By Mr. ROGERS (for himself, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ROY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MAZZOLI, and Mr. Mr. ROBISON of New York):

H.R. 15859. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize assistance for planning, development and initial operation, research, and training projects for systems for the effective provision of health care services under emergency conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 15860. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

H.R. 15861. A bill to end the war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HEINZ:

H.R. 15862. A bill to reduce income tax withholdings by an average 5 percent and to strengthen the minimum income tax provision; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEELE:

H.R. 15863. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to prohibit tampering with any device or element of design installed in or on a motor vehicle or motor vehicle engine in compliance with regulations under section 202 of the Clean Air Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. VANIK, Mr. PIKE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. RYAN, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. OBEY, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. REES, Mr. METCALFE, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BINGHAM, and Mr. DELLUMS):

H.J. Res. 1250. Joint resolution: Authorization of the President of the United States to approve an interim agreement between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself and Mr. SCHEUER):

H.J. Res. 1251. Joint resolution. Authorization of the President of the United States to approve an interim agreement between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey):

H.J. Res. 1252. Joint resolution: Authorization of the President of the United States to approve an interim agreement between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; to the Commitee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAZZOLI (for himself, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. RUNNELS):

H.J. Res. 1253. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the term of office of Members of the House of Representatives and the eligibility of such Members to be elected to the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H.J. Res. 1254. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the busing or involuntary assignment of students; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN for himself and Mr. FUQUA):

H. Con. Res. 642. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of the report of the Commission on the Organization of the Government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. NIX:

H. Con. Res. 643. Concurrent resolution relative to outstanding debts due the United States of America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H. Con. Res. 644. Concurrent resolution calling upon all parties to the 1949 Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War to insure respect for that convention by persuading North Vietnam to fulfill its obligations under the convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON (for himself, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. HANLEY):

H. Res. 1039. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct studies and investigations within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials, were presented and referred as follows:

403. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Federal lands adjacent to Point Mugu State Park; to the Committee on Armed Services.

404. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to creating a national park in Los Angeles County; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

405. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 15864. A bill for the relief of Robert Dona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 15865. A bill for the relief of Richard L. Krzyzanowski: to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 15866. A bill for the relief of Beatrice Dascil Aquino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAMES V. STANTON:

H.R. 15867. A bill for the relief of Mikolaj Kormanicki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLURE:

H.R. 15868. A bill for the relief of Jose Ramon Santa Maria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE PENSACOLA STORY

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, horror stories make their way into the headlines without difficulty. Scare stories are a close second. Constructive stories seldom get more than a bare mention. There is a constructive story which I have noted and which I consider highly meritorious. It tells the history of the care and treatment of psychiatric patients in the Pensacola, Fla., area. A key line is, and I quote:

Pensacola had no psychiatrists, psychiatric beds, Guidance Clinic—really no mental health effort of any sort prior to 1948.

What has happened is largely the work of Dr. Philip B. Phillips, who tells the story. The accomplishments in Pensacola in this area constitute a fine model for every community. I am happy to submit Dr. Phillips' story for printing in the RECORD:

THE PENSACOLA STORY

(By Philip B. Phillips, M.D.)

(Note: This article is a condensation of Dr. Phillips' history of the care and treatment of psychiatric patients in Pensacola and the Escambia County area.)

Pensacola had no psychiatrists, psychiatric beds, Guidance Clinic—really no mental health effort of any sort prior to 1948. That year members of the Escambia County Medical Society determined that their patients should not have to go 210 miles to New Orleans or 360 miles to Jacksonville for evaluation and treatment. Dr. W. C. Payne Sr., president-elect of the Florida Medical Association, Dr. Sidney G. Kennedy, president of the Escambia County Medical Society, and Dr. Herbert L. Bryans, president of the Florida State Board of Health, beloved Pensacola physicians, sought the services of a young psychiatrist assigned to the Naval Air Training Command there. He responded willingly and began seeing patients late in the afternoon, evenings and on weekends with approval of his commanding officer and the Navy's Bureau of Medicine and Surgery.

These events initiated the cooperation of physicians, community leaders, hospital boards and administrators which has continued over more than two decades. The results have included one solution to the community's mental health problems.

A PSYCHIATRIST AND GUIDANCE CLINIC

When Baptist Hospital opened in October 1951, two rooms for psychiatric patients were made available on the medical floor. Escambia General Hospital had a small outbuilding, perhaps 25 feet square, where four disturbed patients could be treated if no one objected too much. When absolutely necessary, Pensacola Hospital, re-named Sacred Heart Hospital, permitted psychiatric admissions on the medical floor. In October 1952 the first civilian neuropsychiatrist began practice as a member of a group of other physicians. The local climate was not overly receptive. He was required to obtain the chief nurses' permission before his patients could be admitted and give assurance that they would not disturb the other patients.

Two years later the Child Guidance Clinic was established through efforts of parents, Junior Woman's Club, School Board and County Commissioners. A psychiatric social worker, clinical psychologist, secretary and volunteer neuropsychiatrist made up the initial staff which opened for service in the

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

basement of a school building, later moved to an ancient frame residence and still some years later to the ground floor of the newly built county health department building.

When pressured to assume responsibility for indigent adult psychiatric patients who had no other source of care, the staff of some six professionals set up a pilot program to determine if the service was really needed. Without compensation they conducted a weekly night clinic from 1957 to 1959. It met a growing need. The staff recommended that the Clinic become the Escambia County Guidance Clinic open to all age groups; the Board of Directors concurred after studying the patient load and services rendered.

MORE PSYCHIATRISTS AND HOSPITAL BEDS

In late 1954 a second psychiatrist entered private practice. A year later the first psychiatrist secured an associate, a former Navy flight surgeon who had recently completed psychiatric training. In 1955 the Navy doctor who initiated psychiatric consultative services at the request of Drs. Payne, Kennedy and Bryans was reassigned to Pensacola and warmly welcomed into resumption of his "moonlighting" practice by the three overworked psychiatrists.

The need for additional hospital beds increased with growth of the city and county. Baptist Hospital constructed the first of numerous additions in 1958 and established a 11-bed open area on the medical floor, the consensus at that time as to the best arrangement for such a service. The beautiful, four story, brick and glass Escambia General Hospital opened in 1961. One large first floor wing was reserved for the City-County Clinic, a charity service for indigents. From the standpoint of mental health needs, the greatest addition was a large floor west wing providing an open and closed psychiatric unit totaling 30 beds.

Psychiatric beds were increased from the initial two beds in 1951 to 17 by 1958 and to 43 in 1961.

That year the two psychiatrists in group practice added a third. A Pensacola native son returned to practice solo and the Navy doctor now a Captain approaching retirement joined with a colleague to construct a building for their offices looking toward full-time civilian practice.

Experience wtih the psychiatric section at Escambia General Hospital convinced local psychiatrists that a separate unit offered many advantages. This became the mode for local practice. Baptist Hospital in another new addition included a 19-bed psychiatric service which was formally opened in September 1964.

The following year the Catholic Order, Daughters of Charity, which had served the community at the Sacred Heart Hospital opened the new Sacred Heart Hospital with 250 beds and a modern 17-bed psychiatric service. This increased total psychiatric beds to 79 in the three hospitals.

The 19-bed psychiatric unit at Baptist Hospital became inadequate in 1968 and the hospital purchased a convalescent home immediately across the street. Its design fitted into the rehabilitation program of the hospital and meant an instant addition of 150 beds for extended care, progressive care, rehabilitation and mental health. The entire fourth floor was modified to provide a 38-bed psychiatric unit and in 1970 the south half of the third floor was converted from extended care into an expanded mental health unit, thus adding an additional 16 beds.

The staff of the 38-bed service at Baptist Hospital is typical of those at the other hospitals. Headed by a psychiatric nurse administrator, there is additionally a clinical nurse specialist, seven regular registered nurses trained as psychiatric nurses, a psychiatric social worker, 16 licensed practical nurses, six male psychiatric attendants, mostly premedical students, a ward clerk and two relief clerks plus the usual dietary and housekeeping staff who serve the entire building.

The ground floor provides not only an admission room and offices for the administrator and nursing supervisor but adequate facilities for physical therapy and complete rehabilitation facilities for both inpatients and outpatients. On the first floor also is a large reception room, beauty shop for patients and dining room and food service department for all patients who chose to leave their floors for meals.

MENTAL HEALTH CENTER DEVELOPED

About the time the Escambia County Guidance Clinic outgrew quarters at the health department building, the Congress passed the Community Mental Health Center Act. When state plans were called for, Florida's went in and the state was among the earliest to be approved for federal funding for construction of mental health centers.

Planning began to meet federal and state requirements for a facility at Pensacola. These included close cooperation by the three hospitals which would provide inpatient and night hospitalization, working agreements with the center staff which would provide a new Day Care Center, continued follow-up and after-care for state mental hospital returnees, expanded consultative services to the schools and Juvenile Court, and improved working relationships with Vocational Rehabilitation. These also included free exchange of records to promote continuity of care, ready access of staff to all participating units, joint inservice training programs, reciprocal consultative relationships and opportunities for research and evaluation.

In July 1968 the Escambia County Community Mental Health Center situated on a city block of property given by trustees of Baptist Hospital opened to patients. It consisted of three large one story buildings connected by passageways built with a $189,000 federal grant supplemented by $140,000 in local funds. It is currently staffed by two psychiatric nurses, six clinical psychologists, eight clinical social workers, five part-time clinical psychiatrists and one full-time psychiatrist, three educators, one full-time expert in special education, one part-time pharmacist, business administrator, part-time bookkeeper and seven secretaries.

The 1971 operating budget is slightly over $462,730. Source of this fund is roughly 30% federal, 28% state, 8% county, 13% fees, 8% United Fund, 6% School Board, and 7% other sources. The budget includes a $30,000 grant received from the Law Enforcement Planning Council to amplify a drug abuse program for youngsters. Recently the Northwest Florida Alcoholic Rehabilitation Clinic was absorbed into the Center.

Analysis of activities of the Center for the first eight months of 1970 reveals that an expenditure of $208,623 for salaries, utilities, supplies and depreciation provided 12,599 hours of direct treatment and consultation at a cost per hour of $15.34. This does not include several thousand hours of round-the-clock crisis calls or some 1,300 hours of professional time on calls to parents, schools and agencies, or the patients who have to be worked into regular schedules.

HIDDEN INGREDIENT

Pensacola has been progressive in the mental health field and successful in meeting the needs of patients. One ingredient in this success appears to be the friendly, enthusiastic person-to-person cooperation usually on a first name basis and a hearty optimistic can-do attitude on the part of key citizens, hospital administrators and leading physicians. Mix in aggressive public spirited psychiatrists willing to work hard at whatever they feel will benefit their community and this completes the recipe for success.

These psychiatrists enter into community life actively and are striking antitheses of the ivory tower dwellers. They have served as chief of staff at the major hospitals, president of the county medical society, on advisory councils to the Juvenile Court, Fine Arts Council, and many more. They appear as guest speakers and actively seek financial support for worthy projects. Their warm and friendly manner is seen in all interpersonal contacts. Talk community mental health to one of them and he appears to know everyone in town. It is not name dropping or a brash lack of dignity but an obvious respect for the other man.

Pensacola has not reached all its goals. There are needs, but somehow this Gulf Coast city, steeped in history yet strikingly alert to the future, will find a way to meet them in the outstanding manner it has in the recent past. With good citizens working amicably together any city could.

GOVERNMENT AND INFLATION: WHO'S TO BLAME?

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, inflation remains a matter of concern to the overwhelming majority of Americans. Any program which is aimed at reducing inflationary pressures must, initially, properly identify their cause. In many respects, we have failed to do this and, as a result, our efforts to reduce inflation have been less than successful.

Implicit in the program of wage and price controls which have been instituted as a means of reducing inflation is the theory that private enterprise is primarily to blame for such inflation. If business and labor are primarily to blame for inflation, it is only proper that an anti-inflation program deal with such causes. But if business and labor are not the responsible parties, programs which impose wage and price controls upon them will have little effect upon rising costs. This, unfortunately, seems to be the case.

Government itself is deeply involved in producing the inflation we face. Writing in the Public Interest, Prof. James W. Kuhn of Columbia University points out that wages of workers in Government have risen more than those of workers in the highly unionized industrial segment of the economy.

He notes that:

Studies by the Bureau of Labor Statistics indicate that firemen, policemen and public school teachers, among the three largest categories of government workers, have enjoyed far larger wage increases in recent years than those in private industry.

The Wall Street Journal, analyzing the real cause of inflation in our society, states that:

The Federal Government, in addition to constantly pushing up its own payroll, has done more than a little to increase State and local payrolls. Since 1965, grants in aid programs have increased more than two and a half times. It is a small wonder that Government employes, at all levels, now add up to nearly one-fifth of all wage and salary workers.

