial balance. Now that the higher education amendments have been passed, it is only fair and logical that more money should be spent on programs aimed at improving the quality of education of the disadvantaged at the elementary and secondary levels. Only in this way can they take advantage of the opportunities afforded them by the other legislation.

I frankly fear that we put the cart before the horse. Hopefully in the future Congress will do a better job of exercising oversight. By so doing we will be able to correct some of the mistakes these remarks suggest we have made.

DDT

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, toxic exposure to insecticides may be fatal; but, immediate treatment with the antidote could be lifesaving. The right antidote must be immediately available wherever there may be toxic exposure to pesticides. Atropine is the only available antidote to organophosphorus and carbamate insecticide poisoning.

Thus far, the AtroPen is the only available means for the automatic injection of atropine by nonmedical personnel, to individuals poisoned by organophosphorus or carbamate insecticides. There is available an insecticide poisoning emergency treatment kit containing five AtroPen automatic injectors and one training injector. Each AtroPen contains 2 milligrams of atropine. The United States and their allies have purchased over 35 million AtroPens for use as antidotes to organophosphorus compounds.

Since poisoning with organophosphorus compounds requires immediate treatment it is essential that the drug be given as soon after exposure as possible; and it is essential that the drug begin to work as quickly as possible. Blood levels of atropine parallel the increase in heart rate caused by atropine. The graph shows the difference in time required to achieve an increased heart rate when atropine is taken by mouth, injected with an ordinary syringe and administered with an AtroPen. In view of this, I am pleased EPA has begun to act on this matter with their ban on DDT; however, I would call to the attention of my colleagues two articles detailing the dangers to the public and migrant farmworkers. The first appeared in the New York Times of June 18, 1972, and was written by E. W. Kenworthy. The second by Victor Cohn appeared in the Washington Post of June 16, 1972:

[From the New York Times, June 18, 1972]
DDT: IN THE END THE RISKS WERE NOT ACCEPTABLE

WASHINGTON.—A decade-long struggle came to what may prove to be the decisive turning point last week when William D. Ruckelshaus, administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, ordered a ban, effective Dec. 31, on almost all remaining domestic uses of the toxic, virtually non-degradable pesticide DDT.

Mr. Ruckelshaus' decision came at a time when domestic use has fallen from a 1959 peak of 79 million pounds to about 12 million pounds. Furthermore, the order applied to only 14 uses which were not under cancellation notice. The most important was use on cotton, 86 per cent of the total.

Nevertheless, the order had a tremendous public impact because for many the DDT battle had come to epitomize the struggle over the environment.

There were three good reasons for this. First, the battle dramatized one aspect of the human condition—of great expectations aroused by the application of scientific discovery only to be dashed by experience and larger knowledge. Second, it made ecology understandable—peregrine falcons absorbed DDT in their systems; the females laid thin-shelled eggs that broke, the young were not hatched. Third, the fight over DDT reduced to homely, down-to-earth terms the basic struggle between environmentalists and those "practical" people who complain that the environmentalists are opposed to "progress." In economic language, the struggle is over the "cost-benefit ratio." And nowhere has this ratio of costs versus benefits been more controversial than in the DDT battle.

The battle had its real beginning in 1962—although some biologists had warned earlier of the dangers in excessive use of the persistent pesticide—with the publication of the late Rachel Carson's "The Silent Spring." The book came as a shock to those who remembered how, in World War II and after, DDT had been celebrated as the "wonder" chemical. And wonders it had performed, eliminating in South Asia, Africa and Latin America the typhus-carrying louse and malaria-transmitting mosquito.

At home and abroad agricultural scientists found that DDT was effective against a whole range of crop-destroying pests. Production of the chemical boomed, trade-name pesticides with a DDT base proliferated, and uses—including spraying of domestic gardens, shrubs, shade trees and even interiors of houses—became indiscriminate.

The Carson book infused with the odor of death ("and no birds sing") the warnings that hitherto had been buried in scientific papers. "Unscientific," said some scientists, and "overwrought," said others. But still others supported her.

From then on, the battle was joined. The National Agricultural Chemicals Association, representing the manufacturers and formulators of DDT, rose to its defense. They had the support of the Department of Agriculture, the House and Senate Agriculture Committees, some farmer organizations, cotton state members of Congress and some scientists, including Norman Borlaug, winner of the Nobel Peace Prize for developing new wheat strains, who has recently denounced in unscientific language the advocates of a DDT ban.

It was a coalition with a powerful economic and political base, far more formidable than the unorganized coalition of biologists, environmental organizations, bird lovers, and writers, who sought a ban on DDT.

What turned the tide? Many things. For one a study in 1969 said that tests showing DDT produced cancer in mice "did not

prove carcinogenicity for human beings at the very much lower levels to which they are actually exposed," but it added that "a remarkable degree of concurrence has been found to exist between chemical carcinogenesis in animals and that in man . . ."

Most important was the sudden emergence of public concern for the environment in 1968-69, and with it the formation of public interest law firms, staffed with highly skilled and aggressive young lawyers, who knew how to assemble scientific findings and also how to thread their way through the labyrinth of administration law.

In October 1969, lawyers from the Environmental Defense Fund, representing four environmental organizations, set in train what was to become "the DDT case" by petitioning the Secretary of Agriculture to issue notices of cancellation of the registration of the "economic poison" DDT for shipment in interstate commerce.

What followed was a highly public demonstration of the truth of what has become for students of government a cliché—namely, that Federal agencies very often subvert those private interests they are supposed to regulate in the public interest.

The Department of Agriculture fought every inch of the way. At first it ignored the petition of the environmental groups. Then, realizing it would be taken to court, it issued notices of cancellation for four minor uses. Then, brought before the Federal Court of Appeals, it argued (1) that it had already replied to the petition by its notices, (2) that the plaintiffs had no standing to sue since they did not make DDT or use it, (3) that the court should not interfere with decisions that Congress had wisely left to the "expertise" of Executive departments.

Ordered by the court to issue cancellation notices on all remaining uses, or say why he could not, the Secretary of Agriculture issued notices for 50-odd uses, but not on cotton.

At this point, responsibility for pesticide registration was switched by the President to the new Environmental Protection Agency, and when the court ordered cancellation notices on all remaining uses, Mr. Ruckelshaus—who did not regard the manufacturers or the Southeast cotton growers as his clients—complied.

Montrose Chemical Corp., and the formulators asked for public hearings, and in their arguments against a ban they were joined by the Department of Agriculture. In the end, Mr. Ruckelshaus overruled the recommendation of the hearing examiner that the benefits of DDT outweighed the dangers and that the proposed ban should be reversed. Mr. Ruckelshaus found that the risks to the environment and human health were "unacceptable."

The formulators immediately appealed to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in New Orleans—evidently hoping that a court in the Cotton Belt would be more sympathetic to their arguments than the Court of Appeals in Washington. The Department of Agriculture is expected to join their suit as intervenors.

The environmental groups countered by asking the Courts of Appeals for the District of Columbia to make the Ruckelshaus order effective immediately. Their real purpose, however, was to keep the case in that court.

There is considerable doubt among lawyers whether either court would reverse Mr. Ruckelshaus for these reasons:

The administrator said that the chief substitute for DDT would be methyl parathion, a highly toxic organo-phosphate, more effective than DDT, but a poison that degrades quickly and so is a danger only to unskilled applicators.

Methyl parathion is now used almost exclusively on cotton in California, Arizona, Texas and Arkansas. Moreover, in the Southeast it has long been mixed with DDT, because, while DDT is effective against the boll worm, parathion is more effective against the boll weevil. Therefore, many applicators in the southeast know the dangers of parathion. Furthermore, Mr. Ruckelshaus said the delay in making his order effective was to provide time to train applicators in the safe use of parathion.

Mr. Ruckelshaus's order will have no effect on the manufacture of DDT for export, thus insuring supplies for anti-malarial programs.

[From the Washington Post, June 16, 1972]

DATA ON PESTICIDES WITHHELD BY EPA,
SENATE PANEL TOLD

(By Victor Cohn)

An "unfeeling and negligent" Environmental Protection Agency has failed to give Congress the facts it needs to protect 2.6 million farm workers against a growing number of poisonous pesticides, a Washington public interest spokesman charged yesterday.

The facts: With EPA's new DDT ban and declining DDT use, there will be more and more use of pesticides like the organic phosphates—easier on the environment but far harder on the health of those who work in the fields.

The charge that the EPA has denied congressional committees reports in its files on widespread sicknesses of farm workers was made by A. V. Krebs, Jr., research associate, and Jerry Berman, legal counsel for the Agribusiness Accountability Project, a nonprofit Washington group funded by the Field Foundation.

They testified at a Senate Commerce subcommittee hearing.

"Over a dozen reports" in EPA possession, Krebs said, tell of farm workers who became seriously ill because they pruned trees or worked in fields as long as a month after pesticides were used.

He cited a study made by Dr. Thomas Milby of the California State Health Department that cited incident after incident in Tulare and Kern counties citrus and truck crop land.

For example: "Sept. 17, 1970 . . . Kern County (McFarland), Calif. . . . Ranch: Roberts and La Borde (Paramount Citrus Growers) . . . 32 reported ill, 12 seriously (34 days after application of parathion)."

Krebs quoted Dr. Donald S. Kwalick of the New Jersey State Health Department as saying that organic phosphates in 1969 caused 52 of 82 reported pesticide poisonings.

He also quoted Milby as saying "there is probably an even more common form of 'adverse' effect in farm workers—a slow, insidious impairment of hand-eye coordination and other neuromuscular functions that most workers might just scribe to 'getting old.'"

How much such illness there really is, serious or mild, no one really knows, Krebs said.

But the effect of EPA silence, he maintained, may be continued lack of protection for farm labor.

President Nixon last year proposed a new pesticide law. The House Agriculture Committee wrote and the House passed a weaker version. The Senate Agriculture Committee last month approved what most environmentalists call a better but still imperfect version.

One reason for the imperfections, Krebs insisted, is that the EPA has in effect sat on the annual reports filed by its "community studies pesticides projects" in 15 states.

The charge was called "unfair and irresponsible" by David E. Dominick, EPA's assistant administrator for pesticides. He did not deny that the reports in question were not sent to Congress. But he said:

In response to the administration proposal, the House pesticide bill would provide that dangerous farm chemicals must be applied by trained certified applicators.

All EPA field studies are available for viewing, and more than 200 articles have been published in widely available journals as a result.

California's Dr. Milby testified this year before a Senate Agriculture subcommittee, and Dominick and EPA Administrator William D. Ruckelshaus "gave serious attention" to the organic phosphate toxicity problem in oral testimony before the same group.

Ruckelshaus put a Dec. 31 effective date on his near-ban on DDT this week just to provide time to train pesticide applicators to avoid future illness.

Krebs and other witnesses nonetheless urged the environmental subcommittee to try to strengthen the pesticide bill to force the EPA to give farm workers even better protection.

SCHOOLBUSING

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, the possible busing of schoolchildren to achieve racial balance is one of the most important issues facing the Nation. Because this question directly affects every home in Livonia, I am taking this means to communicate to you my feelings on this issue and to assure you that Congress has taken action to prevent busing in Wayne, Oakland, and Macomb Counties this fall.

First, let me summarize the convictions on which I have acted as your Congressman. First, I do not believe in busing of schoolchildren to achieve racial balance. It is neither good educational policy nor good social policy. Second, I believe that Congress must give clear guidance to the courts that busing children to achieve racial balance is contrary to national policy. Third, I believe in the right of every child in our Nation, regardless of race, to receive the benefits of a decent education. Fourth, I believe that we must find an alternative method of financing our school system so that we no longer rely on the property tax as a major source of revenues.

My own position has been arrived at after careful analysis and thought and I would like to share it with you.

First, the busing of schoolchildren to achieve racial balance in our schools is not a viable solution to the complex social and educational problems facing our Nation. Numerous analytical and scientific studies have fully demonstrated that busing does not, in and of itself, improve education for disadvantaged students or racial minorities. Indeed, the Ann Arbor study on busing indicated that in many cases busing actually lowered the performance of those it was intended to aid.

The neighborhood school is an extremely valuable asset. The school should be an integral part of community life. Many parents have made their choice of housing based on the location of good school systems and the continuity and security offered by a neighborhood school can greatly strengthen the ability of a

child to learn and to relate to the community as a whole.

There are, certainly, inferior schools in the Nation which do not offer their students a decent education. The answer to this problem, however, is not to lower the quality of the good systems, but to raise the quality of the poor ones.

Second, while the Congress has consistently voted over the past few years against the busing of schoolchildren to achieve racial balance, the wording of these resolutions have been ambiguous and for that reason have largely been ignored by the courts. The Congress earlier this month approved the Broomfield amendment which is explicit in its meaning. The 18-month moratorium which it establishes will clearly stop the implementation of decisions such as the Roth decision that would require metropolitan area-wide busing.

I was a member of the Senate-House Conference Committee which drew up this strong and clear statement of congressional opposition to busing. All of us on the committee were impressed with the involvement of millions of citizens who made their views known on this important issue. Democracy functions best when the people help shape our Government's policy. They have certainly done so in this crucial matter.

Third, every American of good will believes in the right of all our 2.1 million students in the elementary and secondary schools to a decent education which will prepare them to lead fulfilling and responsible lives as members of our society. I am wholly convinced that those who oppose busing do not do so on a basis of racism. The fact that they support equal educational opportunities and work for the improvement of the poor schools belies that charge. They believe, quite simply and quite correctly, that it is absurd to bus a student from a good school to a poor one. Such busing adds a monumental, totally unnecessary and unproductive expense to school budgets when the funds could and should be used for improving the schools.

Fourth, because we are all concerned about our children, it is hard to oppose spending on our schools. Yet property tax levels have become so steep that an open tax rebellion has been spreading throughout the Nation and in school district after school district new funds have been turned down by the voters. At the same time, the courts in many States have ruled that the use of the property tax as the major financing mechanism of the schools is inherently unfair and therefore is unconstitutional. Clearly it is essential to find a new, fairer means of raising school funds. A number of proposals have been made including State income taxes, sales taxes, the value added tax, Federal income tax, and so forth. All of these alternatives should be studied so that our property taxes can be reduced to more reasonable levels.

With this background, let us now turn to the more immediate question facing us as a community: What is the likelihood that children will be bused from Livonia in the fall of this year? The answer, in my view, is very clear. The Broomfield amendment in the Higher Education

Conference Report which the Congress recently approved will stay the Roth decision and busing will not take place. Let me quote to you from the memorandum which I prepared with the aid of legal counsel for the Education and Labor Committee that I recently forwarded to the Livonia School Board:

The legislative history of this amendment in the House is critical. The amendment originated in the House of Representatives. It could not be more clear that it does apply to the decisions and orders of Judge Roth. Ordinarily there are only a few words written or spoken concerning the meaning of a particular amendment and where the language is in any way ambiguous the meaning may be subject to doubt. Here the legislative history is so complete and the explanation so comprehensive and so explicit that there can be no doubt about the scope and application of the Broomfield amendment.

Finally, let us turn to the question of what we can do now. As your Congressman, I intend to continue to push for legislation that will stop court-ordered busing to achieve racial balance. Within the next few weeks, I expect the Roth decision to be overturned by higher courts on the basis of the higher education amendment for which I worked so strongly. I intend, however, to seek further legislation in this area which will effect the desired change. Many have raised the question of a constitutional amendment. Yet as the President stated so succinctly in his address to the Nation on this subject, the ratification process involves action not only by the Senate, the House, and the President, but by State legislatures in at least 37 States. The process is obviously slow and cumbersome and could not be effective in time to deal with the pressing and immediate problems we face.

As parents and as citizens I hope you will continue to let your views on this issue be known in a responsible manner. If you concur with me in my efforts to stop busing to achieve racial balance, you can continue to contact all public officials to emphasize your views. You can continue to restate your support for equal educational opportunity for all students. You can help by expressing your views in this questionnaire and return it to me so that I might publicize your feelings.

LEGISLATION TO ESTABLISH SAFETY STANDARDS FOR MOBILE HOMES

HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of H.R. 15157, the National Mobile Home Safety Standards Act of 1972, I am concerned about the deaths, personal injury, and property damage resulting from mobile home accidents.

I would therefore, like to call your attention to a statement made by Congressman Louis FREY, who appeared on June 27, 1972, before the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control in Los Angeles to discuss fire hazards in

mobile homes, and H.R. 15157. Mr. FREY had the following comments:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN LOU FREY, JR.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Commission, I appreciate having the opportunity to appear before you today to discuss the fire hazards associated with mobile homes and the need for uniform national safety standards dealing with such hazards.

Profound changes have occurred in recent years in the American housing market due in large part to the increased manufacture and sale of mobile and modular homes. The production of mobile home units has increased fivefold in the United States from 1960 (103,700) to 1971 (500,000).

More than 7 million Americans live in mobile homes. Half of the one-family homes built in the United States today are mobile homes and 95% of the homes sold for under \$15,000 are mobile homes. In my own State of Florida which is the largest mobile home market in the Nation, there are 1,271 mobile home parks and over 165,000 individual lots.

Moreover, efforts especially at the Federal level are underway to accelerate this already phenomenal increase. In 1970 FHA guaranteed mortgage loans were extended to include mobile homes and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board allowed Federal savings and loan associations to provide mortgage loans on mobile homes. Early in 1971, guaranteed Veterans Administration loans were extended to include the purchase of mobile homes, and it was announced that the largest private homebuilder in the United States—Levitt and Sons—was going into the mobile home market.

And just this month, Federal financial involvement with mobile homes was further liberalized. The Department of Housing and Urban Development authorized the first sale of "Ginnie Mae" securities backed by FHA title 1 mobile home loans. This decision makes FHA mortgage guarantees for mobile homes much more attractive since it assures the buyers a substantially lower downpayment and monthly payments from 15 to 20 percent less than would be possible in conventional financing. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board has also just decided to increase the percentage of assets which a Federal savings and loan association can invest in mobile homes from 5% to 10%.

While there has been a phenomenal increase in the manufacturing, sale and purchase of mobile homes, there has been an alarming lack of effort by the States and Federal Government to assure that the homes sold meet certain basic safety standards, especially with regard to fire. And, with the rising demand, there have been and are bound to be a few manufacturers who utilize unsafe construction materials and techniques.

Mobile homes are not subject to local building codes. The distinction between standard homes and mobile homes is oftentimes meaningless as some of the newer mobile home models are not really mobile at all. The most common size is 12 feet wide and 60 feet long, but they can be purchased in double or even triple width. The only time such homes are ever mobile is for the trip between the factory and the mobile home park. Even then they must be moved by tractor or heavy-duty truck.

Furthermore, only half of the States have adopted standards directly or as a guideline. The standards were developed by the American National Standards Institute. Five out of the 10 top manufacturing States have no code whatsoever: New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Michigan and Ohio.

These same standards, it should be noted, are utilized for membership in the Mobile Home Manufacturers Association. But, like most self-regulatory activities, it lacks teeth.

Criticism has also been made of the code itself. The final report of the National Commission on Product Safety concluded as follows concerning the mobile home code:

Although the limited space in mobile homes calls for special consideration in their design, exigencies are largely unheeded. The standard does not provide exits opening on either side at opposite ends, in the event of fire or upset; safety glazing; or bracing to prevent fishtailing. It permits use of gas, fire floor heaters (which generate excessive grate service temperatures). It does not require that the heater vent be constructed to preclude blocking, nor that the operator be informed of the importance of an electrical ground.

Moreover, those States which have adopted the code for the most part only apply it to homes manufactured in the State and sold in the State. Thus, mobile homes manufactured in a State without one and sold in a State with a code and homes manufactured in a State with a code but sold in a State without one are in most cases not regulated at all.

More importantly, however, is the lack of enforcement in those States which have adopted the code. For instance, in my own State of Florida which manufactured 38,000 mobile homes last year and has the largest number of mobile home parks—1,271—and lots—165,023—there are three inspectors to handle all complaints against the manufacturers of mobile homes and recreational vehicles and also the construction of all vehicles. Since they handle all recreational vehicles—campers, motorhomes, and so forth—and receive on the average 20 complaints per month on mobile homes only, and 17 new applications daily from mobile home dealers, they must resort to random spot checks of manufacturers. They inform me that every time they inspect they find violations of the code. Florida, it should be noted, has just decided to add three inspectors which should improve the situation.

And Florida has one of the better enforcement programs in the country.

There is no formal regulation at the Federal level either, although both the FHA and VA require that before mortgage money is lent on a mobile home, it must meet the ANSI standard. The FHA employs a "self-certification" process which in reality means no regulation at all. The VA, on the other hand, has just inaugurated a quarterly inspection of manufacturing plants by a person from each of their State offices. Experts in the industry tell me that a great deal of expertise is required to adequately inspect a mobile home and they are skeptical of the VA's capabilities in this regard. So am I.

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board has just recently authorized the Federal Savings and Loan Associations to make loans for the purchase of mobile homes. But they do not require that the mobile home financed meet any safety standards whatsoever.

Since the FHA and VA are insuring the financing of mobile homes and the Federal Home Loan Bank issues deposit insurance for Federal Savings and Loan Associations, fiscal responsibility alone would seem to require adherence to uniform Federal standards.

The lack of effective regulation of this rapidly expanding form of living is resulting in property damage, financial ruin, human suffering, and in some cases, death.

Mobile homes, as constructed and set up, do present a serious fire and life safety hazard. Let us look at some recent facts. A leading mobile home insurance company estimated that the average mobile home fire loss in 1971 was \$1,529, as compared to \$350, for a conventional home. The average mobile home fire loss increased from \$889 in 1966 to \$1,529 today. An analysis made by one insurance company of 5,543 mobile home fires in 1971 estimated that damage due to such fires amounted to \$6,780,972.34. The State of Oregon estimates that the average loss to a mobile home as compared to its value is 3.80 times as great as the same ratio for a stand-

ard home. The average age of a mobile home that has a fire is 7½ years as compared to 40 years for a conventional home.

Even more alarming is the fact that the mortality rate in mobile home fires has been estimated in the State of Arizona as eight times that of ordinary dwellings and 3.29 times greater in Oregon.

I would like to include for the record an excellent summary and comparison of the causes of mobile home fires for the years 1966-71 by Foremost Insurance Company which is one of the leading mobile home insurance companies in the country. It follows: (see exhibit A)

As you will note, 19.2 percent of all mobile home fires were due to faulty electrical wiring. The primary cause was the extensive use made of aluminum wiring and heat tape. Heat tape has a life expectancy of about 3 years and eventually failure usually takes the form of an electrical short. When placed around the water pipe adjacent to the inflammable insulation in the flooring of a mobile home, the short can ignite a fire very early. Thirteen percent of such fires are due to faulty furnaces and flues. The area surrounding furnaces, gas water heaters, stoves and so forth, should be, but are not protected with fire retardant material. Insulation used in mobile homes should also be fire retardant.