The attempt to curb inflation by placing regulations and limitations upon private enterprise but proceeding with deficit spending by Government is doomed to failure. The Wall Street Journal declared that:

In considering the nation's problems any government may find it easy to try to shift the blame elsewhere. Until government recognizes more clearly its own responsibility for the present inflation, though, this particular problem is not likely to go away.

I wish to share with my colleagues the editorial, "Who's To Blame," which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of June 16, 1972. This editorial follows:

WHO'S TO BLAME

Implicit in wage and price controls is the theory that the private sector is really to blame for inflation. Businessmen and labor unions have been acting irresponsibly, and a vigilant government has to coerce them into line.

That sort of reasoning never made a great deal of sense. The basic cause of our present inflation, as well as all those in the past, is irresponsible government monetary and fiscal policy. Controls at best only mask the effects of such policy; they do not eliminate them.

The government involvement with the inflation of wages and prices, moreover, goes even beyond inefficient financial management. How far it extends is shown by Columbia University economist James W. Kuhn in an article in The Public Interest, "The Riddle of Inflation—a New Answer."

It's true enough, for instance, that big industrial unions in recent years have put powerful upward pressure on wages. Yet Professor Kuhn notes that wages of workers in government, the service industries and wholesale and retail trade have risen more than those of workers in the highly unionized industrial segment of the economy.

"Comparable data for earnings of state and local government employes are not available," he continues, "but studies by the Bureau of Labor Statistics indicate that firemen, policemen and public school teachers, among the three largest categories of government workers, have enjoyed far larger wage increases in recent years than those in private industry."

Nor is it true that government and service workers, as a group, were so vastly underpaid that they still lag behind workers in comparable private jobs. Actually, municipal employes in a number of major cities enjoy pay advantages over their counterparts in private industry—and in the federal government.

Rising government and service wages obviously have added to the upward pressure on taxes, which in turn has fueled the wage demands of the industrial unions. "The great increase in the cost of public and private services," says Professor Kuhn, "has been the most important inflationary force in the economy."

The federal government, in addition to constantly pushing up its own payroll, has done more than a little to increase state and local payrolls. Since 1965, grants in aid programs have increased more than two and a half times. It's small wonder that government employes, at all levels, now add up to nearly one-fifth of all wage and salary workers.

Growing government spending, and the resulting upward pressure on payrolls, has usually been very well-intentioned. The aims have been to attack poverty, inadequate health care, poor housing and a host of other actual problems.

All too often, however, the programs have been badly devised or poorly executed or both. And in recent years there has been much too little effort to limit spending programs to the resources actually available; instead, in the late 1960s, a host of new social programs was stacked atop escalating outlays on Vietnam.

Perhaps the outstanding example of a failure to gauge the availability of resources was the launching, in 1965, of the huge new Medicare and Medicaid programs for the aged and the poor. The health care industry was so badly strained that medical costs leaped upward in a typical inflationary reaction.

The government's inflationary influence is sweeping. Construction wages and costs, for example, have been shoved upward with the help of the Davis-Bacon Act, which requires government contractors to pay the "prevailing" wage. In practice this has come to mean the prevailing union wage; if there is no union in the locality, the government may pick a union wage paid many miles away.

Professor Kuhn stresses that the large industrial unions do indeed hold a great deal of power over wage costs; he is merely arguing that the unions' power, in relation to the governmental influence, has been overrated. We would add that excessive union power has become a problem only because the unions for so long have benefitted from an excessively friendly government; Davis-Bacon is only one example.

In considering the nation's problems any government may find it easy to try to shift the blame elsewhere. Until the government recognizes more clearly its own responsibility for the present inflation, though, this particular problem is not likely to go away.

NATIONAL VOTER REGISTRATION MONTH

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, today I join a number of my colleagues in reintroducing a resolution authorizing the President to declare September 1972 "National Voter Registration Month." Recognizing the importance in our society of the individual's right to vote, we must set up effective means to bring citizens into the electoral process.

In light of our expanded voting population, particularly new 18- to 21-year-old voters, it has become increasingly important that we take a critical look at needed reforms of our voter registration process. It is a sad commentary when, in a system whose basic tenet is that the people's will is sovereign, 47 million Americans do not exercise their right to vote. Yet this is precisely what happened in 1968. This means that only 61 percent of America's potential voting population actually went to the polls. In comparable elections, Great Britain and Canada had turnouts of 76 percent, France 80 percent, West Germany 87 percent, Sweden and Denmark 89 percent.

Some will say that the 39 percent of the American people who did not vote in 1968 were simply apathetic. This may be true in some instances, but certainly not in all. Actually, many people feel that the door to the electoral process has been slammed in their faces. Archaic rules, arbitrary legal barriers, and assorted hurdles confront each voter attempting to register. These include residency requirements, outmoded registration procedures, and sheer voting inconvenience.

I am hopeful that this resolution will encourage all Americans to make needed changes in our voter registration process—changes which will insure that the maximum number of citizens will participate directly in the decisions that shape their lives.

BUSING PETITION GETS MAJOR PUSH

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, busing continues to be the primary local concern issue of citizens in Texas. Quality education is parents' top objective in progress for schools.

In Texas it was major news when Chairman CELLER scheduled the busing hearings before the Judiciary Committee. And personally I have been most appreciative of Chairman CELLER's fairness and patience in the hearings.

Back in Texas the leadership and position of "TIGER" TEAGUE is important. When he signed the Lent busing discharge petition this was front page news. TIGER is a strong advocate of the normal congressional process. But he said the time has come to sign the Lent discharge petition.

One of the South's greatest editors is Ray Zauber. His plain spoken column is widely read and expresses the community viewpoint. Zauber speaks in the Oak Cliff Tribune with conviction.

Below is the June 20 story by Ray Zauber in the Oak Cliff Tribune:

Hearings by the House Judiciary Committee on the volatile subject of school busing were arranged solely by Congressman Olin E. Teague in head-to-head discussions with Chairman Emanuel Celler.

As chairman of the Democratic caucus, Tiger Teague wields considerable influence on Capitol Hill. It would be safe to say that there is not another Southerner in Congress who could have exerted enough pressure on the salty Celler to bring the school matter before his committee.

An unabashed liberal, the crusty octogenarian runs a one-man show when controversy hovers about his committee. Unless Celler consents controversial judicial issues are never heard. Unless he nods affirmatively, no recommendation is reported out affirmatively.

To get the matter of busing before the committee was a considerable achievement of the Tiger from Texas. A forum was thus provided for those cities affected by adverse rulings on busing for balance.

While he was hopeful that some kind of action would be taken by the Judiciary Committee or even legislation might be drafted as a compromise to that offered by the President, Congressman Teague refused to sign a Discharge Petition which would force a constitutional amendment against forced busing.

Teague argued that he would lose his leverage by committing himself prematurely, even though his sympathies were a matter of record on the subject. Congressman Jim Collins, one of the leaders in the Discharge Petition movement, defended Teague's de-

cision even though one is a Republican and the other a Democrat.

In a press release last week, Teague reversed himself and announced that the time had come for his name to be added to the Discharge Petition. "Now convinced that no meaningful recommendations will emerge from the House Judiciary Committee, I am adding my name to the list of those seeking a constitutional amendment to prevent forced busing," Teague declared.

Thus a very powerful voice and influence has been added to the slowly-growing list of Representatives supporting an amendment offered by Congressman Norman Lent, a Democrat from Long Island, N.Y.

The Lent Amendment is short and sweet, merely stipulating that no busing for the sake of racial balance will be funded by the federal bureaus or extenuated by the federal judiciary.

After the busing hodgepodge which emerged from the conference committee in the Higher Education Bill, it is obvious that only an amendment will solve the sticky problems. President Nixon's recommendations are probably stymied by the recently-enacted Education Bill and all but dead.

No relief for the cities already saddled with massive busing schemes has been offered by the Congress or the President. This is a gross injustice to the busing cities for cases still in adjudication may be held in abeyance until January 1, 1974, under terms of the rider in the Education Bill.

Thus, Richmond has gotten relief but Charlotte will stagger under harsh busing edicts already ordered by the courts. Dallas may be in a grey area because the appeals court has not ruled on Judge William Taylor's plan now in operation.

Dozens of cities across the South, in Michigan and California and other selected states will continue to suffer because the language of the rider is vague and their appeals are already exhausted.

Law should be the same for one and all. Congress has already punished the South with sectional legislation on Civil Rights and school busing.

It is time to seek equal protection and equal justice for all of the geographic areas of the United States. The Lent Amendment would be a step in the right direction.

A EULOGY TO THE LATE HONORABLE GORDON CANFIELD

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, as our Nation deeply mourns the passing of our most distinguished former Congressman, the late Honorable Gordon Canfield, I place at this point in the RECORD the following eulogy in tribute to our highly respected statesman from New Jersey so eloquently presented by Dr. Omar N. Barth, minister of the Broadway Baptist Church of Paterson, N.J., at the weekly meeting of the Paterson Rotary Club, held in the Alexander Hamilton Hotel, June 22, 1972. This statement bespeaks the high esteem and lasting memorial that Mr. Canfield has achieved in the hearts of all of us who have had the privilege and honor of knowing him.

The eulogy follows:

A EULOGY IN TRIBUTE TO GORDON CANFIELD

The hearts of all of us are heavier today. A warm, delightful friend will no longer sit at our table, commenting on the passing parade, laughing at our stories, revealing some backstage scene he witnessed during thirty-seven exciting years in the Nation's Capital. The day before yesterday, June 20, 1972, Gordon Canfield passed away at the age of seventy-four.

Gordon Canfield was a politician. To some, that single word produces an instant image of someone who glad-hands everyone he meets, because he needs every vote he can get, who does you favors in October, so you will do him a favor in November.

There is another explanation not quite so cynical, not quite so jaundiced. It could be that a man is jovial and friendly simply because that's the way he is and he can't be anything else. It could be that a public official honestly believes he is also a public servant and that he cannot serve his people unless he knows them, and he cannot know them unless he feels it when they hurt.

All that I have ever known or observed in the years of my acquaintance with Gordon leads me to believe that his warmth was no political expedient. I never felt that he put a friendly hand on my shoulder because he had his eye on the first Tuesday in November.

I offer one simple line of evidence. Long after he had any need for your vote or mine, long after his desire for political position had vanished, that hand of warmth was still upon our shoulders, those thoughtful little expressions of concern were still in evidence.

Gordon Canfield's life and legislative achievements are written large in the Congressional Record. His initiation of, and support for, a multitude of causes and concerns are a matter of public knowledge. But they were not confined to the period when he was paid to do them, or when he was a friend of Presidents, and stood on occasion, front and center, under the lights of the Capitol dome. In the years of retirement he has continued to put his time and life at the service of city and community. Even the debilitating effects of a stroke did not side-line him very long.

Yet it is not that splendid record in the halls of Congress of which I speak, nor the indelible mark he made upon the Coast Guard Reserve as an arm of our National Defense, nor of the tremendous civic accomplishments which now belong to the history of Paterson and the County of Passaic. I call your attention rather to the little things that symbolize his greatness and will make him a cherished memory for many years to come.

How many times he delighted us all at these luncheons, popping up from his table to respond to a comment from the rostrum, to ask a pointed, relevant question at the end of a speaker's address, that forefinger of his raised high to call attention to some principle he held dear. I shall always remember Gordon for that—the way he pointed his finger up and never out.

Does not each of us have personal remembrance of commendatory words he gave us, letters of appreciation sent us, kindly notes about us in the Rotary Newsletter, often written because he had called us on the phone to ask what we'd been doing lately in our business or with our family.

Years ago I introduced him to a certain public speaker's weekly magazine. He promptly subscribed to it and frequently thanked me for the suggestion. Just two weeks ago, the last time I saw him, he asked if I still subscribed.

Gordon's pastor, at the Covenant Reformed Church, Dr. Jerry VanDerVeen, was recently privileged to give the invocation in the House of Representatives. The opportunity had been arranged for him through Gordon's thoughtfulness, and the kindness of our present Congressman, Robert Roe. He related to me how many of Gordon's old friends on Capitol Hill expressed their esteem for their former colleague. Dr. VanDerVeen told me something else that didn't surprise me either. He said, "Omar, I can vouch for his faith," going on to describe Gordon and his family's consistent attendance at church and the weekly Bible Class—of how he contributed so much to those discussions even with halting, hesitant speech.

What a comfort that faith must be to his beloved wife and sons today.

It was a political opponent who described Gordon Canfield as a man who did little things for little people. Whether that was a disparagement or a compliment, the description only makes taller the man who did great things for his country. Much more importantly, it made him a candidate for highest honors in the Kingdom of God.

It is written in the Book of Books: "Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world:

"For I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in:

"Naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me.

"Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungred, and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink?

"When saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee?

"Or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee?

"And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." (Matthew 25:34–40)

Will you stand with me now in silence, in the midst of your personal memories, and add at the end a prayer for those who love him most and knew him best.

POLLUTION BY NATURE AND MAN

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, spring is a season when a gentleman's fancy turns to special things and we enjoy fresh greenery and a new awakening of life. March winds carry children's kites, and April showers bring May flowers.

However, while all the countryside is blooming, subtle changes are taking place which should give us cause to stop and consider a serious problem that is growing worse every year.

The problem is erosion. Spring is the season when erosion from wind and rain is aggravated and is far worse than any other time of year. The April rains that bring May flowers also eat away topsoil at an alarming rate and deposit the silt in our streams. The March wind has caused farmers to lose entire crops, and in some cases, all material to full plow-

ing depth has been blown away in a single year. Water, for its part, has also ruined entire crops, and silt erosion in some areas reaches 3 tons per acre for a single inch of rain, leaving lifeless skeletons of once-fertile fields.

The interaction of natural erosive forces with those imposed by man is not well understood. In Soil Conservation Service study reports, scientists postulate that some stream trenching and gullying could be related to natural cyclic factors, and I discussed the role nature plays as a polluter in my comments of Monday, June 26. There is little doubt, however, that cultivation has increased runoff and erosion rates and prolonged the gullying cycle. The worst culprit in causing pollution and erosion is, of course, man.

The decisive factor that makes erosion problems worse in late winter and spring is the depletion of the vegetative cover on the land. The lack of cover is most acute in the spring, when plowed fields must lie unprotected until crops have been planted and receive the rains they need to grow.

Farm and ranch management practices can make a vast difference in the gravity of erosion problems, both in the spring and throughout the rest of the year. Eroded sediment yields for watersheds in various regions have been determined from reservoir studies and streamflow sampling programs. Results from about 50 studies in the Missouri River region range from negligible losses for well-managed plots to immense erosion rates on badly managed plots. For example, single storms have caused sheet erosion rates of over 20 tons per acre and annual losses have been measured at over 60 tons per acre. In the Missouri study area, a 20 ton per acre yearly sediment yield appears to be the average for mismanaged land, while well-managed land usually averaged less than 1 ton per acre. Erosion can therefore, be reduced up to 95 percent by simple conservation measures. These simple measures would also increase annual farm income by an average of $2.50 per acre.

Left to erode, our farms and ranch lands crumble into silt. Reservoirs, ponds, and canals fill up, sometimes in less than 15 years. Roads and railroads are silted over, and the public health and recreation are damaged. One of the most frustrating problems is that the silt carried by floods and rains fills flood control reservoirs and in turn makes floods more frequent and much harder to control. Programs to control and prevent siltation are obviously needed, and have formidable obstacles to overcome.

The bill I have introduced, H.R. 15596, empowers the Secretary of Agriculture to take the much-needed steps to bolster our faltering watershed program. The Secretary is authorized to make agreements and provide technical and other assistance to landowners in areas ranging through methods of cultivation and land utilization, the growing of vegetation, engineering operations, and other vital areas.

Possibly most important, the Secretary may initiate and accelerate nationwide research and education about erosion and related polultion. We desperately need to alert people to the problems of erosion and the resulting sediment and to the fact that the problem is already serious and is rapidly growing worse.

An estimated 4 billion tons of sediment drain from our farmlands into lakes and rivers every year. This sediment is the greatest single source of pollution in the country. Landowners must be alerted to the seriousness of the problem, and the needed information and assistance must be made available to them. The passage of H.R. 15596 would be an extremely simple act, but one which is urgently needed to clear the way for ending the complicated problems of erosion and pollution.

ARMS CONTROL AND MILITARY SPENDING

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, in light of the heightened interest in arms limitations growing out of the Moscow summit and the SALT discussions, the people of our Nation might expect to see a slackening of the massive arms inventory and look forward to a reduction of the onerous tax burden needed to support these expensive weapons of war.

But no. Apparently, this is not the case. With an ironic Orwelian rationale we hear of a need for different weapons.

In a recent radio broadcast, commentator David Brinkley delivered a number of pertinent observations on this seeming paradox. His comments are worthy of thoughtful attention. Mr. Brinkley, in his succinct and lucid exposition, lays bare the need for a thorough and prompt examination of the logic that President Nixon and his Secretary of Defense propound that leads to more and more weapons at ever-increasing cost to the taxpayer despite an impending arms limitation agreement.

Mr. Brinkley's comments are from his program "Report and Commentary," broadcast June 20 by NBC radio.

The comments are as follows:

DAVID BRINKLEY RADIO COMMENTS—JUNE 20, 1972

Whatever happens, peace or war . . . arms agreements or no arms agreements . . . the military always winds up spending more . . . and apparently nobody can stop it. Back in a minute.

Soon after President Nixon came back from Russia with an agreement to reduce the building of some types of military hardware . . . there is Defense Secretary Laird before the Senate . . . asking more money to build other types of military hardware. The people of this country may be forgiven if they find this bewildering. So do many members of the Senate.

Two or three years ago there was talk of a "peace dividend." Meaning that when the Viet Nam war started, the Pentagon was spending about 50 billion dollars a year, not fighting a war. When the war expanded . . . it began spending 80 billion—the original 50, plus another 30 for the war. A person might, therefore, assume that when the war ended . . . all or most of the 30 billion might be saved. But no. When the American commitment was reduced to a fraction of what it had been . . . there was no peace dividend. On the contrary, as the war drags toward an end the Pentagon wants not less money but more. To catch up on weapons development neglected during the war, it said. If they were developing weapons with 50 billion before the war . . . it is not clear why they couldn't develop weapons with the same 50 billion during the war. In any case, the talk of a peace dividend is only a memory. There is none.

Then Mr. Nixon in Russia agreed to reduce the building of heavy weapons, an agreement widely approved. And so it was assumed that spending for weapons could be reduced. But no, there's Secretary Laird asking not less money but more.

If the Federal Government were a private enterprise, it would be bankrupt already . . . running billions in the red every year. Interest on the debt is now the third biggest national expense behind Defense and Welfare. And yet, somehow, the cost of an adequate military machine seemingly cannot be controlled. The American people might legitimately wonder why.

Military spending might be seen more sympathetically if, for example, the armed services were less wasteful in their use of manpower—such as sending 100 thousand men to war and having 80 thousand or more doing administrative work and 20 thousand or less doing the fighting. The buying of gold plated weapons far more expensive and elaborate than necessary. Maintaining bases around the world in excessive numbers. Duplicating and competing forces in three separate military services. Failing to get weapons produced at anywhere near the stated price. The C5A. Firing people who try to prevent this. Buying and then discarding super-complicated weapons that never work.

Laird told the Senate peace cannot be bought cheaply. But they're not buying peace. They're buying weapons.

David Brinkley, NBC News, Washington.

SCHOOL BUSING

HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, recent court decisions on school busing to achieve a racial balance in our public schools are of concern in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan as they are throughout the State. In my July newsletter to constituents, I restated my position on the role of Congress in the matter of school busing to achieve racial balance. I wrote as follows:

One evening last December we were invited to sit in the President's box at the Kennedy Center here in Washington. Our hosts were Mr. and Mrs. John Ehrlichman. Mr. Ehrlichman is one of the President's closest advisors. During the intermission our conversation turned to the busing issue, the assignment and transportation of pupils in order to achieve a racial balance in the schools. Court-ordered busing already was in effect in Michigan and some other states.

In the 1964 Civil Rights Act, Congress said in so many words that desegregation did not mean the assignment or transportation of students to overcome a racial imbalance in any schools.

The Courts either had ignored that language in the statute or had explained it away. Many members of the House, exasperated by the Courts' high-handed disposition of the 1964 language, had concluded a Constitutional Amendment would be required to set the matter straight and several proposals already had been introduced. During our conversation, I expressed to Mr. Ehrlichman my belief that school children should not be assigned and transported to schools far from home merely to achieve a racial balance in every school.

On the other hand, boards of education should be required to maintain an equal excellence of faculty, facilities and programs in all schools. I said further that Congress has power to deal with the problem legislatively and that an effective law would be preferable to a Constitutional Amendment. When Congress deals with an issue legislatively it retains control over the law.

If the Courts interpret a statute differently than Congress intended, Congress may change the law. If the Courts say a Congressional Act fails to conform to the Constitution, Congress may act again. But when language is written into the Constitution, Congress cannot reach it. Constitutional provisions become tools in the hands of the Courts, and whatever the Supreme Court says they mean, that they mean. So, on the subject of busing to achieve racial balance in the schools, a Constitutional provision should be resorted to only if the Congress is found without power to deal with the issue legislatively. I urged continued search for a legislative solution. We would, however, ask for hearings on the Constitutional Amendment so that the whole subject could be explored.

Soon after the 1972 session commenced, the Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee scheduled hearings on the busing issue to begin March 1. As a matter of fact, they got underway during the last week in February. There was a mood of urgency, but a large number of witnesses wanted to be heard so that the subcommittee was kept busy with them until the Easter recess.

Then, during the recess, President Nixon proposed a legislative solution. He asked for the introduction of two bills, one an 18-month moratorium on further Court-ordered busing and the other an equal educational opportunity measure which, if enacted and implemented, would make busing to achieve racial balance unnecessary. The bill proposing permanent legislation, the equal opportunity act, went to the House Committee on Education and Labor. The moratorium bill went to the Judiciary Committee.

When the Judiciary hearings resumed following the Easter recess, their thrust was toward the legislative proposal instead of Constitutional Amendment. In May the hearings concluded but the subcommittee has taken no further action either on the moratorium or the Constitutional Amendment. Nor has the Education and Labor Committee progressed beyond the hearing stage on the President's equal education opportunity proposal.

Last November, when the House passed the Education Amendments Act of 1972, it attached by floor amendment some anti-busing provisions. They prohibited the use of federal funds to transport either pupils or teachers, or to purchase buses in order to achieve racial balance in any school. They prohibited any federal agency from requiring or urging state and local education agencies to use their state or local funds for that purpose. And they stayed the effect of any Court order requiring busing until all appeals had been exhausted or the time for appeal had expired. When these amendments reached the Senate they were toned down and, although the House twice instructed its conferees to hold firm for the House-passed versions of the anti-busing amendments, the end product contains modifying phrases which considerably weaken the original language.

On June 23, the President signed the Education Amendments into law, including the weakened version of the anti-busing amendments. He denounced them as not strong enough and I agree with him.

Still, I voted for the conference report which sent the legislation to the President's desk because I was convinced it was either those limitations on busing or none at all. I favor further Congressional action, the enactment of the President's moratorium legislation. And if the Courts continue to ignore Acts of Congress and rule that Congress is without power to act, I would urge a Constitutional Amendment.

GOVERNMENTAL PROCESS—TV SERIES

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, on June 1 the House passed legislation which would give additional aid to the Nation's public television program. Recently, I noted the efforts, in the field of educational television, exhibited by WCET–TV in Cincinnati. WCET showed a production it had made out of a Washington program that my office participated in bringing Cincinnati area high school students to the Nation's Capital to study government. The televised program allowed all students in the area to participate in the seminars. I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention a proposal written by James McAdams to broaden this concept into a 10-week program.

The proposal follows:

GOVERNMENTAL PROCESS—TV SERIES

(By A. James McAdams)

This year the offices of Congressman William J. Keating and Donald Clancy in conjunction with the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce conducted a series of seminars in government for 50 Cincinnati area high school seniors. Cincinnati educational television WCET–TV then put the Washington trip into a two part program.

The success of Congressional Scholarship Tour production demonstrated the intrinsic value of educational television as a conducive medium in the learning process.

Using this production as a pilot-program, Thomas Brumley and myself of WCET–TV have decided to delve further into the possibilities regarding televised instruction on the democratic political process. We have found that there is a basic need for further comprehension of the American political governmental system.

In view of almost incessant criticism of American political structures, it has seemed to us that a moderate diversion from the norm might be in order. It has appeared that such malevolence might be countered by a more positive approach in presenting fundamental governmental bases and modes of operation. This could be accomplished through a series of educational television productions which would orient the viewer to the significance of Washington, D.C. as the center for the decision making processes which insure the security and stability of the United States. Hopefully, the visual portrayal of key operations might tend to enhance a more personal and sensitive understanding of the democratic system in action.

The target audience would be the viewing public of National Educational Television. Eventually, the shows would be made available to the secondary school system to be used as teaching motifs and instructional guides. The productions, as visual representations of the democratic process, would afford, to the viewer, an appeal often not found on the printed page.

The programs will be designed as a combination of television presentation and related printed materials, to aid both teacher and student. The study will include governmental personnel, of the highest level possible, drawn from all major branches in an attempt to generate the most interest. The series will be designed to have appeal to those in and outside the classroom and will be able to be utilized as a series or as separate presentations, depending upon the need of the viewer.