In December 1971 the results of a fire hazard survey of 759 mobile homes in New York State by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was released. 159 different models were involved. This is the only study ever commissioned on mobile home safety at the federal level.

Their study concluded that "many potentially serious fire hazards were discovered. These were of two kinds: situations encouraging the likelihood of fires and situations making successful escape of occupants of a burning home difficult or unlikely."

Two major hazards were discovered: types of heating installations and electrical fire problems. 727 of the 735 homes surveyed used kerosene, propane, oil, or gas as fuel. A large number of furnaces had been modified usually to use a different type of fuel and many had not been cleaned for a long period of time. Only 32 had furnaces equipped with thermal shutoffs. Also dangerous—because of the hazard of continuing flow of fuel into a burning home—were the 60 instances of gravity feed from an elevated outside fuel storage tank, and the 181 instances of mobile homes lacking any outside shut-off valve for the fuel valve.

Repeatedly during the surveying, occupants complained about faulty wiring and inadequate electrical connections. Among the hazards encountered were improper wiring of outlets, circuit breakers that did not cut off all circuits, wires in contact with furnaces and improperly operating pilot lights. In addition, no onsite inspection of electrical installations was required in the area.

More alarming was their finding that it would be difficult to exist from many of these homes in the event of a fire and the appalling lack of safety measures. Some only had one door and others had non-functioning doors. Outside doors, they found, might be impossible to open because of the possible distortion of the door and frame under high heat making the outside doors which were metal difficult to open. Another difficulty observed in both door and window operation was binding resulting from the distortion of the home caused by uneven settling of one or more support points.

Furthermore, most windows were found to be entirely useless for escape. Many were jalousie type, and, were too small for both adults and children to escape from.

Most frightening is the following description of the lack of safety measures: "The stories of mobile home fires frequently mention unusually rapid spread and difficulty

of egress. Yet, over two-thirds of the homes surveyed did not have fire extinguishers, and two out of every five families had never discussed what they would do in the event of fire. Perhaps this is no different than in other types of single-family conventional, residential dwellings. Yet, the special hazards (rapid spread and faulty exits) would seem to prompt special attention to these counter-measures. There did not seem to be any uniform attempt to make fire-resistant the structures near furnace installations. Most were enclosed by wood paneling, and some were located so as to block egress from bedrooms to the outside in case of fire.

The HEW report made the following recommendations to eliminate some of these hazards:

1. Enforce rigorous application of USAS-A119.1(1971) standards at point of manufacture—it is unlikely that strict adherence to those standards should have been followed by so many complaints and observations of faulty electrical installations.

2. Require on-site inspections by State and local authorities—particularly of electrical, plumbing and heating installations—after the mobile home is located and before occupancy.

3. Use better foundation supports—concrete pad, piers sunk below frost line, appropriately positioned adjustable jacks, or some new and better base that would minimize distortion.

4. Outlaw fuel storage in tanks elevated above floor level.

5. Control additions, especially any that might enclose two exit doors.

6. Encourage overhangs to protect exit doors from freezing rain and snow.

7. Position furnaces at ends of mobile homes unless, when in center, independent exits are supplied for both ends.

8. Encourage provision of fire extinguishers as standard equipment with new homes.

9. Develop and require more push-out escape windows with screens and storm windows not impeding rapid ejection and escape.

10. Require thermal shutoff and alarm for heating system.

11. Require outside fuel shutoff with quick acting valves.

12. Require fire retardant materials on mattresses, walls, floors, and ceilings—especially in zones where initiation of fire is most likely—near furnace, in kitchen, and bedrooms.

13. Develop space-occupancy standards.

14. Devise educational programs for the special needs of mobile home occupants.

15. Initiate a clearinghouse for injury-hazard relationships in mobile homes.

16. Require sprinkler systems.

Let me conclude this discussion of fire hazards in mobile homes by quoting in part from a letter addressed to me from a fireman in Gibsonton, Florida:

"I am a fireman in the Gibsonton Volunteer Fire Department, and thus, am sitting on top of the situation as regards fires in these units.

"When answering an alarm, and learning that it is a mobile home fire, my personal views are: that except for saving life, or personal possession, or protecting adjoining property, the engines may as well stay in the firehouse, because, if they are not at the scene in moments of ignition, it is certain to be a total loss even though only one end may be destroyed. They go up that fast.

"Now to the design of these homes.

"Prior to the twelve wifes, the second door of these units opened directly into a bedroom, giving occupants an escape route in case of fire. In the newer units, probably to preserve the decor of the bedroom, the second door is now situated in a hallway between the living and sleeping quarters.

"In this hallway are the heating furnace, entrance to the bathroom and in some, a

small bedroom. The main, or master bedroom, is at the end of the hall.

"A malfunction in the heating unit during the night, and getting a little headstart, could prevent the use of that second door as a means of escape from the bedrooms. Also, the type of windows used in these units, are a detriment for getting out, and in some, with their placement near the ceiling, makes it an impossibility. I believe the second door should still open directly into the bedroom.

"More on design, but for another reason.

"I am also a driver and First Aider on the ambulance we operate in conjunction with the fire department. I find that in a good percentage of these homes, it is impossible to get into a bedroom with a stretcher, as we cannot make the turns, into them. Recently, while inspecting a new doublewide (24 x 54), with three bedrooms, I noted that the same situation prevailed. As we know, many mobile homes are being purchased by elderly people, and as such, are more susceptible to falls, heart attacks, and other illnesses necessitating the use of a stretcher. Of course we can use an orthopedic (scoop) stretcher, but it takes more time, and even with its use, the patient would almost be in a vertical position to make the turn out of the bedroom to the wheeled stretcher. This is another reason why the second, or third door, should open into the bedroom.

"I believe that the proper placement of doors in these units, and the use of better construction materials as your bill provides, would do much to make mobile home living that much safer."

Since the vast majority of mobile home owners are either retired or young persons just getting started who have put their life savings and personal possessions in the mobile home, any fire or loss imposes quite a hardship—77 percent of the mobile homeowners in Florida are retired and the average income for a Florida mobile homeowner including social security is \$5,702.

Most losses, moreover, are not covered by warranties. The warranties are oftentimes of very short duration and hard to comply with. Some companies, for instance, require that the mobile home be returned to the point of purchase.

In addition, insurance companies have become more and more reluctant to insure certain models of mobile homes due to the high risk of loss involved. Consequently, insurance rates for mobile homes are considerably higher than those for standard homes. The insurance on the average \$6,000 mobile home is approximately \$100 which is equivalent to the insurance on a \$40,000 conventional home.

The National Mobile Home Safety Standards Act of 1972, H.R. 15157, which I introduced would implement many of the recommendations of the HEW report by establishing enforceable uniform national safety standards.

This legislation is modeled to a certain extent on the Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1970, although there are significant variations. It is, I emphasize, a balanced, fair approach to the problem. The thrust of it is to establish minimum, uniform safety standards while at the same time promoting the use of the mobile home as a low cost, desirable form of housing.

Under my bill, the Secretary of HEW shall through a National Mobile Home Safety Bureau in consultation with the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of Transportation establish federal mobile home safety standards. In prescribing standards the Secretary shall consider: first, all relevant mobile home safety data; second, consult with the States; and third, consider whether any proposed standard is reasonable, practicable and will not result in a substantial increase in the retail price of mobile homes.

The standards would be established no

earlier than 180 days after enactment with revised standards at least 180 days later. A National Mobile Home Safety Advisory Council will be established. The majority will be representatives of the general public, including representatives of state and local governments, and the remainder shall include representatives of the American National Standards Institute Committee on Mobile Homes and Recreational Vehicles and representatives of the mobile home manufacturers, dealers, and insurers. The Secretary must consult with the Advisory Council before establishing or amending any standards. These standards shall not apply to the sale, offer for sale, or introduction in interstate commerce of any mobile home after the first purchase of it in good faith for purposes other than resale.

Once the standards have been promulgated, no person shall manufacture for sale, offer for sale, or introduce or deliver for introduction in interstate commerce or import into the United States, any mobile home manufactured unless it conforms to such standards.

The Secretary is further authorized to conduct research, testing, development, and training for the development of new standards and to determine the relationship between mobile home performance characteristics and accidents involving mobile homes and the occurrence of death or injury from such accidents.

The Secretary is also authorized to conduct with the advisory council a thorough study of standards for used mobile homes and recommend additional legislation if he feels such is necessary within 1 year after this legislation is enacted.

Each violation of the prohibited acts outlined in section 108 of the bill are subject to the civil penalty of \$1,000. Injunctive relief is also available in the U.S. district courts. In addition, if a mobile home does not conform to applicable Federal mobile home safety standards and it is prior to a sale by a distributor or dealer, the manufacturer or distributor shall either repurchase the home at his cost or furnish the parts and costs of installation to the distributor or dealer.

Provision is made for judicial review for any person adversely affected by an order—standard—issued by the Secretary.

Inspection and investigation is authorized as may be necessary to enforce the standards established. Designated employees may enter at reasonable times factories or warehouses for prompt inspection. Each manufacturer, distributor, and dealer shall establish and maintain such records and reports as the Secretary may require. The Secretary may also require each manufacturer to give performance and technical data to each prospective purchaser. Finally, each manufacturer shall furnish to each first purchaser and all dealers notification of any defect in a mobile home produced that relates to mobile home safety which he has discovered after manufacturing such home or which has been discovered through testing or inspection by the National Mobile Home Safety Bureau.

Certification that each mobile home conforms to the Federal safety standards shall also be given by each manufacturer to each distributor or dealer at the time of delivery.

Section 120 of the bill allows any state to assume responsibility for the development and enforcement of mobile home safety standards if the plan they submit to the Secretary for such provides for the development and enforcement of mobile home safety standards which are the same as the federal standards. Detailed reports would still be made by manufacturers, distributors, and dealers to the Secretary. And, the state agency will make such reports as the Secretary may require. The Secretary shall make a continuing evaluation of the way each

state is carrying out its plan. Approval may be withdrawn at any time.

Grants will be made to states that have designated a state agency to assist them in identifying their needs and responsibilities in the area of mobile home safety standards or in developing state plans. The federal share shall not exceed 90 percent. Grants of up to 50 percent can also be made to assist the states in administering and enforcing state plans for mobile home safety. Title II in the bill amends existing law to provide that loans made by the FHA, VA or a Federal Savings and Loan Association for the purchase of a mobile home may only be made for a home that meets or exceeds the mobile home safety standards established by this legislation.

Thank you Mr. Chairman for inviting me to appear before your Commission today. If you have any questions, I would be happy to respond.

HORTON SALUTES SISTER HELEN MALONE UPON RETIREMENT AND DR. ALICE FOLEY, HER SUCCESSOR AS PRESIDENT OF NAZARETH COLLEGE

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, within the congressional district I represent, there are, of course, many things of which I am proud. None assumes any greater importance to me, and I would venture to say the entire community than the number of institutions of higher education. Because the philosophy upon which each college is founded is of the utmost importance in shaping the young lives which are so vital to the future of our Nation, those leaders who formulate the policies designed to carry out these philosophies are all important.

Nazareth College, an outstanding liberal arts school for women in my district has been the fortunate recipient of 12 years of devoted service from Sister Helen Malone who retired this month. Succeeding her will be the first lay president in the college's 48-year-old history, Dr. Alice Foley.

As an alumnus of Nazareth, Sister Malone showed a true love for her school through the years of hard work and devotion which she brought to the administration during a time of change for all educational institutions. The school as well as the entire community have benefited from her accomplishments.

Dr. Alice Foley, Sister Malone's successor, has had a brilliant career during her 36 years with the Brighton school system. She retired in 1971 as Brighton's assistant superintendent and director of instruction and is a past president of the New York State Teachers Association.

Both of these gifted women have left an indelible impression on the field of education. I would like to join in the accolades and request that my colleagues in the Congress share, also, in paying tribute to Sister Helen Malone and Dr. Alice Foley.

Sister Malone was recognized for her many contributions to Rochester aca-

demic life by the Rochester Times Union on its editorial page and by Democrat and Chronicle columnist Cliff Carpenter, the texts of which follows. The Genesee Valley Newspapers paid tribute to her most worthy successor, Dr. Foley, in an article which I am inserting into the RECORD at this time.

[From the Rochester (N.Y.) Times-Union]

SISTER HELEN SERVED NAZARETH WELL

Sister Helen Malone is an unusually gifted woman. For 12 years she has overseen the expansion and progress of Nazareth College. She steps down as its president July 1.

But Sister Helen's Nazareth days go back beyond that—first as an undergraduate and later as chairman of its Speech Pathology Department.

Before she became president in 1960, one might have found sister—Sister Helen Daniel then—at the top of a ladder painting scenery for a student dramatic production or working with handicapped children in the college's speech and hearing clinic. Anyone witnessing Sister Helen's work with young children with impaired speech is struck by the instant rapport and confidence she elicits.

Wise and gentle, Sister Helen has been a model of calm reserve in her 12 years as Nazareth's first full-time president. Under her leadership, however, the college has almost doubled its student body, added three new dormitory buildings and the magnificent new Nazareth Arts Center, and adopted several new educational concepts.

Sister Helen will be succeeded by Dr. Alice L. Foley, vice president of the college and director of continuing education, who brings to the post a splendid academic reputation.

[From the Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat and Chronicle]

SISTER HELEN PACKS UP

(By Cliff Carpenter)

Time on the job is running out now for the little lady with the hushed voice and the dancing smile.

Very soon, Sister Helen Malone will pack up her memories and leave the high-ceilinged office of President of Nazareth College of Rochester.

The memories reach across the 200-acre East Avenue campus where chattering undergrads in miniskirts and hip-huggers stroll in the spring sunshine. They reach back to a public school childhood near the tough car shops in East Rochester; back to a time when she flirted with the theater as a career (repertory for two summers in Connecticut and Massachusetts); back to the day of decision when she enrolled in Nazareth in 1935, there to stay, as student, teacher and president, except for more courses and degrees at Cornell and the University of Michigan.

For 37 of her 54 years, it has been a love affair with a school.

Even the graffiti on the walls of the tunnels connecting the school buildings seems to reflect the wide smile and the wider wisdom and the flashing humor of the little lady. "Don't tell somebody you love them: Love them!" "It's better to be blatant than latent" "Have you thanked a green tree today?" "I like football, baseball, popcorn, ice cream, motorcycles, Schlitz and Cindy" "My God is very alive; sorry to hear about yours."

The imprint carries over onto a little quickie brochure on Nazareth which bears such legends as "A smile is like a gift you can give each day."

If anybody is qualified to talk about young women in these days of almost violent social fermentation, it must be Sister Helen Malone, or at least so I reasoned and this steered me

to the 48-year-old liberal arts college for women.

There were freshly-cut hyacinths on tables, glowing or brooding modern art on walls, and student notices thumbtacked here and there advertising anything from a Tennessee Williams play to the Leighton Ford evangelistic crusade, and I asked her about restraints in this changing time:

"The students can see anything they care to see. We demand nothing in this respect. We don't even tell them to go to church; we are just grateful if they decide to go."

Are today's students different? . . . do they reflect social unrest?

Sister Helen took her time answering, and answered carefully, visibly reaching through the portfolio of memories:

"A few generalizations can be made but not many for they are individuals first and always. They resent too many required courses; they want more latitude. They are not as satisfied to trust grownups as were other generations."

"To work with them in harmony, you'd better tell them the truth at all times! For they can see the inequities in life and they resent them and they don't understand them. We would rather they were concerned with charity and humanity than fish on Friday . . . and of course the war is so very close to them."

"If we older people think at all, or read at all, or have a heart at all, we will think deeply about what disturbs them. But I am most optimistic about them."

What does she want a girl to be like upon graduation?

"To be her best possible self, with important priorities . . . to celebrate the miracle of life, not to consider it a grim and dismal thing. To put it simply, we would like to graduate a person with a strong commitment to humanity and to God."

As she spoke, a red plastic kite bobbed impertinently in the wind outside the window. Puffs of dust arose from a huge tractor scratching up the earth so more grass and more trees can be planted for this college whose total enrollment has soared from 1320 to 2053 in the 12 years of Sister Helen Malone's presidency.

And so, as I said, time is running out for Sister Helen Malone. This is the way she willed it. She insists she has given what she can, and it is somebody else's turn. She leaves an institution as modern as its mini-skirts, with students from 21 states and 10 foreign lands, and a faculty which has grown in a dozen years from 19 lay teachers and 20 religious, to 53 lay teachers and 18 religious. When she has time for reflection, she will probably teach again, somewhere, for teaching is her life.

She will take with her a remarkable amount of student affection and such graffiti "When true friends drink together even water is sweet," and "Without music, life would be an error."

[From the Genesee Valley Newspapers]

DR. FOLEY HEADS HER ALMA MATER

When Nazareth College's new president was an undergraduate at the catholic girls college several decades ago, she never dreamed she would some day head her alma mater—and after a full and successful career elsewhere.

"I feel very humble to be following in Sister Helen's footsteps," says Dr. Alice L. Foley of 70 Penarow, Brighton, who was named last week as the first lay president in the Pittsford college's 48-year history. She succeeds Sister Helen Malone, president since 1960.

Dr. Foley, vice president of the college and director of continuing education, joined Nazareth's staff last Summer after 36 years with the Brighton schools. When she retired

in 1971 as Brighton's assistant superintendent and director of instruction, she had come to symbolize the school system in the minds of many thousands of parents and students. She is a past president of the New York State Teachers Association.

She graduated summa cum laude from Nazareth and said at the time of her retirement from Brighton that she "had long thought" she would go to the college when she retired.

As an undergraduate, she attended classes in an old building behind Aquinas Institute. She says she never thought then of heading the institution—"It never entered my mind. My only thoughts were for getting a job in those depression days."

Dr. Foley, who will take the reins July 1, has no specific plans in mind for the college.

"It (the presidency) came rather quickly," she says.

She adds, "I hope to keep a happy community of students, faculty, administrators, and supporting staff."

"I want to keep up with the changing times while keeping the atmosphere here what it has always been, that of a very good small college."

She says Sister Helen, first full-time president in the history of the college, "has promised to help me."

Dr. Foley was on the board of trustees of the college from its inception about 1949 until she stepped down to join the faculty. So, she says she has always been in close touch with the institution.

Under her direction, the number of undergraduates continuing education students increased to 350 and a new master's program she initiated has already enrolled about 300 students.

She has been helping Sister Helen on special assignments as well.

Dr. Foley received her master's degree at University of Rochester and pursued graduate studies at Fordham, the University of Wisconsin, and Columbia University. Nazareth conferred upon her the honorary degree of doctor of letters in 1960.

She has been active in many community and professional organizations and was the first woman ever named to a bank board—Rochester Savings Bank—in the Rochester area.

Sister Helen, who was known for many years as Sister Helen Daniel, has headed Nazareth since 1960. During her tenure, the college has almost doubled its student body, added three dormitories, and planned and built the Arts Center.

Board Chairman Peter Barry called her contributions "incalculable."

Said Sister Helen, "Most college presidents would agree that as time passes it becomes increasingly more difficult to maintain a consistently objective viewpoint. Fresh insights are constantly required to meet today's multiplicity of challenges and problems."

She said she has no plans for the future. She is a tenured professor of speech at the college.

EULOGY TO PHILIP J. PHILBIN

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in the House in paying respect to our former colleague, the Honorable Philip J. Philbin, who passed away at his farm in Boston, Mass. I had the privilege of serving in this Chamber with Congressman Philbin for 10 years. His passing marks the end of a career of

public service of a man who was respected by all who knew him as a dedicated public servant.

Congressman Philbin was well liked and rose to a position of great influence in the House, serving for a brief period as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. He leaves two daughters and four grandchildren and I join in expressing to them and other members of his family my deep personal sense of loss and sympathies.

WALTER LAWSON GRANT

HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, if I am not belaboring the obvious, each of us must regularly face the shock of the untimely passing of a friend, a loved one. None of us is a stranger to the experience.

Recently, Walter Lawson Grant, a valued friend and publisher of the Danville Register and the Bee, two of my hometown newspapers, was so taken.

It is a measure of the man that only in his death did many people become aware of his accomplishments in life. The newspaper accounts of Mr. Grant's life, which I respectfully request be inserted in the Record at this time, offer a description of a good life lived to the fullest.

Those who knew him share with his family and his associates a great loss.

The material follows:

[From the Danville Register, June 3, 1972]

WALTER GRANT DIES FROM HEART ATTACK

Walter Lawson Grant, publisher of the Danville Register and the Bee and executive vice president of the Register Publishing Company, died last night of a heart attack. He was 51.

STRICKEN AT HOME

After being at his desk all day, Mr. Grant suffered chest pains at his home early in the evening and was taken to Memorial Hospital, where the attack developed and he died a few minutes later, at 8:20 p.m.

Mr. Grant had returned Wednesday night from Germany, where he had inspected late developments in printing technology and equipment as preparation for the changeover of the local newspapers from hot to cold type processes.

One of his last community activities was completing arrangements for the gift to the Danville Museum of Fine Arts and History of his extensive collection of mounted specimens of big game animals he had killed in many parts of the world.

NATIVE OF RICHMOND

A native of Richmond he was born August 18, 1920, a son of the late Charles James Grant and Helen Lawson Grant. He attended The College of William and Mary and the University of Tennessee. Later, after World War II, he studied law for a year at the University of Virginia.

As a member of the Richmond National Guard, he was called to active service in September, 1940, and reported with his unit to Fort Story. He was transferred to the Air Transport Command and served with that organization the remainder of the war. He was separated from service in 1945.

WED MISS STUART JAMES

He wed Miss Elizabeth Stuart James of Danville on April 18, 1942. Survivors besides Mrs. Grant, are their two daughters, Mrs. Elizabeth Grant Peters of Richmond and Mrs. Helen Grant Prosser of Athens, Georgia, and their sons, Walter Lawson Grant, Jr., a student at the School of Law, University of Virginia, and Rorer James Grant of Danville; and a sister, Mrs. Elizabeth Grant Doane of Richmond.

Mr. Grant was one of the founders of Family Weekly magazine and served as its vice president and treasurer until the newspaper supplement was sold to its present owners.

SERVED ON PLANNING GROUP

He served on the Danville Planning Commission a number of terms and was, for some years, its chairman.