The series will be composed of the following 10 programs, each of which will attempt a particular facet of the democratic system in Washington.

1. The city of Washington, D.C., will be viewed, in an attempt at discovering its value as the locations for many of America's significant historical edifices and relics.

2. The election process will be studied and its importance in the democratic system evaluated.

3. Next, a program will attempt to create an understanding of the workings of the legislative through an analysis of the passage of legislation between the House and Senate.

4. A congressional office would be examined and an appraisal made of its initial value in operations.

5. The significance of a lobby effort in relation to the legislative process would be studied.

6. A scrutiny would be made on the Bureaucracy in its relations to the good of the American public.

7. An attempt would be made to generate a level of personal understanding of the American citizen in regard to the officials at the Pentagon and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

8. The importance of the Executive Branch would be explored by studying the role of the President, his Cabinet and advisors.

9. A study would be made of the judicial branch, analyzing American jurisprudence.

10. Finally, a concise qualitative analysis would be conducted looking at the Federal System as a complete entity.

This series of shows, when produced will certainly be a "first" for the media, demonstrating the tremendous potential of educational television. Currently, Shawn Lucas and myself are in Washington researching the feasibilities of such a production. At present, we are in need of Congressional support which would aid in making such a series possible.

TRIBUTE TO A GREEK-AMERICAN HERO

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, on June 24, 1972, a moving ceremony took place in the city of Manchester, N.H. The

Ambassador of Greece to the United States, the Honorable Vassilious Vitsaxis, paid tribute on behalf of Greece to the memory of a Greek-American hero, Christos Kalyvas, who fell in France during World War I where he fought with the American forces there.

Christos Kalyvas was born in a Greek village and migrated to the United States in 1908. He settled in Manchester, N.H., and became a shoemaker. During World War I, he joined the American army, as a volunteer, and was sent to Europe. On October 8, 1918, he was killed in action while defending the United States near the city of Argonne, France.

Because of Christos Kalyvas's heroism and dedication to freedom, the city of Manchester erected a monument which bears his name. The ceremony in honor of the monument was attended by many hundreds of citizens of the city of Manchester and included: a wreath-laying to the monument by the Mayor Sylvo Dupuis and the Ambassador of Greece; a religious service in memoriam, chanted by the Greek Orthodox clergy of the city of Manchester, headed by the Greek Orthodox bishop of Boston; and the ground-breaking for a new home for the aged, to be built near a park which will also bear the name of this Greek-American hero, Christos Kalyvas.

In his remarks during the ceremony, Ambassador Vitsaxis stressed the long-standing brotherly ties which exist between the United States and Greece. He also emphasized the manifold contributions of Americans of Greek extraction to the United States which have been and continue to be exemplified and symbolized by the sacrifice of Christos Kalyvas. Ambassador Vitsaxis' remarks are stimulating and illustrate the many contributions which Greek-American friendship has fostered. For this reason, I would like to publish the Ambassador's remarks in order that my colleagues can benefit from them. The text of his remarks follows:

REMARKS OF THE AMBASSADOR OF GREECE, THE HONORABLE VASSILIOS VITSAXIS

It is with a sense of humility and of deep emotion that I came today to this city—and more particularly to this Park—to honor the memory of a brave soldier and, in doing so, the memory of every one and all, who, in this country, in my country or in any other freedom-loving country, have offered their lives to preserve the moral values and the lofty Ideals, which form the very foundation of our way of life.

I do not believe—as I think nobody really does—that those who fell in the battlefields were more brave than those who returned home after having defended—in the roar of battles—their flag and what it stands for. I do not think either, that one sacrifice is more valuable than another. But I do believe that one can choose symbols which render it easier to our human mind to grasp, on the basis of a concrete example, some rather elusive and complex realities of the Moral realm.

Being the envoy of Greece in this country and having upon my shoulders the responsibility to look after the maintenance of the friendly relations between our two countries, I have deemed that Christos Kalyvas was indeed a typical example of the long-standing and deeply rooted bonds which tie together my country and its people with the United States; bonds which stem from our common belief in national independence, in freedom and in human dignity, bonds which found their expression throughout the history of our two countries; in the strong philhellenic movement which captured the imagination of the Americans, during our war of Independence and in the alliance which has always existed between our two peoples; and last but not least, bonds which were cemented by the strongest element, "blood"; blood shed as a supreme sacrifice by brethren, side by side, in the battlefields of the world.

This is why I thought that by honoring the memory of a Greek immigrant who was killed in action, defending the flag of his adopted new homeland—the United States—I would be honoring, at the same time, the hundreds of thousands of Americans of Greek extraction as a matter of fact all of them, with no exception whatsoever, for their admirable contribution—be it with their honest hard labor, be it with the rifle in hand—to making these United States the most powerful and the most advanced leader of the peace-loving countries in the world of today.

Christos Kalyvas was born, as I was told, near Kozani in Macedonia, Northern Greece. Macedonia . . . this bulwark of Freedom, which for more than two thousand years has unceasingly been in the limelight of History for having largely contributed to every hellenic, and for that matter, to every human achievement.

Aristotle—the Thinker of the centuries!

Alexander the Great—the military genius and the living torch of civilization, hundreds of legendary names have rendered this part of Greece one of the most famous of the world.

Kalyvas, an unknown Greek immigrant, came to the shores of this country, as tens of thousands did, at the beginning of the current century, looking for a better tomorrow.

He established himself in this very city of Manchester and became a shoemaker. When the war broke out and the United States joined the allies in their struggle to preserve the world from a dark despotism. Christos Kalyvas, the Greek immigrant, as thousands of Greek immigrants did, joined the United States Army, as a volunteer.

Almost a hundred years before, when enslaved Greece revolted against the Ottoman Empire, to achieve her independence and her national freedom, many Americans came to our land and fought shoulder to shoulder with their Greek brethren for what they knew was a worthy cause.

In 1916, it was the turn of the Kalyvases of all of them to volunteer and fight under the Star-spangled Banner for the same worthy cause.

In July 1918, Christos Kalyvas was assigned to the 16th Infantry Regiment of the 1st American Division and was sent with his unit to France.

He was not a learned man. He never knew what thinkers have said about the war: That "every bit of land and every wave of the deep blue sea, every rock and every tree, wherever it may be; every mountain's crest and every beach is worth fighting and worth dying for in the name of Liberty and in the quest of Justice."

Christos Kalyvas did not study the dusty books of wisdom; he simply listened to his heart which told him . . . "Now is the time to fight" and he did. As all the Greek-Americans, Kalyvas did, both then and afterwards. During World War II, during the Korean War and even now—at this very moment—in the jungles of Viet Nam . . .

Christos Kalyvas fell in the field of honor, on October 10th, 1918, a few days before the Armistice was concluded. His sacrifice was not in vain . . .

Because he had a dream—as hundreds of thousands had, because he bravely fought—as hundreds of thousands did—because he was prepared to die—as hundreds of thousands were . . . The victory was ours and peace was honorably won.

Christos Kalyvas was a hero, but what we have come to honor today is Christos Kalyvas the Symbol!

His sacrifice examplifies the sacrifices of thousands of Greek immigrants who have given their lives to the United States.

I have come today, in the name of the Government and of the people of Greece, to pay tribute to his memory and to tell you that we are proud, as you are, for Christos Kalyvas; proud of all of you Americans of Greek extraction, and also proud of all of you our American allies and friends stemming from every corner of the world in strings of generations raised in this God blessed land.

Because the United States are made of people with the heart and the determination of Christos Kalyvas, because they have friends and allies—as Greece—with whom they share both the bread and the graves in the battlefields, they are what they are. A country of great destiny.

Let the memory of Christos Kalyvas be preserved by generations to come, as an immortal symbol of the ties, between our two countries and let us hope that the Tomorrows, which are waiting below the horizon of Time . . . will spare us from the necessity of new sacrifices of blood and offer us vast green fields of peaceful cooperation among nations.

The fulfillment of this dream for which we all pray to God the Almighty will not render void the sacrifice of Christos Kalyvas. It will be—on the contrary—its best justification.

RECENT RESTRICTIONS IMPOSED ON PREDATOR CONTROL OPERATIONS

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, during consideration by the Committee on Agriculture of the predator loss indemnity bill, and since we reported the bill, we have received much mail on the subject from concerned citizens.

There also have been many newspaper articles published relative to losses incurred by livestock and poultry producers in States from the Mexican border to Canada. A recent story sent out by the Associated Press gives a colorful and accurate picture of the situation that prompted introduction of the pending legislation, and publish it in the RECORD.

Among those who wrote us was Miss Diane D. Lanford of Blanket, Tex.—not in my district—whose father operates a sheep and cattle ranch. She sent us a copy of a letter she wrote to William D. Ruckelshaus, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Because this letter comes from an individual qualified to discuss the recent restrictions imposed on predator control operations, and because it is so convincing as to the actual harm that can be done the ecology by extreme measures intended to benefit wildlife, I insert it in the RECORD along with three other letters. One of these was forwarded to us by our colleague, Mr. MCKAY, of Utah. I offer them because they are typical of so many we have received, and I hope that Members of the House will read them to see that there are two sides to this issue which so many think poses only some

simple solution, such as the precipitous banning of a long-used predator control method when no practical substitute for it is available.

The above-mentioned news items follow:

RANCHERS DOING HOWLING NOW

(By Robert E. Ford)

Possibly the world's most lonesome sound can be heard throughout the West provided the listener is at the right place at the right time.

This is anywhere in rough country on a clear night. From somewhere far away comes a cry, rising and falling, as if the heart were being torn from something living.

Actually, it is nothing more than a coyote trying out his vocal cords.

The Indians believed he was the smartest animal around, and created legends about him.

The coyote possesses many of the traits that the Indian heeded before he was forced onto reservations. He was intelligent, clever, an expert on hit and run raids, and could melt away into the wilderness so that his enemies couldn't find him.

Mr. Coyote is having one of his good times right now, and we'll wager that he's in his den right now laughing his furry head off at his latest victory.

This is because the federal government has switched over to his side, in effect.

So now a new howl is heard in the land—coming from ranchers and chicken raisers. They howl pretty good, too.

This triumph for what the encyclopedia calls the Prairie Wolf came this year when President Nixon banned use of coyote poison on federal land and the Environmental Protection Agency stopped interstate shipment of predator control poisons.

For, smart as he is, the coyote isn't a very good chemist and can't distinguish a poison from a non-poison.

Particularly he hasn't learned to cope with a device which, when he takes a tug at a piece of meat, flips poison into his throat far enough down so that he can't spit it out.

Ranchers, particularly sheep and goat raisers, protested loudly in Washington against the ban of poison. They estimate that coyotes, even with widespread use of poison, cost them $17 million in 1970 in animal losses.

They offered another deal to the government: Pay them damages if poisons are completely banned. They estimate the coyote population will explode to the point that their losses will be $50 million annually.

The government, in the person of Nathaniel Reed, assistant secretary of the Interior Department said poison isn't necessary.

Advised Reed: use packs of killer dogs or airborne hunters to control the coyote population.

This sounds good, but it just doesn't work that way.

Killer dogs do not stop killing just because they've chased the coyotes away. They turn to killing stock, too, and can be worse than coyotes.

Or take the experience a few years ago of a rancher-farmer on the edge of the Wichita Breaks between Seymour and Wichita Falls.

He got tired of coyotes and bought several greyhounds who surely could outrun a coyote and kill it.

The greyhounds drove the coyotes deep into the breaks for a time. Then the dogs disappeared.

The rancher-farmer never knew whether the dogs:

1. Were killed by the coyotes,
2. decided to run away, or
3. joined the coyotes.

Asst. Secy. Reed apparently doesn't know much about coyote habits, else he wouldn't have suggested shooting them from the air. Eagles can be shot from the air, as bird lovers know, but coyotes are not birds of the same feather.

They prowl at night mostly, and until riflemen develop night eyes there isn't much chance of seeing one so they can shoot.

In daylight, coyotes mainly hide in dens or other places where they can't be seen. Seeing a coyote is somewhat unusual.

Out in West Texas you probably could get another western type war started between ranchers and farmers over coyotes.

One time the ranchers pretty well rid Baylor County of coyotes. So what moved in: Jackrabbits.

The rabbits started chewing on the farmers' crops—there being no coyotes around to catch the fast little beasts.

So the farmers had to organize great rabbit drives to save their crops.

The balance of nature is very delicate. So what are you going to save—livestock or crops?

Environmentalists say the coyotes do not inflict damages heavy enough on ranchers to warrant their destruction through poison.

And we can just see an angry rancher waving that $17 million loss bill in their faces.

W. M. Sims of San Angelo told a congressional committee last April that 80 per cent of all predators killed were destroyed by poison. Others said shooting and trapping simply could not keep the coyote population within bounds.

Most ranchers will agree on one thing: No matter what you use to eradicate them individually; the country still will have coyotes.