He was a member of a special Highway Study Commission during the term of Governor Thomas B. Stanley.

In Danville he was active in numerous organizations, including the Elks, the Danville Golf Club, the Young Men's Club, Kiwanis, and American Legion Post 325. He served on the board of the Danville Chapter Virginia Museum of Fine Arts and of the National Tobacco Textile Museum.

He was president of Tuscarora Country Club during its formative period and continued his interest in its growth and development.

One of his hobbies was skeet and he was a marksman of considerable skill.

The body is at Townes Funeral Home. Funeral arrangements were not completed, pending the arrival of his children.

PUBLISHER WALTER GRANT TO BE BURIED TOMORROW

The funeral of Walter Lawson Grant, 51-year-old publisher of The Bee and The Danville Register, will take place tomorrow at 4 p.m. at the graveside in Mountain View Cemetery. The Rev. M. Douglas Girardeau will officiate.

Mr. Grant had been in his office as usual yesterday, but suffered chest pains at his home in the early evening and was taken to Memorial Hospital, where he died shortly afterward at 8:20 p.m.

His community and civic interests were diverse, and he was also known for his widespread travels as a big-game hunter. He had recently completed arrangements to give his extensive collection of mounted game specimens from various parts of the world to the Virginia Museum's Danville chapter, which he served as a board member.

His most recent trip, from which he had returned Wednesday, was to Germany, where he inspected late developments in printing technology and equipment in connection with the changeover of the local newspapers from hot to cold type processes.

The local publisher was one of the founders of the nationally distributed Family Weekly magazine, and served as its vice-president and treasurer until the newspaper supplement was sold to its present owners.

He served the city as a member of the Danville Planning Commission a number of terms and was, for some years, its chairman. At the state level he was a member of a special Highway Study Commission during the term of Gov. Thomas B. Stanley.

His local interests also included membership on the board of the National Tobacco-Textile Museum, the presidency of Tuscarora Country Club during its formative period, and membership in the Elks, the Danville Golf Club, the Young Men's Club, Kiwanis Club and the American Legion Memorial Post 325.

Born in Richmond Aug. 18, 1920, he was a son of the late Charles James Grant and Helen Lawson Grant. He married the former Elizabeth Stuart James of Danville on April 18, 1942, and they resided at 104 Manchester Ave.

He attended the College of William and Mary and the University of Tennessee and, as a member of the Richmond National Guard, was called to active service in September, 1940, reporting with his unit to Fort Story. He later was transferred to the Air Transport Command and served with that organization for the remainder of World War II until his separation from service in 1945, after which he studied law for a year at the University of Virginia.

His wife survives, along with two daughters and two sons: Mrs. Elizabeth Grant Peters of Richmond, Mrs. Helen Grant Prosser of Athens, Ga., Walter Lawson Grant Jr., a student at the University of Virginia School of Law, and Rorer James Grant of Danville. He also leaves a sister, Mrs. Elizabeth Grant Doane of Richmond.

The body will be at Townes Funeral Home prior to the service.

[From the Danville (Va.) Bee, June 3, 1972]

WALTER L. GRANT

Danville, and, indeed, areas far beyond, have suffered a grave loss in the untimely death of Walter Lawson Grant, publisher of The Danville Register and The Bee, age 51. A heart condition of some months and which he preferred not to discuss brought the ultimate seizure.

He was a man of seemingly untold knowledge and ability. Not only was he a speed reader with photographic retention, he delighted in tackling problems which baffled others.

He spent more hours at his office than most of his employees, not only guiding the operation of the local newspapers, with the ever-present teamwork of veteran General Manager Andrew A. Farley, but other far-reaching interests, as well. Behind closed doors he could drive a hard bargain. When those near him were in trouble, he was the first to render assistance.

His widow, the former Miss Elizabeth Stuart James, and his four children, alone knew the inner-man: gentle yet strong and firm, one who would not tolerate abusiveness but shared every moment of enjoyment with those near him.

At the time of his death, he was deeply involved in directing modernizations in the newspapers' printing process. In fact, he and General Manager Farley returned from Germany only this week after inspecting equipment and processes related to the changes here.

He had the ability of instilling a desire for perfection into those with whom he worked, not only in the newspaper publication but in other undertakings such as the Danville Planning Commission, the Highway Study Commission, the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts and the National Tobacco-Textile Museum, to mention only a few of his endeavors.

His newspaper family shares with his real family a feeling of deep loss. And we resolve to bring into reality the improvements he launched with vigor and determination.

[From the Danville (Va.) Register, June 4, 1972]

GRANT SERVICES TODAY AT 4 P.M.

Graveside services for Walter Lawson Grant will be conducted today at 4 p.m. in Mountain View Cemetery by the Rev. Douglas M. Girardeau.

Mr. Grant, 51-year-old publisher of The Danville Register and The Bee, died in Memorial Hospital Friday night.

[From the Danville (Va.) Register, June 4, 1972]

WALTER LAWSON GRANT

He had put in a full day at his office. People from inside the plant and others had come in for conferences. He was in good spirits and a bit enthusiastic about the technological developments in printing he had examined dur-

ing a trip to Germany. His main interest over the past few months had been to move along toward a changeover from hot to cold type processes. Both the science and the mechanics involved intrigued him.

As always, he had some new stories to tell from his trip.

Three hours later came a telephone call. Walter L. Grant had died from a heart attack.

Shock went through the newspaper plant and through the city. Close associates and friends knew that Mr. Grant was on a strict regimen to cope with angina. But it was his nature and manner to minimize personal troubles and to contribute pleasantries others might enjoy. He did that Friday. In fact, he did it almost daily.

Walter Grant was an extraordinary person. He tried his best to hide that fact—but it was fact. His talents were many. He developed speed reading before it acquired that name. His taste in reading was catholic and his appetite for the printed word was voracious. He loved music and was something of a walking library of the words and lyrics of this century's songs, as well as the classics of past centuries. He had played the violin well as a youth but decided not to keep in practice, since other interests demanded more of his time.

He enjoyed working with his hands. During his service in World War II with the Air Transport Command, he had learned to dismantle and reassemble the powerful aircraft motors with such facility that he could do it in the dark. Precision machinery fascinated him. His mechanical skills included woodworking. He became an expert joiner and cabinetmaker. He designed and built intricate cabinets for grandfather clocks and, as needed, made parts for the time mechanism.

Few businessmen of his time did more hunting for large and rare animals than Walter Grant. His collection of specimens soon will become a part of the Danville Museum of Fine Arts and History, when the quarters are remodeled for the new uses of the Sutherland Mansion. Visitors to the Axton Lodge, the family estate in Pittsylvania County, have seen the superb display soon to be available to the public.

One of Walter Grant's happiest talents was his ability to tell stories, especially humorous stories. He could swap yarns by the hour with convivial people—and often did. This ability, plus a knowledge that approached expertise (without ever conceding as much) in several fields, made him an interesting member of any party.

All of which adds up to the fact that Walter Grant liked people—that is most people. Some he could not abide, and he did not always hide that attitude. But he had a wide circle of friends who applied to him the yardstick of individual worth and found him rich in merit.

There are those who worked with and for Walter Grant during the nearly three decades he was top executive of the newspaper publishing firm and who developed great admiration for him as an individual and as a responsible publisher. They particularly admired the sense of fairness he encouraged and insisted upon in the policies, practices and performances of the newspapers and all who contributed to their production and distribution.

Technological changes in printing and publishing have been disconcerting to some who watched as their crafts were being outmoded. Dismay was short-lived over such changes at this newspaper facility, because Walter Grant had made certain all interested would have a chance to learn exciting new processes and new skills. He provided the equipment and he provided the enthusiasm that has characterized the preparations for change to date.

An admired leader has been lost. Another staunch friend has departed in peace.

CUMBERSOME SECRECY CURBS

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, the Honorable WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, has made some important statements on a problem which has become more and more in the news within the past few months—the Government's practice on the top-secret classification of documents. One of my hometown newspapers, the Daily Press, carried a very interesting editorial on the problem in their June 6, 1972, issue which addressed itself to the efforts Congressman MOORHEAD has made to change the situation. I am pleased to include the editorial so that everyone may have an opportunity to benefit by reading it:

CUMBERSOME SECRECY CURBS

Answering the public outcry against unnecessary secrecy in government, President Nixon signed an executive order in March that was greeted thankfully in many quarters as at least the opening wedge for solving a long-standing problem. The order, which went into effect last week, reduces the number of bureaucrats who can wield the stamps that hold up papers from public perusal, and in theory, all 10-year-old top secret documents, all eight-year-old secret papers, and all six-year-old confidential material are now removed from classification.

However, grave doubts are now being expressed that the new system is much of an improvement, and Rep. William S. Moorhead (D-Pa.) charges that it is "unworkable, unmanageable, and filled with technical defects and massive loopholes." As chairman of the House Foreign Operations and Government Information subcommittee, Representative Moorhead has had reason to look into the problem, and he has now introduced a bill to supplant the Nixon system. The Moorhead plan would set up machinery for Congress to get data from the executive branch, and would create an independent Classification Review Commission with wide-range authority over security classification.

This might look like only one more skirmish in the battle between the White House and the legislature on the issue of which one is to hold sway over the other, but there is more to it than that. The executive branch's system, while probably not as bad as Representative Moorhead claims, is cumbersome enough to make it most difficult for anyone to find out what about classified matters that may no longer be of real security significance.

Thus, you must have a good idea of what you want to know before you can request the data, and then it is up to the person who classified it to decide whether to make the secret available. If he turns you down, an appeal to an Inter-Agency Classification Review Committee can be made, and a turn-down at that level would leave the recourse of an appeal to the federal courts. That precautions are needed to prevent violations of the nation's actual security needs is of course true, but the more one looks at the labyrinthine new process now in force, the more it looks to be in need of streamlining.

But there hasn't been time to put the new system to an actual test, and that must be the first order of business. Congress on its part will not find it easy to work out its own solution in what is left of the current session but it should be a live item on next year's agenda.

NUCLEAR FUSION

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 7 of this year, the House passed on appropriation authorization for the fiscal year 1973 operations of the Atomic Energy Commission. At that time I expressed concern that research and development on alternative methods of atomic generation to the liquid metal fast breeder reactor were being significantly underfunded.

One of the alternatives whose neglect concerns me most is nuclear fusion. The reasons for this concern are many and have to do with several very great advantages of fusion over conventional and fast breeder fission reactors:

First. Resources: The fusion reaction uses deuterium as a fuel, which is abundantly present in sea water. This fusion makes available a virtually limitless energy supply, far outdistancing even the fast breeder reactor.

Second. Safety: Because of the nature of the fusion reaction, it is inherently safer than fission. This may be surprising to many who associate fusion with the hydrogen bomb, but it is nevertheless true.

Third. Environmental: The principal pollutant from nuclear reactors is heat. This is due to the fact that most operate at only about 30 percent efficiency. The fusion reactor extends the possibility of being three times as efficient and thus of producing negligible amounts of waste heat. In addition, the very great problem of disposal of nuclear wastes is avoided as the fusion reaction produces minimal radioactive waste products.

Dr. Ray Gould, AEC's Director of Controlled Thermonuclear Research, has suggested a program of research at roughly double the present level of expenditure that could very possibly demonstrate feasibility by 1980.

Recently, I was reading an article in the Christian Science Monitor, entitled "Taming H-Power, Fuel for Billions of Years, If—." In the article, the author makes the following observation:

(O)bservers here also think Congress has sympathy for Dr. Gould's intermediate program suggestion. It may well vote \$600 million to \$700 million to try to get fusion going in the laboratory by 1980.

This compares with roughly \$450 million America has spent to date on fusion research. And that's perhaps half of the Russian outlay. To give some feel for the world effort, the Russians last year accounted for something like 16.6 percent, America for 15.6 percent,...

The author notes that the "when" of fusion depends as much on the extent of the monetary commitment as on any research breakthrough. A large share of the credit for this goes to the Soviet Union which continued to support fusion on a high level when America had nearly given up. To date the Russians have been very cooperative in sharing with us the benefits of their research. It is a truly international project.

In this era, when we are learning that all peoples are mutually dependent and when international cooperation is realistically possible, I would suggest that we have been less than farsighted in our support of this project at so low a level. Should we not in one fell swoop have shown the U.S.S.R. and the rest of the world that we were seriously interested in living and working together, while at the same time bringing ourselves much closer to the realization of what could be one of the greatest benefits we could pass on to the next generation?

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we Americans need to be especially farsighted in this area of power supply, as recent history has painfully demonstrated to us. I insert the article to which I referred earlier in the RECORD at this point in the hope it will stimulate critical thinking on this important issue.

TAMING H-POWER: FUEL FOR BILLIONS OF YEARS, IF—

(By Robert C. Cowen)

WASHINGTON.—Trying to tame hydrogen fusion to tap a virtually unlimited fuel supply has been like a fairy-tale quest for fabled treasure. Whenever discouragement threatened to overwhelm the searchers, their goal swam distantly into view. They realized just enough laboratory progress to keep their hopes alive.

Now that goal looms more closely, those hopes glow more brightly than ever in the two decades of their quest. A bit more money, a bit more effort, and most fusion workers expect they could have a tame hydrogen reaction running in their laboratories by this decade's end. They call this demonstrating scientific feasibility.

Given a lot more money and prodigiously more effort beyond that, they think they could have a prototype power plant running by the late 1980's or early 1990's. By the century's end, they just might have developed economically attractive power plants, too.

As has often been pointed out, the energy reward of fully mastering fusion power would be immense. Its primary fuel would be doubly heavy hydrogen, called deuterium. This is present in seawater to the extent of one in every 6,500 hydrogen atoms. While this may not sound like much of a concentration, the half gram of deuterium in a gallon of seawater has the fusion energy equivalent of 300 gallons of gasoline.

To put it another way, the fusion energy available from a cubic kilometer of seawater corresponds to the energy equivalent of 2,000 billion barrels of oil or roughly the world's oil reserve, to use a recent estimate. Moreover, experts figure there's enough easily extracted deuterium available to supply human-energy needs at something like 10 times present world consumption for several billions of years and a population level of seven billion people.

STATISTICS TO GRASP

Such statistics are hard to grasp. Lawrence M. Lidsky of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology notes in the journal Technology Review, "It is far simpler and just as accurate to say that fusion of deuterium represents an essentially inexhaustible supply of energy."

Furthermore, the deuterium fuel can be had rather cheaply. Its extraction should account for only a few thousandths of a percent of the price of electric power.

From a physicist's viewpoint, developing the technique of using that fuel is learning to get something (energy) from almost nothing (the near vacuum in which that fuel will "burn"). Physicists expect that the density of the "burning" gas in a fusion

reactor will be about 1/100,000th of an atmosphere, which is indeed practically a vacuum. Yet every cubic meter of that reacting gas can deliver 10 megawatts or more of power.

To get that power, physicists must hold the reacting gas together for perhaps a second and at temperatures of many tens of millions or even hundreds of millions of degrees. The research agonies they have endured for the past two decades have involved this problem of containment.

Since the hot gas is made up of electrically charged particles, magnetic forces can grasp hold of it. Thus researchers use magnetic fields to manage the gas. They quickly discovered that the gas has more ways than a greased pig of escaping the magnetic grip. These instabilities in its behavior allow it to escape to the walls of the reactor vessel where it quickly loses temperature, and any fusion reaction is quenched.

LUKEWARM SUPPORT ONLY

By the early 1960's, some of these instabilities seemed so intractable, from both a theoretical and experimental point of view, that many workers were openly discouraged. America and Britain gave only lukewarm support to the research. But, happily, the Soviet Union maintained both faith in and funding of its projects.

Happily also, this is a field of open and active international cooperation and information exchange. As American presidential science adviser Edward E. David Jr. recently pointed out, thanks to this and to the Russian research, everyone now takes a much brighter view of fusion's prospects.

Academician Lev Artsimovich showed experimentally how to handle some of the most troublesome instabilities. They also showed that certain theoretical considerations which implied that proper containment might be impossible do not, after all, constitute any barrier.

Researchers in several countries have confirmed and extended this Russian work. These and other experiments have brought fusion research to the point where there is a growing acceptance among experts that the eventual achievement of fusion power is a virtual certainty. They think they know how to lick the instabilities. They are finding that their theoretical understanding checks out more and more exactly with their experiments.

This success in harnessing fusion begins to look less like a question of "whether" and more like a question of "when." And "when" depends as much on money as on the skills and insights of the researchers.

MACHINES READY

To use the United States as an example, researchers now are readying machines to test further a variety of possible fusion-taming schemes. These will confirm whether their present understanding is on the right track. But to get a net-energy producing reaction running—that is, to demonstrate scientific feasibility—they need a generation of experimental devices beyond these. Whether or not they make that demonstration by 1980 depends on how soon and in what scope they can move to this next level of effort.

M. B. Gottlieb, who heads the Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory, told the congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy last fall that fusion workers could fiddle indecisively for decades if restricted to present funding levels. Just to meet what he called urgent needs in the present program of his own laboratory would take a 25 percent funding boost, he said, let alone increasing the program effort.

Roy W. Gould, head of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission's Division of Controlled Thermonuclear Research, has given Congress cost estimates for three alternative levels of effort.

Just to keep on as at present would take about \$300 million from 1973 to 1977. Roughly doubling this outlay would give a significantly more active program that might well demonstrate scientific feasibility by 1980. A "go for broke" crash program would involve spending \$900 million to \$1 billion between 1973 and 1977. It just might show scientific feasibility by the earlier date.

HOW MUCH APPROPRIATION?

Right now, no one knows what Congress will approve. The AEC thinks it will probably get \$38 million for fiscal 1973. That's about a 24 percent rise from the \$31 million of fiscal 1972, the kind of boost Dr. Gottlieb says would merely take some of the strain out of present efforts. However, observers here also think Congress has sympathy for Dr. Gould's intermediate program suggestion. It may well vote \$600 million to \$700 million to try to get fusion going in the laboratory by 1980.

This compares with roughly \$450 million America has spent to date on fusion research. And that's perhaps half of the Russian outlay. To give some feel for the world effort, the Russians last year accounted for something like 37.5 percent of that effort. Western Germany accounted for 16.6 percent, America for 15.6 percent, Britain for 7.0 percent, Japan for 6.1 percent, and a miscellany of other countries for the balance.

If Dr. Gould's intermediate program were, in fact, adopted, America's share of this effort would rise significantly, unless others also greatly strengthened their programs. Even then, everyone would benefit. As Dr. David noted, there's far more a spirit of world sharing in this field than of competition.

With laboratory fusion seemingly so close at hand, many environmentally concerned people urge authorities to concentrate on its development, playing down further development of nuclear-fission power plants, especially those based on breeder reactors. They realize that fusion would be easy on the environment. It involves less radioactivity. It offers relatively little danger of catastrophic accident. It should involve less heat pollution.

MISCONCEPTIONS NOTED

However, experts see several misconceptions in the fusion-only approach. First, there are many different kinds of fusion. This is a process in which nuclei of light elements fuse to form heavier nuclei, releasing energy in the process. With 30 kinds of such reactions to choose from, physicists concentrate on the simplest and easiest to control.

Right now this means the reaction in which deuterium fuses with triply heavy hydrogen, a radioactive isotope called tritium. This reaction never can provide the full fusion dream of limitless fuel supply. It also involves a fair amount of radioactive hazard, although significantly less than does the fission breeder reactor.

This reaction gives off most of its energy in neutrons. Their energy in turn will have to be converted to heat to run conventional boilers. The waste heat pollution from such a plant won't be significantly less than from fission stations.

The neutrons also generate radioactivity in the reactor structure. Some materials now being studied for possible reactors, such as niobium, could become embarrassingly "hot." Don Steiner of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory estimates old reactors with niobium could present a radioactive waste-disposal problem perhaps only a hundred times less severe in the long run than with breeder reactors. This could be greatly reduced if, as is likely, substitute reactor materials can be found.

POSSIBLE HAZARD

Then, too, the tritium in the reactor will have to be closely contained. It would be a

hazard if it leaked more than about one ten-millionth of a percent a day. And tritium can diffuse through solid metal walls. However, since it is one of the fuels, there will be powerful economic as well as safety reasons for containing it.

All told, Dr. Steiner expects substantially less radiological hazard from deuterium-tritium fusion than from fission plants, but that hazard will be far from negligible.

Then, too, tritium is a rare element that has to be made by irradiating lithium with neutrons in the fusion reactor. Unlike deuterium, lithium is limited. Easily extracted reserves may be equivalent to no more than today's fossil fuel reserves, Dr. Gould says.

Only when deuterium fuses with deuterium is the full fusion dream likely to be realized. Only then will the fuel be virtually unlimited. Only with this and a few other reactions will radioactive dangers be minimized and heat pollution reduced to the fullest extent. In such reactions, much of the energy goes off as electrically charged particles. It may be possible to tap this electrical energy directly, bypassing any heat cycle, and realizing efficiencies of 80 percent or 90 percent.

Today, such reactions largely wait in the wings while work focuses on the more tractable tritium-burning cycles. Thus decades of expense and effort could well bring commercial fusion power by A.D. 2000. Yet this would only be a stage in the attainment of the full fusion goal.

PRIORITIES TO SET

More importantly in setting energy-development priorities now, no expert foresees substantial installation of fusion power before A.D. 2000. This is the power source of the next century. And over this century's remaining three decades, mankind's energy needs will leap ahead.

Trying to hold those needs in check while waiting for fusion just won't work, as economist Barbara Ward and biologist Rene Dubos point out in their book "Only One Earth," the unofficial background report commissioned for the United Nations conference of the human environment.

"If the world population which is already on the way is to be better fed and housed, . . ." they write, "new sources of energy must be found and the only technology visible on a sufficient scale at this moment is atomic [fission] energy. Even if citizens in already developed societies decide to check the rise of their own energy demands . . . the sheer basic needs of all the world's people could not be met by rationing the energy of the already rich. . . ."

"To keep seven-to-ten-billion people alive and reasonably well served on this planet, atomic [fission] energy looks like being the most likely answer. The alternative—of too little energy—would cause infinitely larger rates of malformation and death."

This is why energy planners continue to emphasize fission plants, especially breeders, for this century even though environmentally soft fusion now seems the brightest gleam on their long-distance horizon.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE COMPULSORY MINIMUM WAGE

HON. SHERMAN P. LLOYD

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, many analysts look upon compulsory minimum wage legislation as counterproductive to the objective of increasing employment. For this and other reasons I op-

posed the recent minimum wage legislation passed by this House, as I explained to the House during debate on May 10. I call attention to the article written by Economist Milton Friedman and published in the current issue of *Newsweek*.

LEGISLATING UNEMPLOYMENT

(By Milton Friedman)

Congress is at it again. Once more it is in the process of legislating an increase in unemployment. Of course, the legislation is not labeled "A Bill to Create Unemployment." After all, Congress can teach big business a thing or two about deceptive labeling. No, the bill is labeled "A Bill to Increase the Minimum-Wage Rate."

The true minimum-wage rate is zero—the amount that an unemployed person receives from his nonexistent employer. This minimum-wage rate will not be affected by the new law. Rather, the law will increase the number of persons who receive a wage rate of zero. Here is a person with limited skill whose services are valued at \$1.60 an hour (the existing legal minimum) by a potential employer. The new law would make it illegal for the employer to hire that person. He could give him charity—pay him \$1.80 or \$2 for services that he values at only \$1.60—but he could not legally hire him for the market value of his services. It is a mystery why anyone would suppose that a person is better off unemployed at \$2 an hour than voluntarily employed at \$1.60.

IGNORANCE?

The economic expansion now under way promises to reduce the extremely high rates of unemployment of teenagers, blacks, and women—the groups with lowest skills. A higher legal minimum-wage rate will have precisely the opposite effect—as every prior rise in the legal minimum has had.

The House has recognized the adverse effect of a rise in the legal minimum-wage rate on teen-age unemployment by enacting a two-step minimum—the present \$1.60 an hour for youths under 18 and students under 21, and a higher rate for most other non-agricultural workers (\$1.80 this year, \$2 a year from now). The Senate has not yet acted, but its Labor committee has reported a bill that would simply raise the rate to \$2 this year and to \$2.20 next year.

The two-step rate is better than a one-step rate. At least, it would reduce the harm done by raising the minimum. But a no-step rate would be better than either.

When a minimum-wage rate was first enacted in 1938 and, to a lesser extent, even when it was last raised in 1966, it was not unreasonable for legislators to dismiss the possible effect on employment. While economists have always recognized that high minimum-wage rates create unemployment and so reduce the take-home pay of poor people—which is what buys food, clothing, and other necessities—empirical studies documenting this effect were scattered and appeared inconclusive.

The situation today is different. Scattered studies have been brought together, additional studies made and some earlier studies re-evaluated. The evidence is now overwhelming that the unemployment predicted by economic analysis is confirmed by economic experience.*

OR CONFLICTING INTERESTS?

As matters now stand, if Congress enacts a higher minimum-wage rate, it will do so knowing that one effect will be to raise un-

employment—as the action of the House documents.

Why would Congress do such a thing? Because the adverse effect on the poor is diffuse and its source misunderstood and hence produces little political pressure. Effective pressure is exerted by organized groups that welcome the effect of a high minimum-wage rate in strengthening unionized and skilled workers vis-a-vis nonunionized and unskilled workers and in protecting employers in high-wage areas (the North) from the competition of employers in low-wage areas (the South). These organized groups find ready allies in the liberal reformers whose lack of understanding of economics misdirects their sincere concern for the disadvantaged.

My first column in this space (*Newsweek*, Sept. 26, 1966) was on the then recently passed rise in minimum-wage rates. I wrote, "I am convinced that the minimum-wage law is the most anti-Negro law on our statute books—in its effect, not its intent. It is a tragic but undoubted legacy of the past—and one we must try to correct—that, on the average, Negroes have lower skills than whites. Similarly, teen-agers are less skilled than older workers. Both Negroes and teen-agers are only made worse off by discouraging employers from hiring them. On-the-job training—the main route whereby the unskilled have become skilled—is thus denied them."

This remains the unpalatable truth.

SAVING THE SMALL TOWNS

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Star in a recent editorial emphasizes the continuing problem of out-migration from our small towns and rural areas and points to the Rural Development Act of 1972 as an instrument to assist in reversing this trend.

Certainly I want to endorse and underscore the views expressed in the Star—one of my primary goals and objectives in the Congress has been the strengthening of small towns and rural America.

The Rural Development Act of 1972 will greatly strengthen the resources of the Department of Agriculture—especially by amplifying and expanding the authority and programs of the Farmers Home Administration and the Soil Conservation Service—and will thereby concentrate more Federal programs and assistance in small towns and rural areas of America.

It has been my purpose in introducing legislation and recommending appropriations to assist our smaller communities and farm areas throughout the Nation.

On my recommendation the Department of Housing and Urban Development established an office to provide information services for small town America.

In several Congresses I have introduced legislation to provide tax incentives to induce business and industry to expand or locate in rural areas to provide employment and induce young people in rural areas to make their homes and careers in their hometowns rather than making the pilgrimage to big cities in search of opportunity.

While chairman and as a member of the Subcommittee on HUD Appropriations, I have consistently urged a balanced program of assistance—with smaller cities and towns being allocated a fair share of grants, loans, and technical assistance.

The House Small Business Committee, which I am honored to serve as chairman, has a most important subcommittee chaired by my colleague, Representative JOHN KLUCZYNSKI of Illinois, that has held a number of important hearings on small business problems in rural areas.

In addition, I have joined with other colleagues in supporting tax-exempt industrial development bonds to assist our smaller communities in bringing in industry, for employment opportunities for our people in rural areas.

The Rural Development Act of 1972—which I was pleased to support—is a giant step forward in providing concentrated and specialized assistance to rural America and because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject, I insert the editorial from the Star in the RECORD:

SAVING THE SMALL TOWNS

About everyone realizes by now that the rescuing of the big cities is a matter of critical importance. Many of us tend to forget, however, that the saving of those shriveling small towns across the country is one of the requisites for urban salvation. For the great migration that has caused the cities' staggering problems hasn't ended. Every year, from thousands of small communities, come 600,000 poor people, more or less, to swell the overcrowded metropolitan centers. Many of those bring no skills; hence they only increase the unemployed rolls.

Without much fanfare, Congress has taken full account of this in a number of hearings, and seems about to take constructive action. Last week a Senate-House conference committee reached a good compromise on the Rural Development Act which Senators Talmadge of Georgia and Humphrey of Minnesota have been pushing for many months. The measure is designed to improve rural economies, mainly by stimulating industrial development through infusions of capital and betterment of small-town living conditions. It would authorize about \$500 million annually in grant funds, and greatly expand the loan authority for federal rural-development activities.

Many a little town, with people in need of work, has failed to qualify for a new industry because it had an inferior waterworks or sewer system, or none at all. This bill would provide much more federal assistance for these and other standard community facilities—and also for industrial parks, employment centers and planning services. For the first time, the Farmers Home Administration would be able to make small business and industrial loans, and there are devices to encourage private investment in rural areas.

All this is a product of much battling over several months to consolidate several divergent bills. Dropped along the way were President Nixon's proposal for rural revenue sharing, and Senator Talmadge's plan for creation of a National Rural Development Bank. There's no damaging loss in either case; certainly the bank would have been superfluous.

As it stands, the bill is a moderate but imaginative experiment. It might be a start toward stemming the flight to the cities, and in any event the quality and rewards of life in rural America need to be improved.

*For an excellent, though not fully up-to-date, summary of these studies, see John M. Peterson and Charles T. Stewart Jr., "Employment Effects of Minimum-Wage Rates" (American Enterprise Institute, 1969).

EIGHTH ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, during the 8 years I have been in Congress, I have sent a legislative questionnaire to each household in the Ninth Congressional District of New Jersey, seeking my constituent's views on important issues of the day. My 1972 questionnaire was sent out in February and March to the households of the Ninth District and a supplementary edition was mailed in May to the towns in Hudson and Bergen counties, which had been added to my district as a result of court-ordered reapportionment.

A total of 180,000 questionnaires were distributed and 31,812 completed questionnaires were returned as a result of these two mailings. The returns reflect, I believe, a widespread interest on the part of my constituents in national affairs and congressional activities. Additionally, thousands of citizens commented separately and extensively on the issues raised by the questionnaire as well as other pressing matters of national concern. I have found these additional comments, as well as the questionnaire results, to be an accurate index of opinion in my constituency. In a democracy, communication between a Representative and his constituents should be a two-way street. The completion of the questionnaires and the separate comments which many citizens took the time to write, will greatly aid me in formulating positions on the issues we must face in the remainder of the 92d Congress. For this reason, I wish to thank again those who cooperated in filling out and returning my 1972 questionnaire. And, I would also like to express my appreciation to those volunteers and members of my staff who spent countless hours at the task of tabulating all of the questionnaire results.

Now that the questionnaire returns have been fully compiled, I am sending the totals to each household in my district, so that each constituent may compare his or her views with the consensus in the Ninth District. And, at the conclusion of my remarks, I shall list the percentage totals of the questionnaire results, but at this point I would like to comment on some of the questions posed any my reactions to my constituents' responses.

For several years now, I have asked questions relating to ending the war in Vietnam. Each year the number of citizens responding favorably to proposals to terminate that conflict has grown rapidly. In 1972, however, the total has risen sharply, from 51 percent last year to nearly 68 percent this year. In other words, fully two-thirds of those returning questionnaires favor the proposal for an immediate halt to the devastating bombing of Indochina, and a prompt return of all Americans in Indochina contingent only on an agreement by the North

Vietnamese to release all prisoners of war at the time of disengagement. I have personally supported this proposal and believe that if the administration were to adopt it as a bargaining position, this tragic and futile war could be quickly ended. The time has long since passed when anything could be gained from the loss of one more American or Indochinese life in that conflict.

The questionnaire's item on amnesty for draft resisters evoked a very strong response from constituents of the Ninth District. Many citizens out of concern for the hundreds of thousands of men who reluctantly agreed to the draft and for the thousands who lost their lives in Indochina indicated they favored no amnesty whatsoever. Some others favored an unconditional amnesty, arguing that the immorality of the Indochina war and the inflexibility of conscientious objector rules left many thousands of young men of conscience no alternative but to leave the country. Still others felt that amnesty should be considered, but not until after our troops are home and our POW's released.

On another question, a substantial majority of my constituents felt that the administration's wage-price control policy was being inequitably administered. From the many inquiries and complaints which I have received from New Jersey citizens in the last year regarding unfair rent and wage control rules, this result came as no surprise. Additionally, the housewife who does the family shopping with a frozen paycheck knows that prices are not being effectively controlled. Meanwhile, corporate profits skyrocket and billions of dollars in tax breaks are handed to the Nation's largest businesses. Perhaps if the administration were instead to adopt a vigorous antitrust policy against conglomerates and monopolies which dominate the American economy, the resulting price competition would go a long way toward curbing inflation.

Opinion appears to be about evenly divided on the question of whether women are discriminated against, particularly in employment. A random sampling of questionnaires, however, showed that women respondents felt that this was the case in far greater numbers than men respondents. Evidently the women's rights movement has a considerable amount of educating to do among the male half of the population. Passage of the equal rights amendment to the Constitution, now awaiting ratification by State legislatures, should give impetus to the cause of women's rights.

The item evoking the highest number of positive responses was the question regarding establishment of a national primary to select presidential candidates. Although I share my constituents' concern with the confusion of the current convention system, I seriously question whether a national primary would be preferable. Such a primary would require extensive and expensive reliance on the media, especially radio and television. This would obviously favor the richest candidates. And, given journalists' tendency to focus on the "front-runner" to the exclusion of less well-known can-

didates, the "underdog" would have an almost insurmountable task in gaining recognition of his or her views in a national campaign. At least under the present system, less well-known and less-financed candidates are able to go in person to the people of individual States and have a fighting chance of coming from behind. Improvements can be made in the convention system, to be sure, but I do not believe that democracy will be well served by making great wealth or approval of the media necessary prerequisites to nomination.

On question 9, fully 71 percent of my constituents were opposed to the value-added tax, a form of national sales tax. I share their strong opposition to such a tax. Not only would this be inflationary, adding on to the price of all items, but also it would be a regressive tax, hitting hardest those of low and middle income. Our Federal tax policy should be precisely the opposite, requiring those of higher incomes to pay their fair share and ending such unjustifiable loopholes as the oil depletion allowance which permits huge oil companies to escape virtually all taxation. The increased Federal revenues thus generated could then be applied to reducing property and income taxes of the overburdened low- and middle-income wage earners and to the alleviation of pollution, the educational crisis and other pressing national problems.

By a 2-to-1 margin, my constituents favored a proposal for a comprehensive program of national health insurance. This represents a slight increase over the number favoring such a system in 1971. Evidently, the continuing, unchecked inflation of costs for medical care and hospitalization has caused more and more citizens to recognize national health insurance as the only viable alternative to the current health care crisis. Although no positive action has been taken on my own and other proposals in this area to date, I am hopeful that the next Congress will face up to this urgent problem.

On the subject of eliminating water pollution, over two-thirds of the questionnaire respondents favored a crash program to clean up our Nation's waterways. Despite the great cost associated with such a project, the overwhelming approval expressed by the citizens of the Ninth District indicates the extent and depth of concern with environmental quality among the American people. Fortunately, this concern has been reflected in the Congress and the Water Quality Act of 1972, with my support, has passed both Houses of Congress.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, by a slim margin, a plurality of my constituents remain opposed to further development schemes for the Hackensack Meadowlands. I share their reservations about this project, especially with regard to its impact on the environment of our area. All of the ecological concerns of our age, clean water, air quality, preservation of a natural marsh and flood plain, prevention of excessive traffic, population congestion, and many other issues, are associated with this project. The State of New Jersey and the Federal agencies

involved have thus far failed to address themselves adequately to the environmental impact of the Meadowlands de-

velopment. There still are questions which need to be answered satisfactorily before this project proceeds any further.

Mr. Speaker, the following is the completed questionnaire tabulation by percentages:

1972 LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE, CONGRESSMAN HENRY HELSTOSKI, 9TH DISTRICT, NEW JERSEY

[31,812 replies—results in percent]

	Yes	No	Undecided		Yes	No	Undecided
1. From the information now available to the general public, do you feel that President Nixon's recent conferences in China were in the best interests of the United States?	56.7	28.2	15.1	10. Because of present economic conditions, it has been proposed that the United States significantly modify its trade policy dating back to the 1930's by relying on automatic quotas rather than tariffs to restrain foreign imports. Do you favor such a proposal?	22.0	71.0	7.0
2. Legislation is pending in Congress to (1) Halt all American bombing in Indochina immediately, and (2) require withdrawal of all U.S. troops by June 30 contingent on an agreement by the North Vietnamese to release all prisoners of war at that time. Would you favor this bill?	67.8	25.2	7.0	11. Pending in Congress is legislation to provide long-term Federal financing for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Do you favor the development of such a public television network?	31.6	56.4	12.0
3. A bill has been introduced in Congress to grant amnesty to draft resisters, provided they agreed to perform 2 years of public service work in hospitals, VISTA, etc. Would you favor this bill?	36.6	49.4	14.0	12. Bills to establish a national health care insurance program are presently being considered in Congress, with costs to be met from social security and general tax revenues. Do you favor such legislation?	57.4	31.4	11.2
4. Has the President's wage/price freeze been fairly administered with respect to all sectors of the economy, i.e., wage earners, businesses, tenants, banks, etc.?	28.0	62.3	9.7	13. Slow progress is being made in cleaning up the Nation's waterways, in large part because of a lack of funds for research and development. Do you believe that we should adopt a crash program, estimated at costing between \$15,000,000,000 and \$20,000,000,000 over 5 years, to correct longstanding pollution and contamination?	61.1	30.7	8.2
5. Do you feel that our present laws and practices discriminate unfairly against women, particularly in employment?	41.8	48.5	9.7	14. As a means of providing mothers with an opportunity to be self-supporting, do you favor the proposal that the Federal Government fund day-care and child development programs for preschool and school-age children?	68.0	24.6	7.4
6. Do you think a Federal law should be enacted to provide financial compensation for innocent victims of violent crime?	54.8	37.0	8.2	15. Do you favor continuation of the draft after its proposed expiration date of June 1973?	51.8	33.1	15.1
7. Would you favor creation of a national commission, composed of business and labor leaders, as well as Members of Congress, to develop a system to avoid prolonged strikes?	58.2	34.0	7.8	16. A "Disney land"-type development, along with sports stadia and a racetrack, has been proposed for the Hackensack Meadowlands? Do you favor such a development?	55.0	35.5	9.5
8. Should Congress establish a system of selecting presidential candidates through a national primary rather than through the present convention method?	68.3	23.6	8.1		42.2	45.7	12.1
9. To finance a form of revenue sharing aimed at reducing property taxes, the administration may propose a value added tax, which is, in effect, a form of national sales tax levied at the manufacturing level with the costs passed on to the consumer.							

TENNESSEE'S JUNE MOON FISHING RODEO OPEN TO FISHERMEN AND VISITORS AT DE KALB COUNTY, TENN., HOMECOMING

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, storied De Kalb County, Tenn.—my home county—is planning a gigantic homecoming celebration June 30–July 4 in Smithville, Tenn.—in the heart of the fabled Upper Cumberland tourist wonderland, land of lakes and mountains.

The homecoming will feature such outstanding events as the Country Fiddlers' Jamboree and contests for the Upper Cumberland Championship on the Public Square at Smithville on Saturday, July 1.

The jamboree will feature groups contesting for the championship in the mandolin, dulcimer, square dancing, buck and wing dancing, guitar, harmonica, gospel singing, banjo and fiddle, among others.

Another top event will be the June Moon Fishing Rodeo on beautiful Center Hill Lake, which nestles in the hills and valleys of middle Tennessee like a glacial lake in the Swiss Alps.

Center Hill Lake—often referred to as the bass capital of the world—will draw fishermen from throughout Tennessee and other States, vying for the rich treasure of prizes.

Many events are scheduled for this homecoming celebration—and I extend to one and all on behalf of the committee an invitation to join us for a real, old-fashioned, country-cooking, mountain-fiddlin', fish-catching celebration and Tennessee homecoming.

SALUTE TO EDUCATION

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1972

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I would like to join with many of my colleagues in the "Salute to Education" declared by the National Education Association to be celebrated on June 21, 1972.

Mirabeau Buonaparte Lamar, the second president of the Republic of Texas, in his first message to the Congress in Houston in 1838 said:

It is admitted by all, that cultivated mind is the guardian genius of Democracy, and while guided and controlled by virtue, the noblest attribute of man. It is the only dictator that free men acknowledge, and the only security which free men desire.

Mr. Speaker, we are to some considerable extent an undisciplined people. Large segments of our population tend to demand more and more government services. At the same time there is broad based support for lower taxes.

We are also a free people, Mr. Speaker, and for better or for worse, public attitudes do shape the ultimate course of events in our system. So it is not surprising that in the last 10 years or so Federal spending rates have dramatically increased, while the net action on Federal taxes has been to reduce available revenues in fiscal 1973 by about \$50 billion, assuming the economy would have behaved as it has under the tax laws which have obtained.

But we cannot continue to spend what we do not have without deficits and increases in the Federal debt. And that we have done. The Federal Government is

going into debt in the 1970's at about three times the rate it was in the 1960's. Nearly one-fourth of our massive \$450 billion national debt has been accumulated just since the beginning of this decade.

Mr. Speaker, no democracy, no nation, can continue by its policies to fly in the face of financial realities without flirting with fiscal collapse. In the words of Mirabeau Lamar, the virtue that we now desperately need to guide and control this Nation is restraint and discipline. It is in this context that I wish to discuss the role of education in America.

It is undeniable that the American education system is peerless. What I would like to note, Mr. Speaker, is a dramatic and fundamental change in the American education system that reflects the need for restraint and discipline that concerns me.

First, let me recite a few facts that escape most people's attention. From 1963 to 1973 the President's budget indicates that Federal assistance to education as a whole increased from \$3.6 billion to \$15.7 billion. That represents an increase from 3.2 percent of all spending of the Federal Government to 6.4 percent a doubling of the Federal priority for education.

That trend seems likely to continue. The Higher Education Amendments of 1972 that have recently cleared the Congress authorize appropriations for 1973 twice the President's budget request and three times the actual funding level of those programs for this year.

The so-called "revenue-sharing" bill—it mandates spending, but raises not a penny in revenues—that has recently passed the House, authorizes Federal Government grants to the States that may be spent for education.

The 1973 Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bill that re-

cently passed the House would appropriate \$665 million over what the budget proposed for the education programs carried in that bill.

I know many who feel deeply the needs that can easily be demonstrated for more spending on education would brush off these facts by saying "So what. The needs are there." The factual reply to that is, "Yes, but the money is not there." The fact is that while that Labor-HEW bill would increase funding for education programs by 14 percent, the general fund of the Treasury, from which the checks will be disbursed, will probably see revenues increase by only 3.7 percent during the same time period.

What all these facts demonstrate, Mr. Speaker, is that we have seen a dramatic shift in Federal priorities toward education. The Congress even now is planning to increase spending for education at about four times the rate it expects revenues to increase in the general fund of the Treasury.

My concern is that the American people are turning to the Federal Government to fund what was once guarded jealously as a State and local responsibility, not for philosophical reasons, but for expedient financial ones. To many the rewards and benefits of Federal spending seem immediate, and the costs seem so remote. That, I believe, is the root cause of this tremendous shift in Federal responsibilities.

H. G. Wells once said, "Human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe." Fiscally our great Nation seems to be rushing toward catastrophe. And I believe that at a time when we are celebrating the role of education in our society it is appropriate to address ourselves to the fiscal education of the American people, and to call upon them to exercise the virtues of restraint and discipline.

The hope and faith of our system of government is that the moral fiber of the people is such that a majority will respond to a forthright presentation of the facts. It is in that spirit I have made these remarks.

LAURENCE K. WALRATH

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, 1972, Laurence K. Walrath will retire as a Commissioner of the Interstate Commerce Commission after 16 years of dedicated service.

Appointed by President Eisenhower, Commissioner Walrath, a Democrat, was reappointed by Presidents Eisenhower, Johnson, and Nixon. During his career with the Interstate Commerce Commission, he was Chairman of Division 1 in 1961, Vice Chairman of the Commission in 1962, Chairman in 1963, and Chairman of Division 2—Rates and Practices—from 1967 until his retirement.

On numerous occasions, I have had the opportunity to call upon Commissioner

Walrath with regard to problems facing the State of Alaska. On each occasion, he has been extremely helpful and knowledgeable in his efforts to see that an equitable solution was found to our problems.

Mr. Walrath has been active and genuinely concerned about the problems facing the ICC, and we are certainly going to miss him when he retires. I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to this outstanding man.