He's proven that he can, as a species, outthink Man.

BAR O RANCH,
Blanket, Tex., June 21, 1972.

Mr. WILLIAM D. RUCKELSHAUS,
Environmental Protection Agency,
Pesticides Office,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RUCKELSHAUS: I just read your U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Fact Sheet. I am appalled.

At this time, I shall introduce myself. I am Diane D. Lanford, a Pharmacy student at The University of Texas and the accomplice of numerous "indiscriminate killings." I live on a sheep and cattle ranch in central Texas. My father owns one of the finest herds of Registered Rambouillet sheep in the nation, some of which have been purchased by India and Mexico. Because of my background, that of a ranch girl and scientist, I feel qualified to discuss the following intelligently.

With regard to the suspension of thallium, I quite agree that so toxic a substance, with "the combined circumstances of dermal absorption . . . and persistence in the environment" along with other factors, is unfit as a predator control measure. There does seem to be a bit of faulty logic connected with the reference to bootlegging, however. If a certain commodity is readily available, with no government or other restriction, why would there be need for bootlegging? This prohibition seems to encourage rather than curtail bootlegging, as your article seems to suggest. I thought that had been rather firmly established by another Prohibition (since repealed).

I can also see some firm grounds for the suspension of 1080 (Sodium fluoroacetate). This is highly toxic in very minute doses, according to your report and quite stable. The "evidence" offered could have been excluded. however, since the reported and suspected fatalities were not connected with predator control materials. I am surprised, above all, that you would include the juicy implication that although "It is not clear . . . how various animal populations are being affected . . . 1080 is *thought* to have contributed to the death of *at* least one California condor, an endangered species."

When you speak of endangered species, sir, to what do you refer? I would like to point out that my family has a history of preservation of natural resources. My father has served as Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Soil & Water Conservation District No. 523 and I am presently looking at a plaque he received for the most outstanding supervisor of the same. That is incidental. Concerning the preservation of rare species, however, we have an array of wildlife on our land. It is no coincidence. We have meticulously preserved the wild turkey, wild guinea, and beaver population as well as dove, quail and more prominent fauna.

Do you know why we have these animals on our land, Mr. Ruckelshaus? Right! You guessed it. Predator control. You see, bobcats and panthers and wolves and red fox all eat our endangered species and when all the rabbits and squirrels and quail and wild turkey and wild guineas and beavers are gone, they eat $200.00 sheep. Lots of them, Mr. Ruckelshaus. Maybe 30 per night. Sheep are not only expensive, but imagine your dismay, indeed your disgust, upon breeding, feeding, caring for one particular ewe for six months, pulling the thorn out of her foot, giving her a shot of penicillin when it becomes infected, treating her for screw worms (why don't you outlaw screw worms?) drenching her, putting out salt and minerals for her, and then driving up one morning to find her throat cut by a predator. There is not a single bite taken from her flesh, just an ugly slash where a wolf has killed her and 20 more and left them untouched. Where is the government then?

Standing there with an apology and a subsidy? No, Mr. Ruckelshaus. No compensation awaits you—only a low import tax on wool such that the wool mill 10 miles from your home is weaving Australian wool (our actual case) and a notice that your only effective means of predator control has been suspended. Then in the very same report, you make the ludicrous comment: "Certain data that are presently available indicate predator losses may in fact be of such low magnitude as to be a minor part of total losses. The Cain report suggests that among other reasons for the decline of the sheep industry may be competition from synthetic fibers and from lot-fed livestock." I agree, the predator losses will, in fact, be of a low magnitude and they will be minor in comparison with the loss of wildlife and domestic animals. I feel, however, that the decline in the sheep industry is self-evident; few people can afford the kind of economic losses suffered nor can they bear the insults of the government.

When a victim of powerful lobbies, lack of data, and an abundance of misinformation can sit in Washington, D.C. and smell that open sewer, known otherwise as the Potomac River, and suspend a useful selective control means such as the cyanide gun, it is frustrating and it is a backward step in technology . . . the same technology which made my father's pacemaker possible. You say that "effective non-chemical alternatives exist, including denning, shooting and trapping methods that have long been available and effective, though more costly than poisons." You use the word "effective" twice in the same sentence, and yet, you have repeatedly stated that you have no statistics. Let me point out why these means of control were so effective for many years. Because men could expect a handsome price for furs and in some cases, a bounty as well. All the young boys of my father's generation thought it great sport to hunt predators. In this day of strict gun control and television, however, who is going hunting on Saturday night? Why don't we outlaw all insecticides and issue hammers for the control of cockroaches? Or why don't all ranchers get together and protest the killing of the housefly. Society for the Prevention of Extinction of the Housefly.

You see, I want my grandchildren to have the opportunity to see one.

Sir, I would like to offer some legitimate suggestions for the control of predators. There has been an extensive amount of research done on animal sex attractants and other Selective media which work on the sense of smell. These are extremely specific, differing perhaps in only one methyl group, or in the spatial arrangement of the steroid, but in that small difference, can select for a species or different members of the same species. Now if this were employed with the use of a cyanide gun or a strychnine bait, wouldn't it be almost totally innocuous to a raccoon, for instance? Yes! It has proven so numerous times. As for secondary death, this seems rather remote and the only thing harmed if the dead animal were not located immediately would be a buzzard, or another predator. By the way, do you know that a buzzard can and has killed baby lambs? They peck their eyes out and proceed to eat them.

Your report states that strychnine causes "death in a rather gruesome form." Let's discuss strychnine. You say "it is a complex, naturally occurring, organic compound which would probably bind to soil readily and decompose over a period of time, although information on the persistence of strychnine and its effects on the environment is somewhat limited." I agree. It is a natural biodegradable poison. The report states that 30 mg. is considered as a threat to the adult man. My Pharmacy book, however, says "fatal poisoning in human beings ordinarily results from doses of 60 to 90 mg. The drug is seldom employed in modern medical practice, but is utilized as a vermin killer." The paper also suggests that "there is no true effective antidote." Phenobarbitol is quite commonly used. I have looked through your points and cannot see why strychnine has been banned. Could you explain to me why? Is it merely because it is a potential threat to humans and animals? May I suggest that automobiles are also a threat.

None of the findings of fact in the report convince me that there has been any great damage done by cyanide either. Of the four incidents in 1970, only three concerned the guns and none were fatal. I wish the same could be said of common household matches, or aspirin.

Both the cyanide and strychnine, used with common sense and maximum care pose no threat to the public. The largest threat to the rancher now is your ban. The packs of wolves now accumulating are killers of men, too. If I have been redundant or extreme, please try to forgive it. I am desperately fighting for something I believe in, not to mention our livelihood.

Sincerely,

DIANE LANFORD.

STATE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Oklahoma City, April 14, 1972.

Hon. W. R. POAGE,
U.S. Congressman,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POAGE: It is our understanding that HR 14163 and others with a similar intent will be heard by the agriculture committee in the near future.

May we take this opportunity to support this type legislation for the benefit of farmers and ranchers in Oklahoma. Our livestock and poultry industries have particular difficulty with coyotes, bobcats, and foxes. Predatory animal control officials in Oklahoma annually receive approximately 2,000 requests to help with predator control. For fiscal 1972, Oklahoma appropriated $136,000 to assist in this work, but in spite of our efforts we estimate a one million dollar annual loss.

Some necessary chemicals and toxicants for predator control have now been denied us, which makes it increasingly difficult to maintain agricultural production.

Therefore, we sincerely request your support for measures to indemnify farmers and ranchers for domestic animals killed by predators.

Sincerely,

BILLY RAY GOWDY.

ROOSEVELT, UTAH,
May 10, 1972.

Representative GUNN MCKAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MCKAY: I wrote to you last fall and winter pertaining to sheep losses that occurred on my ranch during the past two years. The last time I wrote I mentioned that the coyotes seemed to be under control.

Once again I am suffering heavy losses due to coyotes. Steve Davis, the local trapper, has been working day and night trying to control these animals but finds it very difficult to combat them with rifle and steel trap. Yesterday he was successful in killing one bobcat, one old bitch and eight pups. This brings the total coyote kill on my ranch to 22 during the last 12 months.

With the removal of den gases and 1080 it is going to be impossible to even come close to controlling the coyote population. Something must be done and done fast if we are to survive in this industry. I urge you to do what you can to help at this time. I'm sure an airplane in Vernal would help but this fall we need 1080 or another poison that will do the job.

Please tell your city friends that these lambs, pheasants, and fawns that are being killed are not the poor, weak, or ill, but the biggest and strongest of the flock. These kills make me sick—and financially impoverished!

Sincerely,

DALLAS E. MURRAY.

ST. GEORGE, UTAH.

Chairman W. R. POAGE,
House Committee on Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It is difficult for me to understand the hue and cry which has arisen relative to these animals (predators). People swoon when they think of the suffering of predators when they are poisoned, etc. or controlled by other means. People have not yet learned that these same animals to whom they have such charity cause little calves to suffer as they are killed and eaten. It so happens that two nights ago or two evenings ago I was out on my place and I found a young calf half eaten. This happened right on one of our ranch roads. The coyotes had dragged this calf back and forth across the road and perhaps had left it when they heard my approach in my truck.

I managed to get a picture of the little calf half eaten. I thought I would send it to you as I thanked you for what you are doing in our behalf. We have poisoned, trapped and killed coyotes all of my life and they are just as thick or thicker now than they ever were.

PHILLIP FOREMASTER.

SERBIA AND ST. VITUS DAY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, June 28, is St. Vitus Day in Serbia. As part of their observance of this annual occasion, the people of Serbia recall their great and glorious past and look forward to the day when they and their country will once more be truly free.

One of the events that will be recalled will be the Battle of Kosovo, which made deeper and more lasting impressions on the people of Serbia than any other happening in their long history and inspired the greatest of their poets and musicians to write the nation's cycle of songs. The flower of the aristocracy of Serbia, its ruler, and its very existence as an independent nation were destroyed on the battlefield, for Turkey was destined to rule Serbia for almost half a millennium.

The ancient Serbian Empire came to an end when the Serbs and their Albanian, Bosnian, Bulgarian, and Wallachian allies were vanquished on June 15, 1389. Milosh Obilich, a Serb knight who was taken prisoner by the Turks, posed as a traitor and was thus enabled to assassinate Sultan Murad I. The Turkish ruler's son Bayazid I, was chosen to succeed him and went on to lead his army to victory. Prince Lazar, who led the coalition forces in a vain attempt to halt the Turkish advance, was captured and then executed by Bayazid's orders.

Serbia rejoined the family of free nations in 1877. The kingdom of Serbia fought with the Allies during World War I which was the basis in the creation of Yugoslavia. During World War II, the Serbs suffered first from the Nazi invasion and occupation and then by the imposition of communism at the close of the war.

The more than 8 million Serbs are the largest of the numerous ethnic groups that make up Yugoslavia. The Serbs are the largest nationality group within present-day Yugoslavia.

As the people of Serbia observe St. Vitus Day and commemorate the stirring events of the past, they are bound to speculate regarding the future. The leaders of present day Yugoslavia, even while exposing communism in attempting to apply its principles in domestic and economic affairs, are fearful of Soviet expansion. It is interesting that the Communist rulers of Yugoslavia have a much greater fear of the Soviet big brother than of the United States and its free world allies.

WILL U.S. FOREIGN ASSISTANCE SURVIVE FOR YET ANOTHER YEAR AS A GROSSLY INEFFICIENT OPERATION?

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee, I take this opportunity to call to the careful attention of my colleagues and the public another article on the foreign exchange operations fund in Laos. As you will recall, this is the device which was created some 8 years ago to "protect" the American taxpayers from learning of the fraud and corruption

which was supported with $100 million of their Federal taxes.

As you will also recall, Congress—in House Report No. 92–718, "U.S. Economic Assistance for Laos—Stabilization Programs"—called for a major overhaul of the U.S. economic assistance program for Laos. I am saddened to report that our officials in the Agency for International Development have failed to take the much needed action to redirect the U.S. tax dollars being provided as a gift to Laos into a program to truly help the Lao people.

It is also my duty to report that—in spite of the fact that this Congress has neither authorized a foreign assistance program nor appropriated funds for fiscal year 1973—our AID officials have already committed the United States to provide $16 million, of the funds AID hopes to have Congress appropriate for fiscal year 1973, to keep the Laos foreign exchange operations fund—and the fraud and corruption which it finances—operating.

In addition to the Laos fund, our AID officials have now rushed in to establish similar funds in Cambodia and South Vietnam. These same officials were well aware of the critical comments—contained in House Report No. 92–1146, "U.S. Economic Assistance for the Khmer Republic—Cambodia"—when they committed the American taxpayers to provide $12 million under a fiscal year 1973 aid program for which this Congress has neither authorized nor appropriated funds.