DORIS HUNT'S "MOVING" SPEECH

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, last month Doris Hunt, wife of our respected colleague from New Jersey (JOHN E. HUNT), became the first woman in modern recollection to deliver the main speech in Pitman, N.J. Memorial Day celebration. The Pitman Review called the speech "moving." Doris' excellent remarks reveal her strong and sensible beliefs in God and country.

Both JOHN HUNT and I are fortunate enough to have married native Iowans. Doris and her sister Mrs. Emmet Wilson, who now lives in Des Moines, Iowa, were both reared in Audubon, Iowa. Their father, Earl Foster, works for the magazine Wallace's Farmer.

At this point I insert the text of the address.

[From the Pitman, N.J., Review, June 7, 1972]

"OUR CHOICE" IS DORIS HUNT'S TOPIC AT PITMAN'S MEMORIAL DAY SERVICE
(By Doris Hunt)

NOTE.—Mrs. Doris Hunt, the wife of Congressman John E. Hunt (R-1st District), spoke on Memorial Day, May 29, at Pitman's services honoring those to whom Memorial Day is dedicated. Mrs. Hunt, the first woman in modern recollections to speak at Pitman's Memorial Day service, kindly consented to allow the Review to publish her fine speech. Our thanks to Mrs. Hunt for her consideration and for her moving Memorial day message.

Memorial Day is a patriotic holiday in the United States. It is a day to honor American servicemen who gave their lives for their country.

Memorial Day originated during the Civil War, when some southern women chose May 30 to decorate soldiers' graves.

The women honored the dead of both the union and the confederate armies. It is believed that a Virginia woman was largely responsible.

It doesn't seem strange that a woman originated Memorial Day, does it? No, the women do not do the fighting, but they bear the sons who do the fighting, and sit and wait while their husbands, brothers, sons and fathers go to war.

Yes, the mothers hold their baby sons in their arms, with bright hopes for their futures, and then when they become young men, send them off to war. Some return and others give their lives for their country.

What Comfort can a mother and father find, after having lost a son in the service of his country? In John 15:13 Jesus says "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

Yes, this is a comfort and there is some measure of comfort in knowing their sons died, so that we might continue to live in a free nation.

They gave us a "Choice" in the type of Government we want. They gave us a "Choice" in the type of leaders we have. They gave us freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of religion, just to name a few freedoms.

In giving us this freedom they gave us a tremendous responsibility. In both public and private life, healthy and lasting freedom is only possible, if a person respects the freedom of others, and restrains some of his own wishes. Yes, these young men died so that we might keep our freedom.

This must surely be a comfort to their loved ones, but their greatest comfort would be—if we handle this freedom wisely—if we handle this freedom wisely. Remember—Freedom is fragile, handle it with prayer.

What can we the residents of Pitman do today to build a memorial to those who gave their lives for us? A memorial may take the form of a statue, a park, a monument or even a bridge.

We have our lovely Mall here in Ballard Park, dedicated to our service men who lost their lives in defending our beloved United States of America. But what can we here today do as a town to let the world know that we are thankful?

Let us fly our American flag, every single day.

About six weeks ago each church in Pitman got together and in a united effort, distributed New Testaments "Good News for Modern Man" to every home in Pitman.

What a proud day that was for our town. Now, why couldn't our American Legion, our VFW, other service clubs and interested citizens distribute American flags to every home in Pitman. If every home owned a flag, there would be no excuse for not flying it, but the decision would be yours.

This would be a way for our town to honor their war dead, "to let our POW's know that we have not forgotten them and to say thank you, to our servicemen currently serving in all the armed services."

How can we maintain our freedom and fight the evils in our country. I believe only one way, and that is to turn to God. II Chronicles 7:14 "If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray and seek my face and turn from their wicked way; then will I hear from heaven and will forgive their sin and will heal their land."

Our boys fought and died that we might also have a choice in religion. But God gave us the greatest choice.

Shall we turn to him, or shall we turn our back on him? This is our choice. Shall we accept his son Jesus Christ as our Saviour or reject him? This is our choice.

Shall we enjoy God's promises or live our way? This is our choice. Shall we turn to God in prayer, or do it our way? This is our choice.

Do we want the assurance of everlasting life, or don't we care? This is our choice.

Wouldn't it have been easier if God had not included a "choice" in His plan for us? But He did, and we are the only ones who can make this individual choice.

Our Government has tried so many things, signed treaties, passed Bills, tried many programs and spent millions of dollars in search of peace. And have failed. Don't you think it is time we turned to God?

Let's start right here in Pitman! Let's build a memorial to those who gave their lives, by changing our lives. Let's fill our lives with God's love, and in turn, love our neighbors.

I firmly believe that "With God's love within us, His arms underneath us, and His strength behind us, there is nothing we cannot do, if He wants us to do it!"

So you see, it's not by chance, but by choice, as to the type of memorial we will build in

honor of those men who gave their lives for us.

It's not by chance, but by choice, and a privileged choice, that we serve both our God and our Country, at the same time.

NEWS BULLETIN OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting the June 26, 1972, edition of the news bulletin of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. I take this action to help keep my colleagues informed of the actions and preparations being made across the country preparing for the anniversary of our Nation's 200th birthday in 1976. The bulletin is compiled and written by the staff of the ARBC Communications Committee. The bulletin follows:

BICENTENNIAL BULLETIN, JUNE 26, 1972

On the Fourth of July ARBC members will take the Bicentennial mandate from the President and Congress to the American people via thirteen representative cities in all corners of the nation. Fifteen Commissioners will carry the Bicentennial message to several diverse geographical and nationality points of the Nation.

ARBC Director Jack I. LeVant has sent a Bicentennial Memo to the attendees at the "Youth in Action" National Association of Student Councils Conference in Chicago. Director LeVant told the student council reps from throughout the nation: "You as the Nation's young leaders may serve as catalyst to all young people, the citizens of Century Three, in encouraging them to use the Bicentennial Era to become involved in their communities, to learn more about the roots and the future of our Nation, to discover what it really means to have the franchise of the 26th Amendment." Participating in the Conference are Commissioners Thomas Hill, Roy Brooks, and Kenneth Beale.

Wisconsin Governor Patrick J. Lucey has appointed a 37-member Wisconsin ARBC headed by Mrs. Jean Hellesen, associate professor of history at the University of Wisconsin. The Commission was authorized by the state legislature and will take over Bicentennial planning from the State Historical Society.

On June 12 West Virginia Governor Arch A. Moore, Jr. informed the ARBC that he has appointed Lysander L. Dudley, Sr., Commissioner of Commerce, as West Virginia's ARBC Chairman.

Chairman David J. Mahoney is scheduled to appear before the Democratic Party's 1972 Platform Committee at 1:30 p.m., Friday, June 23, in Washington, D.C. He will testify before the Quality of Life Panel. Next month he will also appear before the Republican Platform Committee on the Bicentennial.

Phi Beta Kappa Honorary Society has announced the winners of seven \$20,000 Phi Beta Kappa Bicentennial Fellowships for the preparation of books on the general theme "Man Thinking in America." The ward winners, five of whom are under 40, were selected from more than 450 applicants. They were made for studies that deal with the cultural crises of our time and point to new directions for the future. The books are sched-

uled for publications before or during 1976, when Phi Beta Kappa will observe the 200th anniversary of its founding at the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, Virginia, on December 5, 1776.

A 21-day salute, honoring the American Flag and the 196th Birthday of the United States has been announced by J. Willard Marriott, Chairman of the Honor America Committee, a program of the American Historic and Cultural Society, Inc. The nationwide Honor America program began with observances on Flag Day, June 14, and will conclude on Independence Day, July 4, 1972. The primary aim to the Honor America Committee is to have cities and towns across the country, and Americans everywhere, sponsor local observances. The hoped for result will be the reestablishment of July 4th celebrations as they were known in early America. Honor America Day began spontaneously in 1970 as a result of a conversation between Dr. Billy Graham and ARBC Vice-Chairman Hobart Lewis.

The Chairman of the South Dakota Bicentennial Commission, Les Helgland, has accepted an offer of State 4-H Club members to plan a statewide beautification program as part of the Bicentennial observance. Mr. Helgland said the Commission has received resolutions from the State 4-H Council offering to assist in coordinating a cleanup program. He said that the U.S. Brewers Association has provided funds needed to start the community programs in the State.

The ARBC Communications Office has announced that as of June 14, they have tallied a total of 439 news clippings on the Bicentennial Parks concept. This includes 159 pre-editorials, 10 con-editorials and 270 news stories.

The first Charles River Festival Day was held recently in at least a dozen communities along the river from Cambridge to Millis, Massachusetts. The event challenged citizens to support efforts to make the polluted river swimmable by the Bicentennial in 1976. Other events included motorboat parades, canoeing and rafting, hiking and picnicking, a dance version of "Jesus Christ, Superstar," a performance for the elderly of the "Proposition," and a jazz concert. Governor Sargent issued a proclamation encouraging "everyone to explore the river's ecological and recreational potential."

The Rapid City Journal published an editorial after the recent disaster in South Dakota noting that the city came close to losing a battle for its life. However, residents, strangers and the South Dakota National Guardsmen rallied to aid their fellowmen. Although the tragedy was a grim one, the editor stated, "As we mourn and as we are comforted, we must also look ahead. We must resume and rebuild." At the conclusion of the editorial the following was printed:

Bicentennial and Centennial purpose—The nation's 200th birthday; Rapid City's 100th birthday.

With the help of all the people in the community, to set and achieve goals for Rapid City by 1976 which will improve the quality of life and environment.

The Historic Sites Section of the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection has submitted a report on state-owned historic sites entitled, "Bicentennial '76: A Plan for a Meaningful Program." It identifies the needs and outlines a program for the development of 17 "Bicentennial-related" sites as well as 14 other New Jersey sites. Each site is discussed in terms of its historical significance, needs, estimated development plans and costs, due date for completion of work, and eligibility for federal funds. The plan is now being studied by the Department, the Sites Council and other New Jersey agencies. It is expected to be released to the public shortly.

IN RECOGNITION OF MAURICE M. STEIN

HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, Maurice M. Stein, of Lewiston, Maine, a well-known and respected leader of the egg industry in the United States, met an untimely death on May 3 of this year.

Although Mr. Stein had no formal education beyond the secondary level, he was an extraordinarily intelligent and hard-working individual who rose naturally to a position of national leadership in the poultry and egg industry. His leadership in organizing egg producers to improve their bargaining position in the marketplace was his major contribution not only to his own organization, but also to other commodity groups which followed this pattern.

Mr. Stein's dedication to his family, friends, and community paralleled his dedication to his work. He participated actively in religious organizations, civic groups, and other community activities. Maurice will certainly be missed by all who had the pleasure of knowing and associating with him.

Maurice Stein was born in Boston, Mass., on July 22, 1919, the son of Joseph and Sadie Wyzansky Stein. He attended schools in Malden, Mass., and the Revere, Mass., high school. He was the first Malden man to be drafted in the World War II callup, and was a veteran of invasions of North Africa, Sicily, Anzio, and southern France. He was a veteran of eight major campaigns, with 34 months of overseas duty.

In 1945, in partnership with his brother, Israel, and brother-in-law, William J. Mendelson, he organized Hillcrest Poultry Industries, which was to become a leading quality broiler producing-processing company.

Sensing greater opportunities and challenges in the egg industry, he and his brother Israel organized Maine Egg Farms in 1960. This company's growth was likewise rapid, further attesting to Maurice Stein's unusual management skills. In 1969 Maine Egg Farms was merged into companies forming Cal-Maine Foods of Jackson, Miss., and thus becoming the world's largest independent egg producing and marketing company. He became a vice president and director of this company, as further testimony of his exceptional managerial abilities.

The following survivors of Maurice M. Stein can take justifiable pride in having shared in his many trials and triumphs: his widow, Mrs. Ida (Mendelson) Stein, Lewiston, Maine; daughter Marsha and son Jacob "Jack," Lewiston, Maine; father Joseph Stein, North Hollywood, Calif.; brothers Israel, Lewiston; George, Los Angeles, Calif.; and Robert Hookset, N.H.; and sister, Mrs. Elizabeth Berman, Encino, Calif.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two articles on Maurice Stein be included in the Record at this point.

The first is a eulogy by Mr. John Yarbrough of the Poultry Times, Gainesville, Ga.; the second is a special message to the members of the Northeast Egg Marketing Association of Durham, N.H.

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

[From the Poultry Times, Gainesville, Ga.]
DEATH CLAIMS CHAMPION OF EGG INDUSTRY STRENGTH

The untimely death last week of Maurice M. Stein brought to a close the career of a man whose brilliance lit up many egg industry meetings in recent years.

Mr. Stein moved far beyond his high school educational base. He had the mind of an economics professor, the intellectual persuasiveness of a politician, the fervor of a revivalist, and the heart and stamina of a distance runner.

We often found ourselves on opposite sides of a political or economic issue from that of Mr. Stein, but our differences never diminished our respect for this man's candor, evangelical belief in his "causes" and his complete dedication to the egg industry.

Mr. Stein was one of the founders of United Egg Producers. He was that organization's first president and gave unstintingly of his time, energy and resources to the organization's development. Northeast Egg Marketing Association also carried the stamp of his aid and approval.

This man believed the egg industry could solve its problems and he never quit working for solutions. He was innovative, articulate, sometimes dogmatic, often persuasive and always willing to extend himself for the betterment of his industry, his business, and his country.

Maurice Stein was the kind of a man you would like to have on your side when the battle flags were flying and men's minds were in conflict. He will be greatly missed by the egg industry of this country.

[From the Northeast Egg Marketing Association]

OUR RESPECTS TO MAURICE STEIN

The untimely death of Maurice Stein on May 3rd has shocked and saddened many people throughout the egg industry; his close friends and associates as well as casual acquaintances and those who only knew him as an inspiring leader, dedicated to improving the producer's position in the market place.

Maurice was stricken by a heart attack at his office and he died a short time later in a Lewiston, Maine, hospital. He was 52 years old and is survived by his wife Ida, daughter Marsha and son Jacob.

Maurice was recognized and respected throughout the country for his leadership and dedication to improving the egg industry. He had a brilliant mind that resulted in a steady flow of new constructive ideas. He liked nothing better and he asked no more than to see his ideas develop into action that paid off for the entire industry.

He realized the need for producers to work together cooperatively if they were to have a voice in what they received for their product. His leadership resulted in the banding together of New England producers to form the New England Egg Marketing Association. From this it grew into the present organization covering the entire northeast. He has served as president, director and member of the Executive Committee since the organization was started in 1967.

He saw the potential of a national organization involving a single commodity. He took the bold step of asking egg producers from across the country, to meet at the Kennedy Airport to explore the possibilities of such an organization in September of 1968. United Egg Producers was the result of this meeting and egg producers are now recognized as

being the best organized commodity group and has set the pattern for other commodities to follow. He became the first President of U.E.P. and has served on its Board of Directors and Executive Committee since then.

There will be many times in the months ahead when his leadership and counsel will be greatly missed. We can be thankful as an industry for the contributions that he made. As individuals and as an industry we owe Ida Stein, Marsha and Jacob our deepest gratitude for having shared Maurice with us.

His unusual grasp of national economic trends affecting the egg industry and his willingness to impart his knowledge and wisdom freely to those who sought it attracted many followers and admirers and projected him to a position of seer as well as statesman for the industry. And his articulate voice and statesmanship were both refreshing and reassuring to an industry so frequently plagued with economic crises and strife so common because of its cyclical nature.

He authored numerous articles relating to egg production and marketing and participated in many programs as a speaker and panelist at trade meetings and at university seminars.

CONTE'S \$20,000 FARM SUBSIDY CEILING AMENDMENT WILL AFFECT VERY FEW FARMERS

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I will once again offer my amendment to limit individual farm subsidies to \$20,000 per crop.

Although there were 13,751 farmers who received more than this in 1971, I want to advise my colleagues that my amendment would only have affected 10,143 of them. This is because the other 3,000 farmers exceeded \$20,000 only by collecting their subsidies from more than one program. At the close of these remarks I include a table, based on USDA figures, that shows the number of producers in each of the three programs—cotton, feed grains, and wheat—who received more than \$20,000. These are the only ones who would have been affected by my amendment. They constitute less than one-half of 1 percent of all those receiving farm subsidies in 1971. This information helps to make clear that my amendment will not in any way disrupt the present program. It will not touch the average farmer who really deserves our help. I will have more to say tomorrow on why it is essential for us to adopt this reform.

The table referred to follows:

COTTON, FEED GRAINS AND WHEAT PROGRAMS, 1971
PRODUCERS RECEIVING GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS OF \$20,000 OR MORE AND TOTAL PAYMENTS OF \$20,000 OR MORE

Program	Number of producers	Amount
Cotton.....	8,810	\$311,920,000
Feed grains.....	245	6,911,000
Wheat.....	1,088	31,268,000
Total.....	10,143	350,099,000

Source: USDA.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF RADIO STATION WSBT, SOUTH BEND, IND.

HON. JOHN BRADEMAs

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. BRADEMAs, Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, I had the honor of calling attention to the 100th anniversary of the South Bend Tribune. Today, Mr. Speaker, it is with equal pleasure that I rise to salute the 50th anniversary of WSBT, the South Bend Tribune's radio station.

WSBT, and its predecessor call letters, represents one of the pioneer radio broadcasting operations in the Nation, going on the air as experimental station W9FP in April 1922, with 100 watts of power. On June 29, 1922, 50 years ago today, station WGAZ was granted a Federal license to operate with 1,000 watts of power.

FIRST COMMERCIAL PROGRAM

On July 3, 1922, Mr. Speaker, WGAZ was officially dedicated with what was apparently broadcasting's first commercial program. On September 30, 1925, its call letters became WSBT.

Mr. Speaker, in all these 50 years, this great radio station has observed the highest traditions of public and community service. Like its parent, the South Bend Tribune, which has been in the forefront of significant newspaper technical advancements, WSBT has been a pioneer in many areas of the broadcasting field.

LANDMARK DATES

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to various other landmark dates in WSBT's history: May 1, 1931, a sister station, WFAM, went on the air to operate during periods not granted to WSBT. February 1, 1932, WSBT and WFAM became affiliates of the Columbia Broadcasting System (CBS), as they still are today.

March 29, 1941, WSBT was granted permission to operate on 960 kc and WFAM was discontinued. May 10, 1943, W71SB, one of the Midwest's first FM stations and the forerunner of WSBT-FM, went on the air. December 21, 1952, WSBT-TV began television operations on UHF channel 34, with 17,500 watts of power.

On January 1, 1954, Mr. Speaker, WSBT-TV became the first television station in Indiana to transmit a program in color. April 8, 1956, WSBT moved into its new broadcast center facility. January 24, 1958, WSBT-TV moved from channel 34 to channel 22. September 8, 1962, WSBT-TV began operations from its new 1,047-foot tower with 480,000 watts of power.

On March 1, 1966, WSBT-TV began broadcasting in stereo. May 15, 1967, WSBT-TV power was increased to 2,175,000 watts of power. June 30, 1967, WSBT-TV began live colorcasts.

Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in congratulating WSBT on the occasion of its golden anniversary. I salute this pioneer broadcasting operation for the public service it continues to perform in disseminating news, information, and en-

tainment to hundreds of thousands of people in the northern Indiana and southern Michigan area.

EROSION AND FLOODING IN NORTHEAST OHIO—MORE COSTLY PROOF THAT FEDERAL SHORE PROTECTION LEGISLATION IS NEEDED IMMEDIATELY

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday and Friday, the northeast Ohio area was hit by severe storms associated with Hurricane Agnes. The wind and rain storms caused extensive damage throughout the area, particularly among the communities which lie along the shore of Lake Erie. For some time, residents of these communities have been suffering damage because of the continuing rapid erosion of the shoreline. Because of the soft material which composes this section of the shoreline, erosion and flooding becomes especially severe during storms—such as those of last week.

For several years now, the northeast Ohio congressional delegation has been attempting to develop legislation to help these communities meet the heavy burden of constructing shore protection devices.

The Corps of Engineers has agreed to begin a special study of the cost-benefit ratios of constructing shore protection devices in the Eastlake-Willowick area. The people of these communities need action now. But, Mr. Speaker, as you know, Federal assistance is not available for the protection of nonpublic property in these communities. That law in this area must first be changed. In addition, favorable benefit-to-cost ratio must be established. It is my hope that the corps new study, using new cost-benefit methods, will clearly and once and for all demonstrate that corps assistance in this area is justified. In addition, every effort must be made this year to amend the law governing the protection of non-public property.

Because of the large number of Members who have congressional districts which face the same type of problem that mine faces, I would like to enter into the Record at this point testimony which I presented on Wednesday, June 28, before the Senate Public Works Committee in support of efforts to provide assistance to these communities:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN CHARLES A. VANIK

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee: I am testifying on behalf of H.R. 13689, legislation to permit Federal assistance for protecting our Nation's shorelines in areas where benefit-cost ratios would justify such Federal assistance.

The National Shoreline Study, compiled by the Corps of Engineers and released in August 1971, underscores the seriousness of the problem of shore erosion on our coasts. Thousands of miles of our shoreline are in immediate danger due to erosion, yet most of this land

is not eligible for Federal assistance because it is not publicly owned.

The Regional Inventory Shoreline reports of the National Shoreline Study graphically document the erosion problems faced by each coastal and Great Lakes State. Not one of these states escapes the cancerous effects of erosion. The Study's assessment of shore erosion throughout the Nation found the following:

(In miles)

Region	Total shoreline	Significant erosion	Critical erosion	Non-critical erosion	Non-eroding
Great Lakes.....	3,680	1,260	220	1,040	2,420
Total, Nation.....	84,240	20,500	2,700	17,800	63,740

In my testimony today, I would like to discuss a critical erosion area with which I am very familiar—Northeast Ohio. Yet, we must realize that this Northeast Ohio area is no different from many others.

The particular area in question is a section of the shoreline of Lake County, Ohio. This section is approximately 15 to 20 miles north-east of Cleveland. This stretch of shore extends east from the city of Euclid past the mouth of the Chagrin River, and includes the populous and highly developed communities of Euclid in Cuyahoga County and Willowick, Eastlake, Timberlake, and Lake-line in Lake County. This shore is comprised mainly of large bluffs made up of glacial till and clay. Most areas have a small beach at the base of the bluffs, but these beaches are not stable and are constantly changing due to wave action.

Almost all of the land along the shore is privately owned and residential.