In South Vietnam, AID officials are moving forward with two funds—an economic support fund and an economic development fund—which will cost the taxpayers $125 million for fiscal year 1973. Both of these funds may well support fraud and corruption in South Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, how much longer is Congress going to permit our AID officials to ignore the well-being of the American economy and the well-being of the people of Southeast Asia?

Our AID officials are not engaged in truly needed assistance to the less fortunate people of these countries. They are merely fostering and contributing to fraud and graft by wealthy landowners, businessmen and government officials in these war-torn countries.

Those of us in Congress who have supported U.S. foreign aid have been able to keep foreign aid alive each year by only a few votes. With the flagrant abuses in our AID program, will we be successful in keeping U.S. foreign aid alive for another year?

Mr. Tammy Arbuckle's article of June 25, 1972, follows:

[From the Sunday Star, June 25, 1972]

ELITE IN LAOS FIGHT REFORMS

(By Tammy Arbuckle)

VIENTIANE.—An elite group of Lao families which for many years has prospered from U.S. aid funds is putting political pressure on the Laotian and American governments to prevent new anti-fraud and anti-corruption measures being put into practice, informed diplomatic sources say.

This political pressure has taken the form of demands for the resignation of Lao finance minister Sisouk Na Champassac by members of the National Assembly and attacks in the assembly against Premier Souvanna Phouma and the measures his government has taken to deal with Laos' economic crisis.

The measures were asked for by the United States after congressional committees in Washington discovered millions of dollars in U.S. taxpayers' money was going into Lao pockets through fraud and that U.S. officials on the scene had, for political reasons, failed to take action.

AIMED AT GOVERNMENT

Diplomats say the present assembly attacks are aimed at rocking the government of Souvanna Phouma.

Top Lao families, many of whom are strongly represented in the assembly, know the political aim of the United States is to retain the status quo in Laos through the continuing premiership of Souvanna Phouma.

They hope that by threatening the present government the United States will fear a political collapse and therefore not press further for economic reforms or tighten or cut the lucrative aid funds, particularly its $16 million yearly contribution to the $25 million Foreign Exchange Operations Fund aimed at stabilizing the Lao economy.

ANGRY PROFITEERS

The fund has not stabilized the Lao economy which has seen a 20 percent devaluation of the currency unit, the kip, in the last six months and a price increase in basic commodities of 31 percent already this year, but it has proved convenient means whereby the Lao elite and Vietnamese and Chinese merchants have been able to convert their kip profits to dollars and put the money in Swiss and other banks, to import luxury goods for themselves and keep thriving Thai and Lao smuggling rackets in merchandise going full blast.

The measures which the U.S. insisted on, economy which has seen a 20 percent devaluwhich made the influential profiteers so angry are:

A levy of 240 kip to every U.S. dollar sent out of Laos in addition to the rate of 600 kip to one U.S. dollar. This means Lao commercial houses must pay more to send their profits out of Laos. It is aimed at preventing the flight of U.S. aid dollars to private accounts abroad.

Extensive documentation of foreign exchange transactions, thus eliminating the anonymity which the Lao and Chinese crave for their somewhat twisted financial dealings.

Elimination of private dollar bank accounts in Vientiane.

A parity of Thai and Lao customs duties to minimize smuggling along with introduction of U.S. customs officers as advisers.

Lao government price controls on basic foodstuffs to stop profiteering at the expense of ordinary Laotians.

Tighter fiscal and budget discipline of the Lao government itself (many influential Lao who are involved in commercial finagling, also hold high posts in the government and are not averse, Americans charge, to diverting funds).

Reorganization of the foreign exchange operations committee which oversees documentation of imports.

American officials praise "the effort of the Lao government in the face of obstruction by political opponents and vested interests" to get these reforms going.

But that this effort by the Lao should become a reality is apparently a dream of U.S. aid officials here which is not likely to become a fact.

The opposition is using not only political pressure but is also carrying out economic sabotage and a virulently anti-American whispering campaign in Vientiane markets which is linked with Lao government weakness in enacting such things as price controls. And deep seated corruption can only mean that reforms will remain theories which U.S. aid can present to American congressional investigators.

In the assembly men such as the deputy for Borikhane Province Amkha Southavong, rail against the 240 kip extra charge on dollars leaving Laos, claiming it "provoked enormous difficulties for the population."

This, of course, is rubbish. Only 60 percent of Laos' 2.3 million population live under government control.

Of these only 400,000 people are in the country's monetized sector. The remainder live by barter and subsistence. Of this group only some 8,000 people—800 registered importers plus top Lao families—are benefitting from the $25 million FEOF fund.

By buying Lao produced essentials most Laotians' kip would go a long way as there is need to link Lao produce prices to the dollar. Most imports are for consumption in non-Lao cities or are essentials from Thailand which could be subsidized with money saved by stopping the fund, some Western economic sources say.

U.S. officials, commenting on Amkha's attack, said he was one of those unable to get his dollar profits from house rents out of Laos. "We want a new finance minister who will get tough with the Americans," said one irate deputy, obviously put out by the finance ministry's acceptance of the U.S.-requested reforms.

PROTECTED MERCHANTS

Chinese and Vietnamese merchants, who say they have powerful Lao patrons who will protect them from the police or the military, sabotage Lao government efforts to stabilize the economy by raising their prices almost daily. Although U.S. funds allow them to import food at 605 kip to the U.S. dollar they sell for over 800 kip to the U.S. dollar, a price they base on Vientiane's burgeoning black market.

When corruption fails they hoard goods or sell inferior quality foodstuffs—for example chicken food is mixed with rice.

If Lao troops or low ranking civil servants complain, these shopkeepers lay the blame on the Americans in vicious whispering campaigns.

One story which made the rounds was that the Americans bought up all the best rice to make bread. "The Americans are giving the money. The Americans tell the finance minister what to do. Therefore the Americans are responsible for Laos money and when things go wrong it's the Americans' fault," an educated Lao summed up the popular attitude. "You know all those American ideas of documentation to control dollar flow won't work, people will just pay more money to officials," the Lao said.

Diplomats from other donor nations, Britain, Japan, France and Australia say they know the Foreign Exchange Operations Fund is no longer workable and their governments went along only for political reasons with the U.S. Charlie Mann (U.S.A.I.D. director) was chuckling over the agreement (signed June 14) for FEOF like an old hen with a favorite chick.

FRONTIERO AGAINST LAIRD

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Supreme Court's 1971 decision Reed against Reed was hailed as a promise of constitutional protection against sex dis-

crimination. In Reed the Court struck down an Idaho law which required that men be preferred over women in the appointment of estate administrators. The Court held that—

To give a mandatory preference to members of either sex over members of the other, merely to accomplish the elimination of hearings on the merits, is to make the very kind of arbitrary legislative choice forbidden by the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. 404 U.S. 76.

The limited protection promised by Reed is being whittled down to nothing. In *Frontiero* v. *Laird*, Civil No. 3232–N (M.D. Ala., Apr. 5, 1972), a three-judge Federal district court upheld unequal treatment for male and female members of the Armed Forces in determining dependents' allowances. A male member of the military is automatically entitled to quarters' allowance and medical benefits for his wife. But to receive the same allowance and benefits for her husband, a female member of the military must prove that her husband is dependent on her for over half of his support. No such showing of dependency is required of a male member.

On the basis of Reed, it would seem that to set more favorable benefit eligibility criteria for male members of the military than for female members, merely to eliminate hearings on the merits, is to make the very kind of arbitrary legislative choice forbidden by the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment. But the Frontiero court ruled that administrative convenience justifies the differential criteria and described this result as "clearly in harmony" with Reed.

The plaintiffs in Frontiero have filed notice that they will appeal. I hope that the Supreme Court will review the decision and establish once and for all that the Constitution gives protection against discrimination because of sex.

PRESIDENT NIXON COMMENDS U.N. ENVIRONMENTAL CONFERENCE RESULTS

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has issued a succinct and thoughtful statement praising the results of the recent United Nations Conference on the Human Environment held recently in Stockholm, Sweden. In addition to summarizing the results of the Conference, the President has forwarded a carefully prepared fact sheet describing the principal results of this historic international meeting.

Mr. Speaker, having had the privilege of serving as one of the U.S. delegates to the Stockholm Conference, and having participated in the discussions leading to some of the final results which are recorded in the President's statement and fact sheet, I should state that I fully concur in Mr. Nixon's evaluation of this historic gathering. I am pleased to attach hereto the President's statement—together with the fact sheet—for the benefit of my colleagues and to all who examine the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

(Statement by the President on the Conference Held June 5–16 in Stockholm—June 20, 1972)

I have just received a report on the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment concluded last Friday at Stockholm from Chairman Train who headed the large and distinguished United States delegation.

The United States has worked long and hard over the past 18 months to help make the Conference a success. Representatives of 113 nations met together for 2 weeks to produce an impressive number of agreements on environmental principles and recommendations for further national and international action in this important field.

The United States achieved practically all of its objectives at Stockholm.

(1) The Conference approved establishment of a new United Nations unit to provide continued leadership and coordination of environmental action, an important step which had our full support.

(2) The Conference approved forming a $100 million United Nations environmental fund which I personally proposed last February.

(3) The Conference overwhelmingly approved the U.S. proposal for a moratorium on commercial killing of whales.

(4) The Conference endorsed our proposal for an international convention to regulate ocean dumping.

(5) The Conference endorsed the U.S. proposal for the establishment of a World Heritage Trust to help preserve wilderness areas and other scenic natural landmarks.

However, even more than in the specific agreements reached, I believe that the deepest significance of the Conference lies in the fact that for the first time in history, the nations of the world sat down together to seek better understanding of each other's environmental problems and to explore opportunities for positive action, individually and collectively.

The strong concern of the United States over the fate of our environment has also been demonstrated in our direct dealings with individual nations. The Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement which I signed in Ottawa this April with Prime Minister Trudeau was evidence of the high priority this Administration places on protecting the environment. The Environmental Agreement which I signed in Moscow on May 23 is proof of the desire of our Nation to work together with the others on the common tasks of peace.

I am proud that the United States is taking a leading role in international environmental cooperation, and I congratulate our U.S. delegation on its success at Stockholm. The governments and people of the world must now work together to make the objectives of the Stockholm Conference a reality.

THE U.N. CONFERENCE ON THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT: FACT SHEET

The United Nations Conference on the Human Environment was held in Stockholm, Sweden, from June 5–16, 1972. The U.S. delegation, led by Russell E. Train, Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality, included delegates from the Executive Branch, the Congress, the States, and the private sector. The Conference reached agreement on the following major points:

1. *A new permanent organization will be established within the United Nations to coordinate international environmental activities.* It will consist of an Executive Director who will head a small staff (the Environmental Secretariat) of about 30 persons. This organization will be supported by a Governing Council for Environmental Programs composed of representatives of 54 nations and will be under the United Nations Economic and Social Council. Its major outlays will be met by the U.N. environmental fund.

2. *A $100 million U.N. environmental fund financed by voluntary contributions from member governments will be established.* This fund was initially proposed by President Nixon in his Environmental Message to Congress on February 8, 1972. The U.S. is prepared to commit $40 million over a five-year period to this fund on a matching basis The fund will be used to finance international efforts to deal with global environmental problems, such as establishing the worldwide monitoring network approved by the Conference. A number of countries have already indicated they will contribute to this fund.

3. *The Conference gave strong endorsement toward completing a convention to control the dumping of shore-generated wastes into the sea.* Such a convention was called for by President Nixon in his 1971 Environment Message at the time that he submitted domestic legislation for the control of ocean dumping to the Congress. Preparatory work of intergovernmental meetings held in Reykjavik in April 1972, and in London in May 1972, had produced draft articles and annexes for such a convention. The Conference agreed to refer the present draft to the U.N. Seabed Committee's July-August session for information and comment. It also asked that a conference of interested Governments be convened before November with a view to elaborating the convention and opening it for signature before the end of the year. This conference is to be convened by the United Kingdom in consultation with the Secretary General of the United Nations.

4. The Conference recommended that the International Whaling Commission adopt a 10-year moratorium on commercial whaling. The Conference also recommended that the IWC be strengthened and that international research efforts be increased. This recommendation will be considered by the IWC at its meeting in London on June 26–30. (Chairman Train of CEQ is attending the IWC meeting as the President's representative.)

5. The Earthwatch program—a coordinated plan to use and expand existing monitoring systems to measure pollution levels around the world—was approved. As part of this program, a network of 10 baseline and 100 regional monitoring stations will be set up throughout the world under the auspices of the U.N.'s World Meteorological Organization (WMO) to monitor changes in the earth's climate and to chart levels of air pollution. The Earthwatch program also includes plans for surveillance of the oceans, radioactive wastes, food contamination and changes in numbers of plants and animals which might indicate hazardous conditions in the environment. The Integrated Global Ocean Station System and the Long Term and Expanded Program of Ocean Exploration and Research, both of which will provide extensive data on the seas, will be part of this program.

6. Proposals for conservation conventions were endorsed:

The World Heritage Trust convention, an idea proposed by President Nixon in his Environmental Message of February 8, 1971, is based on the concept that some areas of the world are of such unique, natural, historical, or cultural value that they are part of the heritage of all mankind and should be ac-

corded special recognition and protection. The Stockholm Conference endorsed a draft convention and invited governments to examine it with a view to adopting it at the next general session of UNESCO, which will be held in Paris this fall.

The Endangered Species Convention is designed to provide protection for species of plants and animals threatened with extinction by imposing strict controls on the export, import, and transnational shipment of these species. It was endorsed in principle by the Conference, with the recommendation that an international conference be held as soon as possible to draft and complete the convention.

7. Declaration of environmental principles—A 27-point statement of environmental principles was adopted by the Conference. These principles call for responsible action on the part of countries when dealing with environmental problems of international significance. For example, Principle 21 declares that states have "the responsibility to ensure that activities within their jurisdiction or control do not cause damage to the environment of other states or areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction."

8. A recommendation was adopted by the Conference calling for compensation by the developed countries to the less developed countries for trade damages stemming from environmental factors. The United States voted against this proposal, pointing out that many forces affect export earnings and to single out any of these, such as environmental actions, for compensatory treatment would be wrong in principle and a disincentive to environmental responsibility. However, the United States stated its readiness to deal with any complaint that its environmental actions violate GATT obligations.

READ—DON'T JUST LOOK

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the unfortunate handicaps of too many of our younger generation is inability to read fluently. For too many years, too few have been truly taught to read propperly, or trained in phonetics.

The old saying that a picture is worth 10,000 words may be correct, but the adverse impact on our society from the inability among many citizens to effectively communicate through the printed word, along with accompanying unwillingess to spend the time reading books that help with the lessons of the past, all because to so many, reading itself is difficult and unpleasant, is most regrettable. It is also remediable.

Parents who wish to help their youngsters along the road should discourage too much looking at television or at pictures and encourage a lot more reading, particularly reading aloud.

In this connection, a recent column by James J. Kilpatrick is of interest. The column follows:

GROWING CONCERN OVER FUTURE OF PRINTED WORD

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

LOUISVILLE, KY.—For the past 10 years, the Courier-Journal and Louisville Times have sponsored a lively and ambitious program known as "Newspaper in the Classroom." A number of other papers are engaged in the same effort—and a keenly important effort it is.

The programs are intended to strengthen the ties that bind together the closely related worlds of teaching and newspapering. In both worlds, a primary purpose is simply to inform, to pass along what we hope and believe to be truth, and to cultivate an intellectual awareness in those we reach. Toward this end, the newspaper is a marvelously useful tool of classroom instruction, even at the kindergarten level.

The printed word is in trouble these days. On the surface, it might appear otherwise: Newspaper circulation is at a record high; specialized magazines are generally healthy; sales of paperback books are soaring out of sight; journalism schools have to turn away applicants. Those of us who live by the printed word, and love it, are facing no immediate crisis.

Yet things are happening, under the surface, that compel a mounting concern. Repeated polls tell us, however we may grumble at the findings, that most persons now regard television as their primary source of news. According to one study, children will have spent two to three thousand hours watching TV before they enter the first grade. The trend, in this regard, is toward a nation of viewers, not of readers.

The trend is potentially disastrous. With notable exceptions here and there, the educational system has not slowed this process, but rather spurred it along. The pernicious virus of "look-and-say," which long ago infected instruction in elementary reading still ravages many schools. Millions of children, deprived of phonetic discipline, have grown up to be terrible readers. No wonder they watch TV! It is dismaying to learn of the declining emphasis placed upon spelling, punctuation, rules of grammar and construction. Once courses in "lit. comp." were everywhere required; but written compositions have gone out of style.

Meanwhile, the economics of periodical publishing tend to make bad matters worse. The Courier-Journal historically has trucked its morning editions 200 miles to Hazard and beyond, but the cost of serving distant subscribers have mounted out of hand. For many magazines, the prospect of soaring postal rates is a grim prospect of ceasing publication.

Yet the situation is far from hopeless. The late Douglas Southall Freeman used to complain, in his melancholy moments, that newspapermen write on sand. In a sense we do. Yet this is better than television, which writes on wind. The printed word must always have this enormous advantage over TV—that it is available to the reader at his convenience, to be absorbed in whole or in part, at any hour; to be clipped, filed, or mailed. Some of the products of our labor may be used to wrap the fish, but as a medium of communication, the printed word endures.

It must endure. In an editorial marking the first issue of his new World magazine, Norman Cousins speaks for all of us who write and publish: "We are confident that print will not only endure but will continue to be a primary force in the life of the mind. Nothing yet invented meets the intellectual needs of the human brain so fully as print. The ability of the mind to convert little markings on paper into meaning is one of the ways civilization receives its basic energy."

That conversion process—the conversion of those little markings on paper into meaning—is peculiarly the joint responsibility of those who teach and those who publish. We are co-trustees, keepers of the tablets, and in the administration of that trust, we must not fail.

THE 75TH JUBILEE CONFERENCE OF THE CHICAGO ZIONIST ORGANZATION

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Sunday it was a privilege to address the 75th Jubilee Conference of the Chicago Zionist Organization in my district. I ask unanimous consent to include my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today. My remarks follow:

SPEECH DELIVERED AT THE 1972 CONFERENCE OF THE CHICAGO ZIONIST ORGANIZATION, JUNE 25, 1972, BY CONGRESSMAN ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

It is a particular pleasure to be invited to join you today and participate in the Annual Conference of the Chicago Zionist Organization.

I say this because the events of recent weeks have caused me once again to consider the meaning and the future of Israel. The continuing acts of terrorism and violence by the Palestinian guerrilla groups; the horrible carnage of the massacre at Lod airport; and the freightening responses to these realities by many of the newer, smaller states and by some within the U.N. should cause All Americans to give careful thought to Israel and its survival. Nor is the resolution being offered by Ambassador Bush censuring both Israel and Lebanon at the U.N. the answer.

It is certainly true that ever since 1948, Israel has proven to the world that it can take care of itself—but at what cost.

This state of continual warfare requires universal military service, nerves of steel, and an allocation of national resources for defense that leaves far too little for the development of Israel's industry, agriculture, housing and other domestic needs. What's more, it is questionable that a small nation of only 3 million can withstand the dangers posed by the 35 million hostile enemies surrounding it for an indefinite period stretching into the remaining decades of the 20th century.

It seems to me that ever since that moment on May 15, 1948 when the British colors were hauled down and the State of Israel was proclaimed a genuine miracle has been operating there.

Attacked from all sides. Out-numbered. Out-gunned. Against all odds, Israel has survived. The people of Israel have proved to be uncrushable.

In the 6 Day War, an important step was made to secure Israel's national borders by establishing buffers in Gaza, the Golen Heights, the west bank and through the reunification of Jerusalem.

The changes which have occurred in these areas since that time have been exciting and promising for the long range stability of the whole Middle East.

Nomads in the Gaza are now growing bumper crops of tomatoes and cucumbers and are just beginning to get a taste of the better features of modern prosperity.

The 40,000 workers from the west bank are now employed and able to provide a wholesome and healthy life for their families. The recent west bank elections are testimony to the re-birth of a normalized relationship between Arab and Jew within Israel.

How exciting these new achievements are and what an *extraordinary* departure they represent in the traditionally squalid life of the Arab "fellaheen."

I know that none of this is news to you. I am certain that you follow each new de-

velopment with even more intense excitement and pride than I have through my visit to Israel and the overseas edition of the Jerusalem Post each Thursday. But I think that considering these things is a good way to back into some of the issues that I want to address myself to here at the conference today.

I say this because I know that Israel has a special meaning to you as Zionists and as Americans. But it also has a special meaning to me as an individual—as a non-Jew.

Although it is difficult to express exactly what I mean, I would like to try before we take up the specific question of American policy. The reason I think this is important is because I feel *very strongly* that the time has come when our *feelings*—our values—as a people and our policies should no longer be separated.

Looking back on the beginnings of the modern Zionist movement, I am convinced that this same conclusion was reached by the important Zionist writers and thinkers in the late 19th century.

Men like Moses Hess, Lilenblum, Pinsker, and of course Theodore Herzl realized that the hopes raised by the Enlightenment in Europe with its new rationalism and its egalitarianism were without substance for Jews.

These men were the first to unite the feelings and real life experience of international Jewry with a pragmatic policy decision.

As Pinsker said of the Jewish people—"We are everywhere a guest, and nowhere at home—Consequently it is our bounden duty to devote all our remaining moral force to re-establishing ourselves as a living nation."

Looking back over this century we must acknowledge what far-sighted and prophetic words these were. Today we know that but for the long and difficult efforts of the Zionist movement, the Holocaust might have brought an end to the dream of "next year in Israel."

Somehow, I have the conviction that all of us today must fight to make sure that America sees just as clearly that *its* moral sentiments must be reflected in its policies toward Israel.

The horror of centuries has finally caught up with us. The centuries of state and church-sanctioned anti-Semitism; the pogroms; the indignities of ghetto life; the resignation to a life without basic freedoms and finally the ultimate outrage of the Holocaust have left us, Jew and non-Jew alike, with a new moral imperative. This is our legacy.

The re-birth of Israel represents *all of the best things in man*. It is living, breathing proof that human beings can survive the most vicious, gratuitous acts of insult, injury, and murder and emerge steadfast and determined. The people of Israel have made a commitment to life with the most profound zest, enthusiasm and stubborn pride ever seen in the memory of man. This small nation, which you have helped to build and sustain, stands as an example of people working together for *their land* and within the framework of ethical and moral traditions at a time when so many of *our* people disaffected, jaded and unmoved by genuine emotion for anything outside themselves.

What has all this got to do with America's foreign policy and with America's role in the Middle East?

To me it means that we have to begin to take a new look at what is really in our national interest.

Policy and emotion, Policy and integrity. Policy and conscience. They simply cannot be separated in the case of Israel.

We must begin to realize that every once in awhile nations must have the sense to see that what is "smart" is what is "right." In other words, The Hell with the Oil. The Hell with the Suez. The Hell with the timid souls who say "Don't do that, its too dangerous."

The proper policy for the United States and for all of its friends—is to assure the safety and survival of Israel no matter the cost.

If we are smart as well as honest we will take to heart the lesson of Israel's first 25 years: Don't give in to terror. Don't give in to threats. Don't give in to censure by other countries who could care less what happens to Israel. Don't formulate policy hoping to be loved in return.

America must take an unequivocal stand or risk losing for all time the best living example of values, traditions and principles which we cherish. *Israel must live.*

We all know that there are other things to be gained or lost for the United States in the Middle East.

Today it is still a place of active daily warfare between Arabs and Israelis.

To complicate matters it has become a place of confrontation between the big powers. There is no question but that the Soviet Union intends to meet some of its own needs for friends and oil and access to the Mediterranean and the Atlantic through its support of Egypt-Syria and the Palestinian guerrilla movements.

If *only* this political confrontation were at stake it would be sufficient to justify our support of Israel.

But let's get this point cleared up. I am *not* Pro-Israel because I am anti-Communist. Most of you are aware of my heritage and the way I feel about the domination by the Soviet Union over Poland and other nations of eastern and central Europe.

When I talk about "Captive Nations" I am deadly serious. And no people understand better what is implied in that term than the Jews of the Soviet Union.

But do not be misled. I support Israel and its national future because I believe in it; because it is part of our history; because it is part of me as a person.

This has nothing whatsoever to do with the Soviet Union or France or England or the Sudan or Mainland China or anybody else. Well, then—how do we translate this feeling, this commitment, into action and policy?

I would like to present to you an 8-point Plan for U.S. Policy:

(1) All of us must resist the trend among the new isolationists in America to back away from Israel. In a few years, if unchecked, this movement will begin to have an influence on American policy. We must not allow this to happen.

(2) Secondly, we must react more strongly against the growing anti-Semitism which is coming from the black community and other minority groups. If scapegoating gets a new lease on life in our cities we will bitterly regret it and the Jewish community in the U.S. and in Israel will suffer for it.

(3) We must expand our national commitment to the problems of Soviet Jewry. The Soviet Union does respond to world public opinion and we must keep the pressure on.

(4) We must also continue to expand our financial assistance to Israel to meet the costs of the Aliyah. If we do not help through U.S. government assistance to relocate and re-educate and re-settle the thousands of Soviet Jews yet to come, Israel's defense budget will be seriously jeopardized.

During the past session of Congress, I cosponsored a bill in the House to provide $85 million for this purpose which was recently approved in both the House and the Senate. We must do much more, however, in this direction over the next few years.