Because of the soft material which comprises the bluffs of this area, erosion has run rampant. High Lake Erie water levels and fierce storms have in many places totally obliterated the beach at the base of the bluff. The Lake has reached right up to the bottom of the bluffs, undercutting them and collapsing huge sections of earth. Bluff seepage causes shedding of the bluff, adding to the erosion. In some spots thirty feet of shoreline disappear every year into the waters of the lake. Several weeks ago, one homeowner lost fifteen to twenty feet of land in a single storm. Not only is the rate of erosion unusually fast, the fact that chunks of shore over twenty feet wide collapse into the lake at various times has created danger for shoreline residents.

Shifts of land under houses have caused residents in Willowick to have to flee their homes. Homes have already actually fallen into the lake, and others currently rest precariously balanced on cliffs and are now abandoned. Also, periods of abnormally high lake levels, such as in 1951-52 and 1969, have resulted in severe shoreline damage amounting to millions of dollars.

DAMAGE FROM AFTERMATH OF TROPICAL STORM AGNES

Last Thursday and Friday, Ohio, like the rest of the Eastern part of the United States was hit by severe wind and rain storms. The storm whipped up the Lake's waters and huge breakers crashed into the shoreline. I have some pictures here from the Cleveland Plain Dealer and the Willoughby News Herald which show some of the shoreline damage. As you can see from the headlines, these waves eroded away large segments of the shore and four homes tumbled into the Lake. One family was just sitting down to dinner, when their house began falling away into the water. Over 100 families were evacuated and flooding affected some 300 other families in Eastlake. While some of the flooding could be attributed to the fact that this was the worst storm in the area in about twenty years, it is erosion which is eating away at

the lifeblood of these shore communities—and which is accelerated every time there is a storm. I might add that these homes eroded away last weekend were considered completely safe only a few years ago. Now the homes behind them are in danger.

EROSION PROJECTIONS IN LAKE COUNTY, 1968-2020

In response to citizen concern over the dangerous rate of erosion, the State of Ohio in 1969 commissioned an engineering firm to make a study of this area. This report was released in October 1969 and the findings, Mr. Chairman, are very discouraging.

The study included the years 1968 to 2020. It determined that by 2020 another 535 acres of land will be lost in this four-mile stretch alone. This equal 1,900,000 cubic yards of earth, and represents a loss of almost 350 feet in width along the shore.

The economic losses in the 52 years are also staggering. By 2020, this segment of shore will amount to a value of \$18.9 million. The total tax revenue lost to the communities will be \$3,861,000 by 2020.

These are by no means the only losses. There are also intangible factors we must include. If we do not protect this shore now, 1.9 million cubic yards of earth will fall into the Lake by the year 2020. 80% of the material will remain suspended in the Lake water adding to the difficulties of our fight against pollution.

This Lake County report recommended that 11,700 feet of this four-mile stretch of shoreline needed protection. The cost of totally protecting this shore is estimated to be \$2,547,000, or \$217 per linear foot. A less adequate protection plan would cost approximately \$1.3 million. Mr. Chairman, the more complete of these protection programs will cost only about 10% of the total value of this land in 2020. It will only cost about 40% of the value of the shoreline today, since current (1968) property value of this area is \$6.3 million. The monetary value of this land increases as the years pass, but even today, shore protection of this stretch of land appears to be an economical bargain.

MAGNITUDE OF PROBLEM TOO GREAT FOR INDIVIDUAL HOMEOWNERS OR COMMUNITIES

The homeowners in this area have made numerous and earnest attempts to halt the process of erosion. Citizens have attempted all sorts of improvised shore protection devices, such as concrete blocks, home-made gabions, old cars, etc. As one could expect, such uncoordinated attempts to stem the forces of the lake have been generally unsuccessful. Only a professional, integrated shore protection plan will successfully save these shores.

Mr. Chairman, under current legislation the private land owner along the shore is helpless. Insurance companies have no provisions for covering loss of a home or land due to gradual erosion; they are not permitted to deduct federal income tax losses resulting from gradual erosion; and, so far, no Federal aid has been available to help them save their land. While some 120 Federally-assisted beach protection projects have been constructed or are pending, these have been almost exclusively for the protection of parks and recreation areas—not for the protection of communities and their residents. Adequate protection is beyond the means of local citizens, citizen groups and their individual cities and counties. In most cases, the various states have also failed to provide help—and their communities need Federal help.

H.R. 13689 permits Federal assistance for imperiled homeowners. The enactment of this legislation is desperately needed.

NEED FOR MORE ADEQUATE BENEFIT-COST RATIO DETERMINATIONS

Mr. Chairman, I would like to emphasize that this legislation does not alter the stand-

ards by which the Corps of Engineers evaluates individual shore protection project applications. Each project, regardless of whether it involves publicly owned land or privately owned land, will be judged by the Corps' benefit-cost formulas, so only projects which are justifiable for the public good will be constructed. I certainly do not feel that this legislation will in any way open the door to haphazard or excessive shore protection. It is not the intent of this legislation to pour a concrete ring around our shorelines.

To prevent excessive cost in this program, the Committee might want to consider the requirement that Federal assistance would be available only in those states or counties which adopt—within the near future—shore zoning legislation, and in areas where wave barriers—such as the sand dunes along much of the Atlantic coast—provide vital protection for inland areas.

In other words, developments should not be permitted in critically eroding areas. New developments in such areas would not be eligible for public protection. Thus the benefits of this program would be limited to areas which were developed before the magnitude of the erosion problem was known or which, because of natural causes, become subject to erosion.

Mr. Chairman, I refer to benefit-cost ratios as determinants in the justification of a shore protection project. I would like to briefly elaborate on this. I believe the Corps of Engineers should alter some of the standards and regulations on which their benefit-cost evaluations are based.

Under the existing shore protection law, the Corps' standards are, in some cases, totally inadequate. The guidelines for current shore protection projects is public benefit; all projects must be shown to be in the public interest. However, the Corps definition of "public benefit" is much too narrow. Up until now the Corps has, in almost every case, defined "public benefit" to mean recreational benefit. There are many other aspects of "public benefit" which the Corps has not included in their benefit-cost ratios.

Mr. Chairman, public benefit is derived from the use of city streets, and also by the need for utilities and sewage lines. I think we can all agree that these facilities represent a public investment and are in constant use in behalf of the public. Yet current Corps procedures do not appear to have been defining either city streets or utilities as being in the public benefit. Mr. Chairman, Shoreham Drive in Willowick, Ohio, is literally about to crumble into Lake Erie. This is a paved city street, and I do not see how or why the Corps of Engineers can say such a street is not included in the Corps definition of "public benefit." A city street, for example, is one of the "high priority" projects included in the proposed revenue sharing bill which recently passed the House of Representatives.

Also, as I have mentioned earlier, the shoreline communities are losing a great deal of general and school tax revenues as their lands fall into the lake. The land might be privately-owned, but the homeowners pay the taxes which support the community schools and services. Yet the Corps does not consider loss of tax revenue in its benefit-cost calculations. Since it is this revenue which maintains the educational and service system in a community, how can the Corps neglect this as it judges a project application? Tax collection is I might add, another factor included in revenue sharing calculations.

There is another questionable principle in the Corps determinations. Corps shore protection projects are evaluated on a fifty-year estimated lifetime basis. Erosion rates are figured for this fifty-year period. Yet Corps erosion control projects, when properly built and efficiently maintained, can last and retain their usefulness for 100, possibly even 150, years. If the Corps would base its ben-

efit-cost calculations on a 100-year estimated lifetime, the Corps evaluation would include a larger section of land saved and, therefore, prove to be much more foresighted. The Corps must realize that the benefits of a project will increase if the project is given a longer lifetime. It is ridiculous to figure benefits on a fifty-year basis if the project is going to last 100 years or even longer.

Another baffling aspect of Corps calculations is that private property set between the water and public property will not be protected. The Corps will not attempt to protect that shore until the water has reached the public property.

Finally, I share the concern of many over the Administration's new interest-discount rate used in evaluating and formulating water resource projects. I hope that your Committee will support the long established discount rate formulas. To require that the Federal discount rate equal what would be obtained in the private market does not make sense, since these are public projects in which the private money market has no interest.

I have mentioned some of the weaknesses of current Corps shore protection determination factors. Public streets, utilities, and tax revenue are not classified as being in the "public benefit." Projects, which when constructed will last 100 years or longer, have their estimated benefits figured only over a fifty-year period. Private land between public property and the water falls into the water before protection is undertaken. There is an urgent need for the Corps of Engineers to revise their methods of justifying shore protection projects.

Mr. Chairman, I believe legislation such as H.R. 13689 must be passed to help the many endangered private homeowners along our more developed shorelines. These people have no place to turn to save their land and homes. Shore erosion along many shores, such as along Lake Erie, is not a steady process. Rather, it is an unpredictable and whimsical process, in which huge chunks of bluff can suddenly and unexpectedly shift and collapse. Families have had to flee their homes in the middle of the night due to a surprising shift of their homes due to bluff erosion. In this respect, shore erosion in some places is similar to flooding—it is unpredictable and life-threatening. Yet private property is protected by flood control structures. Now we must realize that in the same way communities should be assisted in the fight against erosion.

The economic strength of many American communities is literally being eroded away by the gradual but accumulative erosion of portions of those communities.

Mr. Chairman, we have the Corps report. We have had a multitude of studies. We know the problem. It is time to translate the Corps findings into action, into help for those communities throughout the Nation who are increasingly suffering from the destructive effects of erosion. I believe that my bill, H.R. 13689, or similar legislation, would be a way of providing relief for these communities. Legislation to assist local communities in meeting the massive costs of erosion control, as well as a change in the Corps' regulations used to determine benefit-cost ratios, could provide the help which is absolutely essential if these communities are not to be destroyed by erosion.

WISE INVESTORS

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, a recent survey conducted by Mr. Wil-

liam Reasoner of Waddell & Reed, Inc., indicates that Polish Americans are, in the main, very wise investors.

The author of this survey declares that—

The 12 million Americans of Polish descent are among the thriftiest savers and wisest investors in this nation.

Reasoner is president and chief executive officer of Waddell & Reed, Inc., a Kansas City-based financial services complex which manages and sponsors the United Funds, Inc.

The findings indicate that in the areas of the greatest concentration of Polish Americans—Chicago, New York, Detroit, Cleveland, Buffalo, Baltimore, Milwaukee, Philadelphia, and Pittsburgh—an overwhelming number are becoming increasingly aware of the importance of making wise investments for the future.

According to the data accumulated by researches, Poles, as a group, favor investment in mutual funds, then blue-chip securities. They like professional management, and they like security in investment. Generally, they are conservative in their investment philosophy, preferring long term to short term investments.

The survey also indicates that there are many self-employed Polish businessmen, whose businesses tend to be owned and operated by families. There is a preponderance of grocery stores, apparel and specialty shops, cleaning and dyeing establishments and other service concerns. The average, nationally, for self-employed is slightly less than 8.5 percent; for Poles, the average is higher, about 8.8 percent.

"They are also very proud to be Polish Americans—they have every right to be proud," the survey concludes.

REGIONALISM

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the use of the term "regionalism" has increased greatly in the past few years. It has become a commonplace expression because of the growing interdependence of our great cities and the communities which surround them.

Regionalism will continue to grow as the cost of providing vital services to people increases. The cities and the suburbs must continue to cooperate if they are to remain viable.

An example of this very necessary practice is the decision by my city, Philadelphia, to make its waste treatment facilities available to some bordering suburban communities.

At this time I enter into the RECORD a description of this regional approach to solving a serious problem:

SOLVING A SERIOUS PROBLEM

As part of its good neighbor policy, Philadelphia is accepting up to 1.5 million gallons of new sewage daily from Delaware County. Water Commissioner Carmen F. Guarino said today.

Guarino said that the sewage flow started recently when his department put into serv-

ice a new diversion chamber and sewer to divert the flow to the City's Southwest Water Pollution Control Plant for treatment. The City is providing this service under an agreement reached last December with the Darby Creek Joint Authority and the Radnor-Haverford-Marple Sewer Authority.

In practice, the City will take up to 1.5 million gallons of sewage daily from the Darby Creek Joint Authority, and Darby Creek's sewage plant will then be able to take an additional 1.5 million gallons daily from the Radnor-Haverford-Marple area, with which it has a tie-in.

This in turn will relieve a small sewage plant operated by the Radnor-Haverford-Marple Sewer Authority. Plans for expansion of this small plant will be postponed.

Guarino said that the new service is an interim relief measure for portions of Delaware County until Philadelphia can expand its Southwest Plant into a more regionalized facility. Plans call for conversion of the plant from primary treatment to secondary treatment by the end of 1975, and for expansion of its capacity from 138 million gallons to 210 million gallons daily.

"At that time," said Guarino, "the plant will accept greatly increased flows from Delaware County—perhaps as much as 50 million gallons daily. This will ensure greater protection for local streams."

Guarino said that this regionalization plan is being carried out at the request of the Delaware River Basin Commission, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the Federal Environmental Protection Agency.

"Of course, regionalized service is nothing new for us," said the Commissioner. He noted that the Water Department has been collecting and treating sewage from numerous suburban communities since the 1950's.

The diversion chamber and sewer for the new service were built under a City contract by Thomas Pinelli Corporation at a cost of \$80,000. The City will be reimbursed by the Radnor-Haverford-Marple Sewer Authority for both construction and treatment costs.

ULMS: TOO MUCH TOO SOON

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, on June 27, the House considered a major acceleration of the ULMS or Trident submarine program. The Committee on Armed Services has reported legislation that contains more than \$900 million for research and development in the ULMS program.

On December 7, the Center for Defense Information, which is directed by Rear Adm. Gene R. LaRocque, retired, issued an informative report on ULMS which concludes that the program is being accelerated too quickly.

The Center for Defense Information concludes that:

The Defense Department offers an impossible rationale for ULMS.

The Pentagon claims that ULMS would be a hedge against possible Soviet technological breakthrough that ignores the existing hedge provided by the United States superior ICBM nuclear bomber force.

I hope that my colleagues will carefully study this important report.

The report follows:

ULMS: TOO MUCH TOO SOON

The Defense Department has asked Congress for nearly \$1 billion in fiscal 1973 to accelerate development of a new offensive nuclear force known as ULMS or Trident.

It would be—if Congress consents—a fleet of new nuclear missile submarines, to be targeted at Russia, with vastly greater destructive power than the present force of Polaris and Poseidon submarines. The program has been called "Undersea Long-Range Missile Systems—ULMS" for several years, but has newly been renamed "Trident."

It has three parts.

A fleet of new submarines, each displacing 16,000 tons or more. This is twice the size of Polaris and Poseidon missile submarines and larger than the Soviet Navy's biggest combat ship (the 15,000-ton helicopter carrier Moskva). Each ULMS submarine would carry 24 nuclear missiles. Polaris and Poseidon subs carry only 16. Under the Pentagon's proposed speed-up, the first ULMS submarines would be deployed in 1978, two years ahead of schedule.

A new nuclear missile, the ULMS I, with a range of 4,500 miles, compared with 2,500 for Polaris and Poseidon. It would be installed in the first ULMS submarines, but could also be put in Poseidon vessels.

The ULMS II missile, larger and even more powerful, with a probable range of 6,000 miles. It would be developed as a possible replacement for the ULMS I in the ULMS submarines in the 1980's.

The Navy hopes to make the ULMS submarines quieter than today's models. Their longer-range missiles would allow them to target the Soviet Union from a much bigger expanse of ocean. An ULMS submarine in port in Charleston, South Carolina, would have most of the Soviet Union in target range. The Defense Department alleges that these features will make it more difficult for the Russians to develop counter-measures against ULMS.

Announcing the name changes from ULMS to Trident on May 16, Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird said the program involved building 10 submarines. Earlier the Defense Department had made public a figure of \$11.2 billion as the estimated total cost of the program "as presently constituted" without specifying how many submarines would be included. There had also been unofficial estimates that the program might ultimately include 30 submarines, costing a total of \$30 billion or more.

ULMS AND SALT

The US-Soviet series of agreements reached in the recent Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) appear to allow the ULMS program to go forward within certain limitations. Under these accords, the United States would be limited to 710 submarine-launched ballistic missiles and the Soviet Union, 950. The ULMS I missile could still be placed in present Poseidon submarines. A limited number of ULMS, or Trident, submarines could be deployed as replacements for existing submarines and for the 54 US Titan II ICBMs.

POLARIS AND POSEIDON

This country's existing strategic submarine fleet is new. The oldest submarine in it is only 12 years of age; the newest, five. With a life of 30 years, this fleet will be usable until the 1990's. Also, the United States is already—even without ULMS—in the midst of a conversion program involving a 10-fold multiplication of its destructive power.

Before this conversion began, the 41 U.S. Polaris submarines carried between them

656 missiles (16 each). Most of these missiles had one explosive warhead each. Some had three which would drop in a cluster on a Soviet city. Thirty-one of the Polaris vessels are being converted to carry Poseidon missiles (16 Poseidons to a submarine). Each Poseidon missile contains 10 to 14 separate nuclear warheads (MIRVs) which could be directed to targets hundreds of miles apart. When this conversion is completed in 1976, the Polaris/Poseidon force will include 6,400 nuclear weapons.

Allowing for the fact that a little less than half of these submarines would be on station at a given time, and using the 85 to 95 per cent reliability rate shown in test firings, the 1976 force would be able to destroy about 2,000 Soviet targets on a moment's notice. There are 219 Soviet cities larger than 100,000 population, and 88 million people—36 per cent of the Soviet Union—live in them. The 1976 submarine force, before ULMS, could destroy these cities nine times over.

THE NUCLEAR BALANCE

Russia is several years behind the United States in strategic missile submarines. The Soviet Union has been building up its fleet of Y-Class subs, similar in size to Polaris, and in a few years is expected to have 42 of them.

But proportionately fewer Y-Class vessels are on station at a given time compared with the U.S. fleet. Only three-to-five Y-Class subs now target the United States, while about 16 Polaris/Poseidons target Russia. The Soviet missiles are shorter in range (1,300 to 1,500 miles compared with 2,500 for those carried in most of the US subs). To target the entire United States, Soviet subs would have to come within sight of the US East and West Coasts and enter the Gulf of Mexico.

The Soviet submarines have many more miles to travel to station than the US vessels, because they have no advance bases. The US subs operate from the continental United States; Holy Loch, Scotland; Rota, Spain; and Guam.

Soviet Y-Class submarines are all based in the Soviet Union. They remain submerged while on patrol. A Soviet rescue tug is stationed in Cuba in case of mishap to Y-Class vessels patrolling the Western Atlantic. Another tug usually remains south of Hawaii to assist Y-Class subs on patrol off the US West Coast.

Submarines are only one part of the US and Soviet nuclear forces. These also include intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) and manned bombers. There are many ways to compare these forces. In numbers of launchers, the balance looks like this in mid-1972:

	United States	U.S.S.R.
ICBM launchers.....	1,054	1,550
Submarine launch tubes.....	656	580
Heavy bombers.....	531	140

But many of the U.S. missiles contain MIRV. None of the Soviet missiles do. Therefore, a more meaningful comparison is the number of actual nuclear weapons that can be fired by these launchers. By this measurement, the balance looks like this:

	United States	U.S.S.R.
Weapons.....	5,700	2,500

Note: Data from testimony by Secretary of Defense Laird, February 1972.

By 1976, under programs already planned, without ULMS, the US nuclear forces will contain 14,000 weapons. These will include the Poseidons, Minuteman III ICBMs with MIRV and SRAM missiles to be placed in B-52 and FB-111 strategic bombers.

The Soviet Union could have a comparable increase in total weapons only if it carried out a major MIRV program. This would take several years. The United States has a major head start in MIRV. There is no indication the Soviets have even begun MIRV.

HOW STRONG IS "STRONG"?

Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird has offered no military rationale for accelerating ULMS. In his fiscal 1973 statement to Congress, Laird states:

"The continuing Soviet strategic offensive force buildup with its long term implications, convinced us that we need to undertake a major new strategic initiative. This step must signal to the Soviets and our allies that we have the will and the resources to maintain sufficient strategic forces in the face of a growing Soviet threat."

Laird said he reviewed all alternatives for "new strategic initiatives" and picked ULMS because:

- (a) it is already under development and would not disrupt other programs;
- (b) it is the best technical program available to provide a future sea-based deterrent;
- (c) larger missiles would mean a given nuclear destructive power could be carried with fewer boats and crews; and
- (d) it includes the option of putting ULMS I missiles in Poseidon submarines.

At no point did Laird say ULMS is necessary for nuclear deterrence.

Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., Defense Department research chief, gave Congress essentially the same reasons, saying ULMS would be a "signal to the Soviets and our allies that we are going to remain strong."

Apparently neither Laird nor Foster think 5,700 U.S. nuclear weapons—going on 14,000—is "strong."

TWO "POTENTIAL PROBLEMS"

Foster went on to say that ULMS would be the best hedge against the "potential threat" of Soviet development of anti-submarine warfare methods which would make Polaris/Poseidon vulnerable.

Other defense witnesses have repeatedly said the Polaris/Poseidon force is so far invulnerable. Rear Admiral Levering Smith, director of Navy strategic systems projects, said in an interview in May, 1969: "I am quite positive that Russian submarines cannot and are not following any of our Polaris submarines under water. I am also quite positive that the new generation of Russian submarines that are getting close to operational status, that are now being tested, will also not be able to follow our Polaris submarines."

In fiscal 1972 budget hearings, Rear Admiral Robert Y. Kaufman, ULMS program coordinator, said: "Polaris/Poseidon today we feel is invulnerable."

Laird told Congress last year there was "no immediate concern about the survivability of our Polaris and Poseidon submarines at sea..." although the US continued to work on defensive measures.

The Soviet Union is far behind the United States in submarine detection. It has not, for example, developed a listening network on the ocean bottom such as the US "SOSUS" system, by which this country keeps track of the movement of Soviet submarines.

But even if the Soviets did develop ways to detect and track US strategic missile submarines, this would do them little good unless they could also destroy all US missile subs simultaneously—which would be ex-

tremely unlikely. One surviving Poseidon submarine could destroy 160 Soviet cities.

Even if the "potential" Soviet anti-submarine threat were to come true, it is by no means certain that the ULMS submarine would be immune. There is no certainty ULMS submarines will in fact be as quiet as planned. Since they will be larger, they could be more easily detected by active sonar at close ranges.

Foster gave one additional argument. The Polaris/Poseidon fleet, he said, must rely heavily on forward bases because of the range of the missiles. An ULMS fleet could be based in the continental United States. Foster said this country faces some "minor problems" with its Polaris/Poseidon bases. This appears to be the first time such "minor" problems have been used to justify a major escalation of the nuclear arms race costing many billions of dollars.

If present bases were lost, there would be less costly solutions than ULMS—For example, other bases or keeping fewer subs on station.

SOME NAVY ARGUMENTS

Admiral Elmo R. Zumwalt Jr., Chief of Naval Operations, gave as one of his reasons for ULMS: "The Soviets are building strategic missile submarines at a rapid pace. We are building none." This argument ignores the fact that strategic missile submarines do not shoot at each other; therefore the mere fact that one country is building them is not justification for the other doing the same. But more importantly, Admiral Zumwalt's argument ignores the enormous lead of the U.S. over the Soviet Union in nuclear weapons carried by submarines, ICBMs, and bombers.

Admiral Zumwalt also testified: "I firmly believe that we need ULMS in order to assure, with a high degree of confidence, a continuing survivable strategic force, regardless of an enemy first strike." But the United States has just such assurance in its "triad" of nuclear forces—land and sea-based missiles and bombers—each of which is sufficient alone to wipe out the Soviet Union. The United States has, for years, been overbuilding its nuclear forces to have this assurance. The Poseidon force itself was built primarily to counter possible development of a major anti-ballistic missile system in the Soviet Union. Though the Soviets are building an ABM around Moscow, no major ABM capability has developed.

CONCLUSIONS

ULMS is not needed as a "signal" to show the Soviet Union that we intend to "remain strong." We can already obliterate the Soviet Union many times over.

ULMS is not needed for the weak "military" reasons offered by the Pentagon—a "potential" anti-submarine threat and "potential" overseas base trouble.

ULMS is not likely to deter Russia from further nuclear buildup. It is more likely to encourage it.

ULMS would further increase the existing danger to the environment of our planet through nuclear accident. Two nuclear powered submarines, Thresher and Scorpion, have been lost, without known environmental effects. These were not ballistic missile submarines. How long can the safety record last? What would happen if an ULMS submarine, carrying more nuclear material than any other vessel in the world's history, were to be in a collision or sink?

If a clear threat to Polaris/Poseidon were to emerge someday, this could be met by simply placing the longer-range ULMS I missiles in Poseidon submarines. The ULMS submarines would be unnecessary.

There is no plausible justification for an accelerated ULMS program.

This leaves Congress with a number of alternatives:

It could stop ULMS entirely.

It could continue research and development on the ULMS I missile for possible use in Poseidon submarines if a clear need emerges.

ULMS FACT SHEET

ULMS submarine

First deployment in 1978 under proposed accelerated schedule.

Probable size: 16,000 tons, twice that of Polaris.

Number of missiles: 24 (Polaris boats carry 16).

ULMS I missile

Probable range 4,500 to 5,000 nautical miles, compared with 2,500 for Polaris A3 and Poseidon.

Being developed for ULMS submarines.

Option to install in existing submarines in 1977-78.

ULMS II missile

Initial planning stage. Option to install in ULMS submarines in early 1980's.

Probable range: 6,000 nautical miles.

Appropriations for ULMS to date

\$166.3 million. The program was first listed by name in the research and development budget in fiscal 1969.

Funds requested in fiscal 1973 budget

ULMS submarine, \$470.2 million.

Missiles, \$479.7 million.

Military construction, \$27.3 million.

Procurement—associated operation and maintenance, \$3.0 million.

Total, \$980.2 million (includes \$35 million originally requested as 1972 supplemental).

Number of submarines in proposed fleet

Ten announced by Secretary of Defense.

Total program cost

DOD estimate: \$11.2 billion.

Contractors

Missiles: Lockheed (builder of Poseidon).

Submarines: Electric Boat Division of General Dynamics (builder of Polaris).

U.S.-U.S.S.R. LONG-RANGE BALLISTIC MISSILE SUBMARINES IN MID-1972

	United States, Polaris/Poseidon	U.S.S.R., Yankee
Submarines.....	41	25.
Nuclear power.....	Yes.	Yes.
Missiles per sub.....	16	16.
Range of missiles.....	2,500 (33 subs)	1,300-1,500.
Nautical miles.....	1,500 (8 subs)	(a 3,000-mile missile has been tested but not put in a submarine).
Number of missiles with MRV (3 weapons in cluster on single target).....	336	None.
Number of missiles with MIRV (10-14 weapons on separate targets).....	496	Do.
Number of weapons in force.....	3,800	480.
Advance operating bases and subs assigned.....	Scotland 9, Spain 9, Guam 7.	None.
Operating areas and number of submarines on station (estimate).....	Mediterranean 2, Atlantic 4, Northern areas 6, Pacific 3, Indian Ocean 1.	Atlantic 3-4, Pacific 0-1.
Total on station.....	16	3-5.

Note: The U.S. Polaris/Poseidon force has 8 times the number of weapons that the Y-class has—most with nearly twice the range of the Y-class missiles. Advance operating bases allow the United States to have 16 Polaris on station, the Russians have 3-5 submarines on station. The United States has both MIRV and MRV. The Soviets do not.

U.S. STRATEGIC NUCLEAR FORCES IN 1976 UNDER PRESENT PLANS WITHOUT ULMS

Type, launch vehicle	NumberX	Missiles per launch vehicle=	Missile totalX	Weapons per missile=	Total weapons
ICBM's (intercontinental ballistic missiles):					
Minuteman III	550	1	550	3	1,650
Minuteman II and Titan II	504	1	504	1	504
Subtotal	1,054		1,054		2,154
SLBM's (submarine launched ballistic missiles):					
Poseidon	31	16	496	12	5,952
Type, launch vehicle	NumberX	Missiles per launch vehicle=	Missile totalX	Weapons per missile=	Total weapons
Polaris (A-3)	10	16	160	3	480
Subtotal	41		656		6,432
Strategic bombers:					
B-52G's and Hs/SRAM	255	20	5,100	1	5,100
FB-111/SRAM	66	6	396	1	396
Subtotal	321		5,496		5,496
Grand total	1,416		7,706		14,082

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS ASSOCIATION HONORS COSPONSORS OF SMALL BUSINESS TAX REFORM BILL

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, recently the National Committee for Small Business Tax Reform—a committee of the National Small Business Association—paid tribute to 156 Members of the House who have either introduced or cosponsored tax reform legislation or publicly announced their support of such legislation.

Each Member was presented with a Citation of Recognition by Harry Brinkman, the president of the association, and Edward Larson, chairman of the Committee on Tax Reform.

Chairman Larson commented:

The forthright action on the part of the Members of Congress in publicly supporting tax simplification and reform for the Nation's small businessmen—and particularly those in each Member's District—deserves the highest recognition. This action should be regarded as the first move in the direction of equitable tax treatment for 19 of every 20 firms in the United States which are small business.

Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to sponsor H.R. 7692, the Small Business Tax Simplification and Reform Act of 1971, in the House, and I welcome the support of my colleagues who have introduced similar bills or are cosponsors of the bill that I introduced.

At the request of officials of the National Small Business Association, I include in the RECORD a list of names of Members of the House who are cosponsors and supporters of this small business tax reform legislation:

SPONSORS AND COSPONSORS OF H.R. 7692 AND IDENTICAL BILLS

Joseph P. Addabbo, D-7-N.Y.
William R. Anderson, D-6-Tenn. (H.R. 10241).
Les Aspin, D-1-Wis. (H.R. 9887).
Walter S. Baring, D-AL-Nev. (H.R. 14048).
Bob Bergland, D-7-Minn. (H.R. 9121).
Wm. S. Broomfield, R-18-Mich. (H.R. 10124).
Bill Burlison, D-10-Mo. (H.R. 14101).
Charles J. Carney, D-19-Ohio.
Bob Casey, D-22-Tex. (H.R. 9729).
Don H. Clausen, R-1-Calif. (H.R. 10425).
Silvio O. Conte, R-1-Mass.
John W. Davis, D-7-Ga. (H.R. 14566).
Harold D. Donohue, D-4-Mass. (H.R. 13964).

Don Edwards, D-9-Calif. (H.R. 9419).
Marvin L. Esch, R-2-Mich. (H.R. 11479).
Hamilton Fish, R-28-N.Y. (H.R. 12813).
Richard Fulton, D-9-Tenn. (H.R. 9183).
Edward E. Garmatz, D-3-Md.
Henry B. Gonzalez, D-20-Tex. (H.R. 9400).
Gilbert Gude, R-8-Md. (H.R. 14732).
John Hammerschmidt, R-3-Ark. (H.R. 11590).

Michael Harrington, D-6-Mass.
James Harvey, R-8-Mich.
James F. Hastings, R-38-N.Y. (H.R. 10492).
Ken Hechler, D-4-W. Va. (H.R. 11377).
Henry Helstoski, D-9-N.J. (H.R. 10455).
Floyd V. Hicks, D-6-Wash. (H.R. 10647).
Frank Horton, R-36-N.Y.
William J. Keating, R-1-Ohio (H.R. 13868).
John D. Kluczynski, D-5-Ill.
Peter N. Kyros, D-1-Me. (H.R. 11517).
Manuel Lujan, Jr., R-1-N.M.
John McCollister, R-2-Neb. (H.R. 11601).
Joseph M. McDade, R-10-Pa.
Spark M. Matsunaga, D-1-Hawaii (H.R. 11687).

Romano L. Mazzoli, D-3-Ky. (H.R. 13984).
John Melcher, D-2-Mont. (H.R. 11353).
William E. Minshall, R-23-Ohio (H.R. 10160).

Parren J. Mitchell, D-7-Md.
Wilmer Mizell, R-5-N.C. (H.R. 14071).
Alvin E. O'Konski, R-10-Wis. (H.R. 10206).
Claude Pepper, D-11-Fla. (H.R. 9425).
David Pryor, D-4-Ark. (H.R. 11793).
James H. Quillen, R-1-Tenn. (H.R. 10327).
John J. Rhodes, R-1-Ariz. (H.R. 11037).
J. Edward Roush, D-4-Ind. (H.R. 10730).
Fernand St Germain, D-1-R.I.
John P. Saylor, R-22-Pa. (H.R. 13931).
Keith G. Sebellius, R-1-Kans. (H.R. 12171).
George E. Shipley, D-23-Ill. (H.R. 11079).
Richard G. Shoup, R-1-Mont. (H.R. 14210).
Neal Smith, D-5-Iowa.
J. William Stanton, R-11-Ohio.
Tom Steed, D-4-Okla.
Frank Stubblefield, D-1-Ky. (H.R. 10235).
Burt L. Talcott, R-12-Calif. (H.R. 9459).
Frank Thompson, Jr., D-4-N.J. (H.R. 10139).

Vernon W. Thomson, R-3-Wis. (H.R. 9471).
Charles Thone, R-1-Neb. (H.R. 10732).
Victor V. Veysey, R-38-Calif. (H.R. 11601).
G. William Whitehurst, R-2-Va. (H.R. 9538).

Louis C. Wyman, R-1-N.H.
John M. Zwach, R-6-Minn. (H.R. 13567).
Tom Rallsback, R-19-Ill. (H.R. 15177).
David R. Obey, D-7-Wis. (H.R. 15312).
Lee H. Hamilton, D-9-Ind. (H.R. 15283).
Ella T. Grasso, D-6-Conn. (H.R. 15400).
Jack Brinkley, D-3-Ga. (H.R. 15421).

INDICATED WILLINGNESS TO COSPONSOR BUT NO BILL AS YET

Walter Flowers, D-5-Ala.
Bob Price, R-18-Tex.
J. Kenneth Robinson, R-7-Va.
William R. Roy, D-2-Kans.
Earl B. Ruth, R-8-N.C.

HAVE INDICATED SUPPORT FOR H.R. 7692 BUT HAVE NOT INTRODUCED AN IDENTICAL BILL

James Abourezk, D-2-S.D.
Mark Andrews, R-1-N.D.
Bill Archer, R-7-Tex.

Herman Badillo, D-21-N.Y.
Nick Begich, D-AL-Alaska.
Charles E. Bennett, D-3-Fla.
Tom Bevill, D-7-Ala.*
James A. Burke, D-11-Mass.*
Frank M. Clark, D-25-Pa.
James C. Cleveland, R-2-N.H.*
James C. Corman, D-22-Calif.*
Frank E. Denholm, D-1-S.D.
William L. Dickinson, R-2-Ala.
John D. Dingell, D-16-Mich.
W. J. Bryan Dorn, D-3-S.C.
John G. Dow, D-27-N.Y.
John Dowdy, D-2-Tex.
Joshua Ellberg, D-4-Pa.
Thomas S. Foley, D-5-Wash.
Cornelius Gallagher, D-13-N.J.
Joseph M. Gaydos, D-20-Pa.
Barry Goldwater, Jr., R-27-Calif.
George A. Goodling, R-19-Pa.
Kenneth J. Gray, D-21-Ill.
Charles S. Gubser, R-10-Calif.
James A. Haley, D-7-Fla.
Margaret M. Heckler, R-10-Mass.
H. John Heinz, III, R-10-Pa.
David N. Henderson, D-3-N.C.
Louise Day Hicks, D-9-Mass.*
William L. Hungate, D-9-Mo.
Harold T. Johnson, D-2-Calif.
John Kyl, R-4-Iowa.
Delbert L. Latta, R-5-Ohio.
Torbert H. Macdonald, D-7-Mass.
William S. Moorhead, D-14-Pa.
Peter A. Peyser, R-25-N.Y.
Walter E. Powell, R-24-Ohio.
Richardson Preyer, D-6-N.C.
Melvin Price, D-24-Ill.
Albert H. Quile, R-1-Minn.
Teno Roncallo, D-AL-Wyo.
Paul S. Sarbanes, D-4-Md.
John F. Seiberling, D-14-Ohio.
Robert L. F. Sikes, D-1-Fla.
Robert Stephens, Jr., D-10-Ga.
Robert O. Tiernan, D-2-R.I.
Jerome R. Waldie, D-14-Calif.
Jame L. Whitten, D-2-Miss.
William B. Widnall, R-7-N.J.
Gus Yatron, D-6-Pa.
C. W. Bill Young, R-8-Fla.
Clement J. Zablocki, D-4-Wis.
Wm. P. Culin, Jr., D-6-Ky.
John W. Byrnes, R-8-Wis.
James R. Mann, D-4-S.C.

H.R. 7211 AND ITS IMPACT UPON WILDLIFE REFUGES

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, legislation, H.R. 7211, pending before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs could have a substantial impact upon the

*Cosponsors of Chamberlain bill

National Wildlife Refuge System. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which has jurisdiction over our refuge system, I recently wrote Secretary of the Interior Morton to request his comments upon H.R. 7211 and its impact upon refuges.

Under date of June 7, 1972, I received a reply from the Department of the Interior's Legislative Counsel, Mr. Frank A. Bracken, indicating that the Department shares my particular concern that the version of H.R. 7211 being considered by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will place the National Wildlife System in jeopardy.

For the information of my colleagues, I include the text of the Department's letter to me, as well as the text of each of the enclosures mentioned therein, at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., June 7, 1972.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: In the Secretary's absence I am taking the liberty of responding to your letter dated May 25, 1972, regarding the House Interior Committee print of H.R. 7211.

You indicated your particular concern that the Committee print might place the National Wildlife Refuge System in jeopardy. The Department shares your concern. I attach for your information a copy of a letter which Secretary Morton sent to Chairman Aspinall which expresses the Department's principal objections to the Committee print and which states that Title IV of the print which deals with public lands is unacceptable to the Administration. The letter states that section 404 would have a devastating effect on the National Wildlife Refuge System. That section would terminate all existing withdrawals of more than 5,000 acres after ten years unless Congress grants an extension. Attached hereto is a list by State of National Wildlife Refuges which would be affected. As you can see, it totals almost 25 million acres which is five-sixths of the entire system. Unless Congress acted within the ten year period, this priceless wildlife habitat would become open to multiple use management, including mining, timber cutting, livestock grazing and hunting.

Also attached is a list of units in the National Park System totaling over 9 million acres which would be similarly affected.

Another section of the bill which we feel will be of concern to you is section 502(a) which would repeal all expressed or implied appropriations authorizations for administration of public lands that contain no dollar limitations. This would affect most of the appropriation authority of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and the National Park Service. Lists for each bureau are attached.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK A. BRACKEN,
Legislative Counsel.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., May 23, 1972.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you know, two of the top priority pieces of environmental legislation for my Department as well as for the Nixon Administration are the National Land Use Policy Act (H.R. 4332) and the Natural Resource Lands Management Act (H.R.

14009). I have, therefore, been following with deep interest the progress of your Committee on this legislation.

The May 9, 1972, Committee Print of H.R. 7211 combines land use legislation and public lands legislation in a single bill.

The land use portion of the bill contains many of the strong points of the Administration's proposal and reflects a bipartisan effort to provide the country with an effective mechanism for dealing with land use problems. While I feel that the land use portions of the Committee Print go a long way towards meeting the Administration's objectives in this area, I feel that they would be immeasurably strengthened by the first six amendments set forth in the attachment hereto. The first of these would assure that States do not omit designating areas of critical environmental concern to the Nation and having designated them, do not fail to protect them. The second gives emphasis to the special environmental value of wetlands in the coastal zones and estuaries.

The third proposed amendment would insure that the expertise of the Department of Housing and Urban Development is utilized in reviewing State land use plans and that State land use plans are consistent with HUD programs.

The fourth would require Federal actions to be consistent with approved State land use plans and the fifth would authorize the President to establish guidelines for Federal agencies to assist them in carrying out the requirements of the Act. The various activities of many Federal agencies have a major impact on land use and for this reason it is important that the Executive be able to assure maximum coordination and consistency of those activities with State plans.

I was pleased to see that the Committee adopted a level of funding closer to the Administration's proposal. In providing funding authorization only for fiscal years 1973, 1974 and 1975, the Committee has created an inconsistency with section 205(b) which imposes penalties on a State not found eligible for funding by the beginning of fiscal years 1976, 1977 and 1978. The sixth amendment would extend the funding for an additional three years to support the penalties. As I indicated, these amendments would greatly strengthen the land use provisions of the Committee Print. On balance, however, we view these provisions as a constructive and positive approach to a complicated and urgent problem.

We continue to feel that the various advisory and coordinating boards provided for in title III would be cumbersome and an unnecessary Federal expense.

The public lands portion of the bill which is title IV is still unacceptable to the Administration. That title would establish common management policies for all Federal lands, including those which have been set aside for specific uses, such as parks or wildlife refuges as well as those BLM lands which are under multiple use management.

The history of the public domain has been largely one of segregation of the land on the basis of what was considered to be higher uses, leaving the remainder open to private entry or to multiple use management. Thus the unique scenic splendors such as the Grand Canyon and the Valleys of the Yellowstone and Yosemite were withdrawn from private entry and multiple use and placed into the National Park System. Later the National Wildlife Refuge System was created and prime wildlife habitat, waterfowl nesting areas and the like were similarly withdrawn from private entry and multiple use and were dedicated to the preservation of our priceless wildlife heritage. The National Forest System was created to preserve the Nation's great forests for timber production and for other uses. Around each of these systems a set of management regulations has been developed, both statutory and ad-

ministrative, to preserve and promote the particular values which the system was designed to protect.

We view the inclusion of all these lands under a common multiple use management system as a setback in the long efforts of Congress and the Executive Branch to protect natural resource values.

The sections dealing with Executive withdrawals will deprive my Department of the ability to move quickly to protect some of the Nation's most priceless natural resources and to set aside specific areas for specific areas for specific public purposes.

Section 403(b) would authorize the Interior Committees of either House of Congress to veto within 60 days an Executive classification which would exclude any use from a tract larger than 5,000 acres for longer than one year. This would delay Federal programs and constitutes a highly questionable delegation of Congressional power to a legislative committee.

Section 404 would terminate all existing withdrawals of more than 5,000 acres after ten years unless Congress grants an extension. This would have a devastating effect on the National Wildlife Refuge System which consists of 30 million acres, 25.5 million of which were included by Executive withdrawal. Section 404 would open this priceless wildlife habitat to multiple use management including mining, livestock grazing, hunting, and timber production.

It would have an equally disastrous effect on 9.3 million acres which were placed into the National Park System by Executive action. It would affect, in addition, approximately 160 million acres of National Forests which were transferred from public domain to the National Forest System by Executive action.

The Executive withdrawal is an essential management tool to reconcile the many competing demands on the public domain and to preserve important public values against non-discretionary private appropriation. I do not contend that the Executive should have unlimited discretion in this area. I strongly believe that effective public land management requires mutual trust and cooperation between Congress and the Executive Branch. For a number of years the Department of the Interior has notified your Committee of all proposed withdrawals exceeding 5,000 acres. We have, moreover, used the withdrawal authority with restraint. In 1970, 96,924 acres were withdrawn while previous withdrawals on 964,961 acres were revoked.

Section 502(c) would require reauthorization of all open ended authorizations. We have no idea at present how many statutes this will repeal. However, we estimate that the number will be substantial and that reauthorization of a very large number of programs will entail a delay and expense and a burden on the legislative process which is unjustifiable.

The last six amendments on the attached list would delete these offending provisions, and I strongly urge you to adopt them.

In conclusion I feel that the Committee has made real progress in the land use provisions. As you know, the Senate is also making good progress along the same lines as you have in title II. In this connection I attach a copy of a letter which I have just sent to Senator Jackson on this subject. There appears to be a good possibility of the two Houses getting together on a good land use bill.

The public lands portion of H.R. 7211 presents major difficulties for the Administration. The provisions I have enumerated in this letter are unacceptable. In view of this, perhaps the best solution would be to separate the land use provision and the public lands provision in the interest of giving the Nation a much needed land use bill.

I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of this letter to the other members of the Committee.

Sincerely yours,

ROGERS MORTON,
Secretary of the Interior.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO COMMITTEE PRINT
DATED MAY 9, 1972, OF H.R. 7211

1. p. 58, line 12—add new paragraph 8 as follows:

"(8) In designating areas of critical environmental concern the State has not excluded any areas deemed by the Secretary to be of critical environmental concern to the Nation."

2. p. 58, line 12—add a new paragraph 9 as follows:

"(9) In controlling land use in areas of critical environmental concern to the Nation, the State has procedures to prevent action (and, in the case of successive grants, the State has not acted) in substantial disregard for the purposes, policies, and requirements of its land use program."

"State laws, regulations, and criteria affecting areas and developmental activities listed in subsection (a) of this section are in accordance with the policy, purpose and requirements of this Act; and that State laws, regulations, and criteria affecting land use in the coastal zone and estuaries further take into account:

"(1) the aesthetic and ecological values of wetlands for wildlife habitat, food production sources for aquatic life, recreation, sedimentation control, and shoreland storm protection; and

"(2) the susceptibility of wetlands to permanent destruction through draining, dredging, and filling, and the need to restrict such activities."

3. p. 61, line 14—change the period to a comma and add "or that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is not satisfied that those aspects of the State's land use planning process dealing with large-scale development, key facilities, development, and land use of regional benefit, and new communities meet the requirements of section 201(c) (7) for funding of a land use planning grant."

4. p. 64, line 25—add a new section 207 as follows:

"Sec. 207(a). Federal projects and activities significantly affecting land use shall be consistent with State land use controls developed pursuant to section 201(c) (7) of this Act except in cases of overriding national interest. Program coverage and procedures provided for in regulations issued pursuant to section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 and title IV of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 shall be applied in determining whether Federal projects and activities are consistent with State land use controls developed pursuant to section 201(c) (7) of this Act."

(b) After December 31, 1974, or the date the Secretary approves a grant under section 201, whichever is earlier, Federal agencies submitting statements required by section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act shall include a detailed statement by the responsible official on the relationship of proposed actions to any State land use controls developed pursuant to section 201(c) (7) of this Act."

5. p. 64, line 25—add a new section 208 as follows:

"Sec. 208. The President is authorized to designate an agency or agencies to issue guidelines to the Federal agencies to assist them in carrying out the requirements of this Act."

6. p. 92, line 9—change "two" to "five".

7. p. 81, line 16-p. 82, line 13—strike section 403(b).

8. p. 85, line 15-p. 87, line 4—strike section 404.

9. p. 87, line 5-p. 90, line 20—strike section 405.

10. p. 92, line 12-24—strike section 502(a).

11. p. 95, line 1-p. 97, line 15—strike section 502(c).

12. p. 104, line 15-p. 105, line 6—strike and insert in lieu:

"(o) the term 'public lands' means all lands and interests in lands (including the renewable and nonrenewable resources thereof) now or hereafter administered by the Secretary through the Bureau of Land Management, except the Outer Continental Shelf."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., May 17, 1972.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you know, the National Land Use Policy Act of 1972, now before your Committee is one of the top priority pieces of environmental legislation of this Administration. I have been following very closely the progress of your Committee as it has been considering the legislation, and I want to commend the Committee for its efforts and for the very considerable progress which it has made in reconciling the various proposals into what I hope will be a landmark piece of legislation.

Committee Print number three combines many of the strong points of both S. 992, the Administration's proposal, and S. 632, the bill which you have sponsored. Frank Bracken, Legislative Counsel of this Department, has furnished the minority and majority counsels of the Committee a list of amendments which would bring Committee Print number three closely in line with the Administration's proposal. I attach a copy of that list for your easy reference.

Of the amendments set forth on that list, there are five which I consider particularly important.

Amendment numbered 5 would correct what I consider to be a major defect in the Committee Print. As drafted, section 302 would condition State eligibility for grants on the preparation of a variety of inventories, projections, and other planning data. Some of these are phrased so broadly as to require an almost endless effort, making the grant eligibility criteria uncertain and diverting the States efforts from what we consider to be the most critical land use issue which is land use controls. We, therefore, propose prefacing section 302 with language which would require simply a process for inventorying resources, projecting trends and gathering data.

Amendment numbered 12 would require the States to develop land use controls after three years instead of after five years as the Committee Print now provides. The effect of amendments numbered 5 and 12 is to require the States to concentrate on the critical aspect of the land use problem and to require it sooner.

Amendment numbered 20 parallels number 12 by imposing the sanctions after three years instead of after five.

Amendment numbered 21 and 22 reduce the sharing ratio to fifty percent and the authorized funding to \$20 million annually for Fiscal Years 1973-1977. This lower level of funding is consistent with the more selective effort which we feel should be encouraged.

There are a number of other amendments which would enhance the bill. The ones mentioned above are, however, particularly important and would, in my view, result in an effective land use bill.

Again let me commend the Committee for its effort.

Sincerely yours,

ROGERS MORTON,
Secretary of the Interior.

AMENDMENTS TO SENATE COMMITTEE PRINT 3
DATED MARCH 13, 1972

1. Page 6, line 17—strike all after ":", through line 20.

2. Page 7, after line 8, add new subsections (d) and (e) as follows:

102(d) The Congress further finds and declares that decisions about the use of land significantly influence the quality of the environment, and that present State and local institutional arrangements for planning and regulating land use of more than local impact are inadequate, with the result:

(1) that important ecological, cultural, historic and aesthetic values in areas of critical environmental concern which are essential to the well-being of all citizens are being irretrievably damaged or lost;

(2) that coastal zones and estuaries, flood plains, shorelands and other lands near or under major bodies or courses of water which possess special natural and scenic characteristics are being damaged by ill-planned development that threaten these values;

(3) that key facilities such as major airports, highway interchanges, and recreational facilities are inducing disorderly development and urbanization of more than local impact;

(4) that the implementation of standards for the control of air, water, noise, and other pollution is impeded;

(5) that the selection and development of sites for essential private development of regional benefit has been delayed or prevented;

(6) that the usefulness of Federal or federally assisted projects and the administration of Federal programs are being impaired; and

(7) that large-scale development often creates a significant adverse impact upon the environment.

(e) The Congress further finds and declares that there is a national interest in encouraging the States to exercise their full authority over the planning and regulation of non-Federal lands by assisting the States, in cooperation with local governments, in developing land use planning process including unified authorities, policies criteria, standards, methods, and processes for dealing with land use decisions of more than local significance.

3. Page 9, line 9—through page 11, line 3—strike and substitute in lieu:

"Sec. 202. The Secretary, to the extent he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act,

(1) develop and maintain a Federal Land Use Information and Data Center, with such regional branches as the Secretary may deem appropriate, which has on file such information pertaining to land use planning and management as the Secretary deems appropriate and useful;

(2) cooperate with the States and interstate agencies in the development of standard methods and classifications for the collection of land use data;

(3) make the information maintained at the Data Center available to Federal, interstate, State, and local agencies involved in land use planning and to the public;

(4) consult with other officials of the Federal Government responsible for the administration of Federal land use planning assistance programs to States, their political subdivisions, and other eligible agencies in order to coordinate such programs; and

(5) administer the grant program established under title II of this Act."

4. Page 11, line 4—through page 13, line 19—strike.

5. Page 16, line 16—strike and insert in lieu: "land use planning program which shall include a process for—"

6. Page 16, lines 17-19—strike.

7. Page 17, lines 16-19—strike.

8. Page 18, lines 2 and 6 and page 19, line 1—strike "The establishment of a method for".

9. Page 18, line 20—strike "The establishment of arrangements for".
 10. Page 18, lines 14-19—strike.
 11. Page 19, lines 7-10—strike.
 12. Page 19, after line 12—insert language from page 21, line 9 to page 23, line 15 (re-numbered as appropriate).

13. Page 19, line 14—change "process" to "program".

14. Page 20, line 18-21—strike.

15. Page 20, lines 22-24—strike.

16. Page 21, lines 1-8—strike.

17. Page 28, line 7 to page 30, line 10—strike.

18. Page 31, line 13—change period to comma and add "as determined pursuant to subsection (a) of this section".

19. Page 31, line 17—strike all after "agencies" through "section 302;" on page 31, line 20.

20. Page 33, line 19—strike and insert in lieu "by June 30, 1975, shall".

Page 33, line 19—strike "The following" and insert "1976" after "fiscal year".

Page 33, line 20—strike and insert in lieu "eligible by June 30, 1976".

Page 33, line 21—strike "The following".

Page 33, line 22—insert "1977" after "Fiscal year" and strike "Seven years from the".

Page 33, line 23—strike "date of enactment of that act" and insert in lieu "June 30, 1977".

Page 33, line 24—strike "The following" and add, "1978" after "Fiscal Year".

24. Pages 34 and 35—subsections (d) and (e) should be similarly amended.

21. Page 36, line 9—change "ninety" to "fifty".

Page 36, line 10—add a period after "programs".

Page 36, lines 11-14—strike.

22. Page 36, line 19—after "need," add "extent of coastal zone".

23. Page 38, line 19—change "\$100,—" to "\$20,—". P. 38, line 20 strike "annually" and insert "in each of fiscal years 1973-1977".

NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGES WHICH WOULD BE AFFECTED BY § 404 OF H.R. 7211 (COMMITTEE PRINT, MAY 9, 1972)

Alaska

Hazen Bay Migratory Bird Refuge, \$6,800.
 Aleutian Islands Bird Refuge, \$2,720,426.
 Bering Sea Bird Refuge, \$41,113.
 Cape Newenka Bird Refuge, \$265,000.
 Semidi Bird Refuge, \$8,422.
 Tuxedui Bird Refuge, \$6,439.
 Kenai Big Game Range, \$1,730,000.
 Kodiak Big Game Range, \$1,815,000.
 Nunivak Big Game Range, \$1,109,347.
 Simeonof Big Game Range, \$10,442.
 Arctic National Wildlife Range, \$8,894,624.
 Clarence Rhode Wildlife Range, \$2,887,005.
 Izembek Wildlife Range, \$320,000.
 Total \$19,814,618.

Arizona

Havasu Migratory Bird Refuge, \$22,109.
 Imperial Migratory Bird Refuge, \$16,501.
 Cabeza Prieta Game Range, \$860,000.
 Koya Game Range, \$660,000.
 Gila River Coordination Area, \$6,896.
 Total \$1,565,506.

California

Imperial Migratory Bird Refuge, \$6,309.
 Salton Sea Migratory Bird Refuge, \$23,424.
 Total \$29,733.

Colorado

Brown's Park Migratory Bird Refuge, \$6,794.
 Total \$6,794.

Idaho

Deer Flat Migratory Bird Refuge, \$11,276.
 Minidoka Migratory Bird Refuge, \$24,363.
 Total \$35,539.

Louisiana

Breton Migratory Bird Refuge, \$9,047.
 Total \$9,047.

Montana

Benton Lake Migratory Bird Refuge, \$12,234.
 Bowdon Migratory Bird Refuge, \$11,936.
 Red Rock Lakes Migratory Bird Refuge, \$7,265.
 U.L. Bend Migratory Bird Refuge, \$36,575.
 Charles M. Russell Migratory Bird Refuge, \$736,505.
 Total \$804,515.

Nebraska

North Platte Migratory Bird Refuge, \$5,047.
 Fort Niobrara Big Game Range, \$14,389.
 Total \$19,436.

Nevada

Fallon Migratory Bird Refuge, \$17,901.
 Ruby Lake Migratory Bird, \$7,438.
 Sheldon Antelope Big Game Range, \$552,043.
 Desert N.W. Range, \$1,588,055.
 Total \$2,165,437.

New Mexico

Bitter Lake Migratory Bird Refuge, \$12,395.
 San Andres Big Game Range, \$57,215.
 Total \$69,610.

Oklahoma

Salt Plains Migratory Bird Refuge, \$19,314.
 Wichita Mountain Big Game Range, \$58,492.
 Total \$77,806.

Oregon

Malheur Big Game Range, \$57,864.
 Hart Mountain Big Game Range, \$182,925.
 Summer Lake Big Game Range, \$7,127.
 Total \$247,916.

Utah

Fish Springs Migratory Bird Refuge, \$14,217.
 Total \$14,217.

Washington

Columbia Migratory Bird Refuge, \$12,365.
 Little Pend Oreille Big Game Range, \$8,591.
 Lenore Coordination Area, \$6,000.
 Total \$26,956.

Wyoming

Zeedskadee Migratory Bird Refuge, \$7,406.
 Pathfinder Migratory Bird Refuge, \$13,795.
 Total \$21,201.
 Total 15 States \$24,908,331.

UNITS OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM WHICH WOULD BE AFFECTED BY COMMITTEE PRINT DATED MAY 9, 1972, OF H.R. 7211.

Alaska

Glacier Bay National Monument, \$2,803,586.
 Katmai National Monument, \$2,792,137.
 Total \$5,595,723.

Arizona

Chiricahua National Monument, \$10,645.
 Grand Canyon National Monument, \$193,019.
 Marble Canyon National Monument, \$25,962.
 Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument, \$328,691.
 Saguaro National Monument, \$77,122.
 Wupatki National Monument, \$35,232.
 Total \$670,671.

California

Channel Islands National Monument, \$18,166.
 Craters of the Moon National Monument, \$53,545.
 Death Valley National Monument, \$1,883,082.
 Joshua Tree National Monument, \$513,396.
 Lava Beds National Monument, \$46,238.
 Pinnacles National Monument, \$14,177.
 Total \$2,528,604.

Colorado

Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument, \$13,317.

Colorado National Monument, \$17,311.
 Great Sand Dunes National Monument, \$35,529.
 Total \$86,157.

Florida

Fort Jefferson National Monument, \$47,125.
 Total \$47,125.

Georgia

Fort Pulaski National Monument, \$5,356.
 Total \$5,356.

New Mexico

White Sands National Monument, \$140,247.
 Chaco Canyon National Monument, \$20,989.
 Bandelier National Monument, \$29,661.
 Total \$190,897.

Utah

Cedar Breaks National Monument, \$6,154.
 Dinosaur National Monument, \$198,615.
 Natural Bridges National Monument, \$7,126.
 Total \$211,895.
 Total 8 States, \$9,316,428.

AUTHORIZATIONS APPLICABLE TO ACQUISITION, DEVELOPMENT, AND MANAGEMENT OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM WITHOUT SPECIFIC APPROPRIATION LIMITATIONS

GENERAL AUTHORITIES

1. Act of August 8, 1953 (67 Stat. 495), as amended (16 U.S.C. 1b-d), providing for emergency assistance, erection and maintenance of utility facilities, transportation of employees, utility services for concessionaires, supplies and rental of equipment, contracts for utility facilities, rights-of-way, operation and maintenance of motor and other equipment.

2. Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended (16 U.S.C. 1, 2-4), authorizing supervision and management of national parks and monuments.

3. Act of May 10, 1926 (44 Stat. 491; 16 U.S.C. 11), authorizing contracts for medical attention for employees.

4. Act of July 3, 1926 (44 Stat. 900; 16 U.S.C. 12, 13), authorizing aid to visitors and employees in emergencies.

5. Act of May 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 729; 16 U.S.C. 14a), authorizing appropriations for printing signs.

6. Act of June 28, 1941 (55 Stat. 350; 16 U.S.C. 14c), authorizing appropriations for preparation and recording of title evidence.

7. Act of March 7, 1928 (45 Stat. 238; 16 U.S.C. 15), authorizing purchase of waterproof footwear.

8. Act of April 18, 1930 (46 Stat. 219; 16 U.S.C. 16), authorizing provision of central warehouses.

9. Act of May 26, 1930 (46 Stat. 381; 16 U.S.C. 17, a-j), authorizing purchase of equipment and supplies, services and accommodations for public, procurement of supplies, materials, and services in emergencies for permittees, care and removal of indigents, reimbursement for lost or destroyed equipment, hire of animals and property of employees, travelling expenses of employees, expenses for attendance of meetings.

10. Act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 885; 16 U.S.C. 17j-2), authorizing appropriations for certain federally owned lands and roads, administration of areas devoted to recreational use pursuant to cooperative agreements, local transportation and subsistence for cooperators, administration of C&O Canal, educational lectures, travel expenses, establishment of water rights, rights-of-way of water line partly outside boundaries of Mesa Verde National Park, telephone service.

11. Act of June 23, 1936 (49 Stat. 1894; 16 U.S.C. 17k), authorizing study of park and recreational programs.

12. Act of July 1, 1955 (69 Stat. 242; 16 U.S.C. 18f), authorizing acquisition and loan of museum objects.

13. Act of August 18, 1970 (84 Stat. 825),

authorizing transportation of employees to isolated areas, recreation facilities, appointment of advisory committees, purchase of specialized equipment, provide for sale or lease of services, resources, or water, acquire air-conditioning units for vehicles, sell products and services from living exhibits.

14. Act of June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225; 16 U.S.C. 431), authorizing the President to establish national monuments.

15. Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666), as amended (16 U.S.C. 461-467), authorizing survey, acquisition, preservation, administration of historic sites, and establishing Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments.

SPECIFIC AREA LEGISLATION

1. Act of March 1, 1872 (17 Stat. 32)—Yellowstone NP.
2. Act of September 25, 1890 (26 Stat. 478)—Sequoia NP.
3. Act of February 7, 1905 (33 Stat. 702)—Yosemite NP.
4. Act of March 4, 1940 (54 Stat. 41)—Kings Canyon NP.
5. Act of March 2, 1899 (30 Stat. 993)—Mount Rainier NP.
6. Act of June 29, 1906 (34 Stat. 616)—Mesa Verde NP.
7. Act of March 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 69)—Petrified Forest NP.
8. Act of May 22, 1902 (32 Stat. 202)—Crater Lake NP.
9. Act of January 9, 1903 (32 Stat. 765)—Wind Cave NP.
10. Act of July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 655)—Platt NP.
11. Act of June 20, 1935 (49 Stat. 393)—Big Bend NP.
12. Act of June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 608)—Saratoga NHP.
13. Act of May 11, 1910 (36 Stat. 354)—Glacier NP.
14. Act of January 26, 1915 (39 Stat. 798)—Rocky Mtn. NP.
15. Act of August 9, 1916 (39 Stat. 442)—Lassen Volcanic NP.
16. Act of February 26, 1919 (40 Stat. 1175)—Grand Canyon NP.
17. Act of August 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 1342)—Chalmette NHP.
18. Act of April 25, 1947 (61 Stat. 52)—Theodore Roosevelt NHP.
19. Act of June 29, 1938 (52 Stat. 1241)—Olympic NP.
20. Act of June 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 262)—Cumberland Gap NHP.
21. Act of February 26, 1919 (40 Stat. 1178)—Acadia NP.
22. Act of November 19, 1919 (41 Stat. 356)—Zion NP.
23. Act of February 26, 1917 (39 Stat. 938)—Mount McKinley NP.
24. Act of March 4, 1921 (41 Stat. 1407)—Hot Springs NP.
25. Act of August 1, 1916 (39 Stat. 432)—Hawaii Volcanoes NP & Haleakala NP.
26. Act of July 26, 1955 (69 Stat. 376)—City of Refuge NHP.
27. Act of August 2, 1956 (70 Stat. 940), as amended—Virgin Islands NP.
28. Act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 593)—Bryce Canyon NP.
29. Act of September 14, 1950 (64 Stat. 849)—Grand Teton NP.
30. Act of May 14, 1930 (46 Stat. 279)—Carlsbad Caverns NP.
31. Act of June 2, 1926 (44 Stat. 686)—Moore's Creek NMP.

32. Act of July 25, 1956 (70 Stat. 651)—Horseshoe Bend NMP.

33. Act of June 2, 1936 (49 Stat. 1393)—Perry's Victory N. Mem.

34. Act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 2028)—Whitman Mission NM.

35. Act of March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1109)—Mount McHenry NM.

36. Act of February 14, 1931 (46 Stat. 1161)—Canyon de Chelly NM.

37. Act of August 25, 1937 (50 Stat. 804)—Pipestone NM.

38. Act of June 14, 1934 (48 Stat. 958)—Ocmulgee NM.

39. Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 665)—Fort Stanwix NM.

40. Act of August 29, 1935 (49 Stat. 958)—Andrew Johnson NM.

41. Act of August 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 897)—Ackia Battleground NM.

42. Act of March 19, 1936 (49 Stat. 1184)—Homestead NM.

43. Act of June 30, 1961 (75 Stat. 197)—Joshua Tree NM.

44. Act of May 18, 1938 (52 Stat. 407)—Natchez Trace Pkwy.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY FOR MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF REFUGE LANDS, HATCHERIES, AND RESEARCH FACILITIES

It is estimated in the President's budget for 1973 that the following amounts will be expended on public lands controlled by the Bureau.

a. Management and investigations of resources: \$50.7 million.

b. Construction: \$6.2 million.

The estimates were derived by computing the amounts budgeted separately for operations and development of hatcheries, wildlife refuges, fishery and wildlife research stations.

Following is a listing of Congressional acts that empower the Secretary of the Interior to expend appropriated funds for management and development of public lands that were acquired through established acquisition procedures.

1. Migratory Bird Conservation Act. (16 U.S.C. 715k).

2. Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956. (16 U.S.C. 742j).

3. Recreational Use of Conservation Areas Act. (16 U.S.C. 460k-4).

4. Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. (16 U.S.C. 590f).

5. Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act. (16 U.S.C. 666).

6. National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd-668ee.)

AID FOR FIREMEN

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I have recently introduced a bill which I think is vitally important for our Nation's firemen. This bill would exempt the first \$5,000 of a fireman's gross income from the Federal income tax.

The purpose of this measure is to aid in the recruitment of firemen at a time when local governments are having an increasingly difficult time raising tax revenue for higher firemen's salaries. Thus, this measure is a form of revenue-sharing whereby communities with the greatest need in the area of fire protection would find it easier to attract firemen to their communities.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation's firemen routinely perform heroic and dangerous work for our local communities. I hope this bill will be passed by Congress so that we can enact this measure without delay.

UNION CARBIDE CORP. SPONSORS HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT FOR CONGRESSIONAL SEMINAR OF WASHINGTON WORKSHOPS FOUNDATION

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a young constituent of mine, Miss Jeanette Williams of Caldwell, Ohio, is studying here in Washington this week in the fifth annual series of the Washington Workshops Congressional Seminar. Jeanette, who just completed her senior year at Shenandoah High School, has maintained a marvelous academic and extra-curricular record during her high school years.

I am especially happy to welcome Jeanette to Washington for her participation in the fine and effective Washington Workshops seminar program for high school students. Jeanette's participation has been made possible by a scholarship grant under a splendid citizenship education program sponsored by the Union Carbide Corp. Each year this company recognizes outstanding merit and ability in a young person from each of their plant communities across the Nation. These students, chosen by their teachers and principals, are then presented with a full scholarship to attend the Washington Workshops seminars in American government. I can think of no finer way for a large corporation to demonstrate its interest in the youth of the Nation and a commitment to the continued strength and well-being of our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, my congratulations are extended to Miss Jeanette Williams and the Union Carbide Corp. for their true and positive involvement in the process and better understanding of our American government.

SENATE—Thursday, June 29, 1972

The Senate met at 8:30 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. PHILIP A. HART, a Senator from the State of Michigan.

SILENT PRAYER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART). This morning we shall open with a moment of silent prayer.

The Senate stood in silence.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the