(5) We must maintain a steady flow of military and monetary assistance to Israel over the next five critical years. There must be no misunderstanding on the other side that the U.S. commitment is half-hearted.

And I must say—as a footnote to this—that *I fail to see* why practically everything we do for Israel is handled as a *loan!* When you stop to consider the billions of dollars in military and foreign aid we have *given* to countries who don't like us and who have never shared our commitment to freedom, I cannot *imagine* why everything we do with Israel is a "business transaction."

I feel so strongly on this point that I believe we should attempt to persuade our NATO allies to accept Israel as an additional NATO partner. When the North-Atlantic Treaty Organization was formed the Mediterranean offered a buffer between the continent of Europe and the Middle East—particularly since the American fleet dominated those waters.

But this situation has changed. With the Soviet fleet now in the Mediterranean, that ocean no longer serves as a buffer, and what happens in the Middle East directly affects all of our NATO allies and our own interests.

This is why I believe Israel should be invited to become a NATO partner and benefit from the collective security of NATO.

If our NATO partners reject this concept, the United States should unilaterally treat Israel within the same posture we treat our other allies in Europe and give—not sell Israel the arms she needs to defend herself.

(6) We must *refuse* to collaborate with the Soviet Union in forcing a "Big Power" settlement on the conflict in the Middle East. Israel must not become the victim of another "Yalta."

Israel has the right to settle its own disputes and its own destiny. There is absolutely no justification for the U.S. to make it possible for the Arab leadership to continue to behave as if Israel is a mythical nation which doesn't really exist officially and which need not be negotiated with.

In my opinion there will never be a genuine peace in the Middle East until face-to-face formal negotiations take place.

Furthermore, I feel that the Jarring Commission has lost its credibility completely by encouraging the Arab leadership in this delusion and by fanning its hopes that Israel will withdraw from occupied territories as a pre-condition to talks.

(7) I think that the United States should take a stern and uncompromising position on the issue of Arab terrorism.

It is appalling to me that in the wake of the recent hijackings and the slaughter at Lod Airport it is left to the *airline pilots* to become spokesmen in this situation.

This should be the responsibility of *Nations* not pilots. All of us know that these attacks and these kidnappings of planes and people simply could not go on without the indifference and sometimes the willing collaboration of the countries involved.

It is time to make it very uncomfortable and unprofitable for countries which condone and collaborate whether we involve economic sanctions or other methods.

As a postscript to this point, we must never lose sight of the fact that it was the exhortation of *Radio Cairo* and *Radio Damascus* which convinced the Palestinian Arabs to leave their homes in the first place!

The Arab leadership created the refugee problem and they have kept these people in camps for these many years for the express purpose of maintaining the hostility and using the plight of the refugees as a phony propaganda weapon.

After all if Israel can integrate the refugees of the Sinai and the west bank into its society and economy, are we to believe that Syria and the Lebanon cannot?

(8) Finally—and most importantly of all—the "Keystone" to America's Middle East policy must be to do whatever is required diplomatically and militarily to maintain the security—the territorial integrity—and the national life of Israel.

To do anything less would be a betrayal of our own national morality, the principles of freedom and justice upon which America was founded, and would be such a violation of what we know as a people to be right that

I doubt we could ever recover our sense of worthiness and self-respect.

In conclusion let me just make an observation:

Over the past few years many of my friends have said to me—"Oh, those Israelis—they're stubborn. They're abrupt. They're in such a hurry they practically knock you down. They're unyielding and uncompromising."

Well—they probably are. *But just think what else* they are. They're proud. They're proud of being Jews and being Israelies. They believe in Israel. They fight for it and they die for it. They're turning deserts into gardens. Last week, for the first time in the history of medicine, a laser beam was used instead of a scalpel to perform delicate brain surgery and to cure cancer patients. Whole new industries in synthetics are being developed. Schools, symphonies and universities are growing and developing. Small Arab towns like Hebron and Bethlehem are hiring planners and architects for the first time in history. And each month thousands of new Israelies appear in harbors of Israel and are fed, clothed, housed, re-educated, and integrated into the fabric of Israel's national life.

This is achievement of heroic proportions. It makes all of us proud to be men.

It turns all of us into Zionists.

LET'S PROTECT OUR OCEAN FISHERIES

HON. ROBERT H. STEELE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, the difficult position of the fishing industry, and the high prices consumers must pay for fish, are primarily caused by the foreign fishing fleets operating just a few miles off our coastlines. The foreign fleets frequently employ mass fishing methods that endanger the ecology of the area, and thus threaten both our own fishermen's livelihood, and an important food source for humanity. In many cases, the activities of the foreign fishing vessels violate multinational agreements designed to protect the economics and ecology of fisheries.

Often, because we presently lack adequate enforcement authority, the exploitive activities of the foreign fisheries is "legal," and cannot be stopped. In the interests of protecting the ecology of the oceans, assuring the continued existence of an important food source, and enabling our country to maintain a fishing industry, it is vital for Congress to address itself to the problem of protecting our living marine resources.

I wish to include excerpts from two current reports documenting particular aspects of foreign fishing off our coasts.

The first, "Beyond the 12-Mile Limit," appears in the July 1972 issue of Environmental Quality magazine. It focuses upon the threat foreign fishers pose to the survival of our coastal fish stocks, and urges this country to take the initiative in protecting the living marine resources along its Continental Shelf.

BEYOND THE 12-MILE LINE

(By Russ Oetting)

Over-exploitive fishery operations by Russian and Japanese fleets during the last decade have decimated yellow-fin sole in the western Bering Sea to the point where a British research vessel reported the lack of any commercial quantity of this resource, at the same time candidly observing the complete absence of either Soviet or Japanese vessels. Halibut and black cod resources in the eastern Bering Sea and the northern Pacific experienced a meteoric rise and fall in catch statistics as the foreign fleets directed their exploitation to these species.

In the North Atlantic Grand Banks, Georges Banks, Brown Banks and Gulf of Maine continental shelf fisheries, haddock and yellow-fin flounder are being decimated by an amazing army of fishing fleets. The so-called Red Fleet, including some of the world's most efficient fisheries vessels from Russia, Poland, East Germany, Bulgaria, Rumania and Yugoslavia, together with those of Japan, West Germany, Spain, Norway and Cuba, exploit fisheries which a decade ago were the exclusive territory of the United States, Canada and Iceland.

Russia and German engineering construction, and photographs recently smuggled out of the VEB Volkswerft, Strausland, East German shipyards, give a detailed picture of the "overkill" capacities of the new Soviet *Tropic* and *Atlantik* stern trawlers (see illustrations). Through sources confidential to this author, the western nations were able to learn of previously unsuspected capabilities, such as 400 ton-per-day floating canneries and trawlers so maneuverable "they can turn on a dime."

Optimism fades even further as scientists from the University of Washington's College of Fisheries, the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute in Massachusetts, and the University of California Scripps Oceanographic Institute at La Jolla have determined that, for various reasons, over 90% of the world's oceans are biological deserts, relatively useless as food sources.

Remaining are the coastal seas or continental shelf waters. Rich in nutrients and shallow in depth allowing sunlight to penetrate and photosynthesize phytoplankton (microscopic algae), this shallow off shore region is responsible for most of the earth's marine biological life. Here are the world's richest fisheries.

Planktonic algae sinking below 100 meters becomes dormant on the dark sea floor. The interaction of wind forces, wave action, and ocean current produce an up-welling of the cool, deep waters which "wash up" onto the continental shelf. Here, masses of dormant phytoplankton perpetually arrive to begin photosynthesizing and feeding the food cycle.

An astounding case of international naivete, the United States and other major fishery nations have adopted an exclusive 12-mile fishery zone intended to protect ground feeding species which ecologically recognize the extent of the continental shelf and the upper region of the continental slope leading to the ocean bottom as the limits of their habitat.

The continental shelf and slope, a natural phenomenon, varies extensively from north to south. In the Atlantic, southeast of Newfoundland, the famed Grand Banks shelf area extends 200 miles into the Atlantic. The Georges and Browns Banks off the coasts of Nova Scotia extend 160 miles seaward. Further south the shelf narrows to as little as 3 miles off the eastern coast of Florida.

In the Pacific a minimal 6–10 mile shelf exists off the coast of Baja California. The west coast continental shelf of the United States and Canada averages 17-19 miles. Except for occasional drops, the Alaskan shelf in the Northern Pacific and Bering Sea extends to Russia.

It is principally in the continental shelf regions *beyond* the official 12-mile zone of exclusive fisheries jurisdiction that many foreign fleets enjoy almost unrestricted exploitation of what historically has been the exclusive property of the coastal nation. These "interlopers" are usually driven to such lengths after they have destroyed their own historic coastal and inland fisheries—often by over-exploitation and criminal mismanagement.

The Russians are a good example. Two Soviet documents, translated by the Fisheries College, University of Washington, and the Legislative Branch of the Congressional Library, bring to light the gross mismanagement and pollution of Russian fisheries. The Soviet Union's most productive inland sea fishery for the past hundred years, the Caspian Sea basin, has been virtually destroyed. Waters of the Volga and other contributary rivers have been diverted from this basin, retained in numerous large hydroelectric dam reservoirs. This, with major pollution problems from millions of gallons of untreated sewage dumped into the rivers from the high populated and industrialized middle Volga region, have resulted in catastrophic reduction in fishery yields from both the rivers and the Caspian basin.

Ostensibly directing their attention to hake, the Soviets now carefully outside the new U.S. 12-mile exclusive fishing zone established as a result of the furor created by their fleets in these waters in 1966, proceeded to exploit this resource heavily while concurrently researching the heavy seasonal salmon runs into the mouths of the Columbia, Klamath and Russian rivers.

Soviet research and exploratory fishing operations on the salmon resource in the Bering Sea and the Alaskan continental shelf waters had already preceeded this research drawing the ire of Alaskan commercial operators. During 1970, Pacific Northwest fishermen joined in the protest against Russian exploitation of salmon stocks.

With the fisheries in the Black Sea and the Baltic over-exploited by Russian, Nordic and other European fleets, the virtual loss of the Caspian and Aral inland sea fisheries, and severe climatic conditions in the Arctic seas, the Soviet drive to new fisheries belonging to other nations is alarming.

Unable to obtain proof of deliberate exploitation of salmon, the U.S. Marine Fisheries Service issued a statement that no confirmed sightings had been made of Soviet use of gill nets, purse seines, surface longlines or trolling gear, traditional gear used to harvest salmon. Therefore, any landings of salmon by the Soviets were considered incidental to normal trawl operations on bottom-feeding fish.

The official Soviet denial took the form of a newspaper article written by Alexi Volkov, Chief consultant to the USSR Ministry of Fisheries, published in Sacramento, California on December 6, 1970. Volkov's article stated in part that staggering costs prohibited the construction of trawlers to conduct other than "other" or bottom trawl operations—thus implying that the "American witnesses" claiming heavy exploitation of salmon were mistaken.

This defense begins to appear dubious as both the *Tropik* and the *Atlantik* trawler classes are not only capable of specializing with drift nets and purse seine gear for salmon, tuna and albacore, but are also fitted with normal bottom trawl gear for exploitation of the bottom-feeding species as well. The most amazing disclosures, however, were the technical discussions of mid-water or layer trawling with bottom trawl nets in conjunction with the most sophisticated horizontal and vertical fisheries sonar gear available, allowing utilization of this deep water gear for exploitation of "pelagic" or migratory species.

Concerted use of this high-frequency sonar by the Russians, with close control of the trawl gear in mid-layer operations, makes an accidental take of large quantities of

any species—including salmon—highly improbable.

Therefore, the trawlers which aroused so much concern in the Pacific Northwest were capable of harvesting most fisheries species (not just bottom feeders as claimed), all of them deliberately.

The salmon in question are sexually mature fish returning to their western U.S. river spawning grounds. Many are yearling salmon which will not move up the rivers but will make another predictable sweep into the Pacific Ocean, to return in a year or so and begin the saga of spawning and death in the riffles where they were spawned. They will, that is, if they can elude Russian and Japanese high seas gill-netting and purse seine operations which dot the migration grounds while avoiding U.S. and Canadian fisheries experts.

While Volkov, as chief consultant for the USSR's Ministry of Fisheries, asserts that Russia participates in at least 36 international agreements on exploitation of living marine resources, it is interesting to note that none of these provide for mutual inspection of catch or equipment. Instead, they depend on the integrity of the nation and its vessel captains and fleet commanders to conduct their operations within the gear, specie and catch limitations imposed.

The inadequacy of a 12-mile exclusive fishery zone was recognized by Senator Warren G. Magnuson (D-Wash), co-sponsor of Senate Bill S-2218 in 1966, when he stated that the bill as enacted was only "stop-gap" action. This bill has not been amended to date, and the Russians, laughing at these antiquated limits while maintaining a similar limitation of their own for the sake of appearances, continue their massive onslaught beyond this area, basing their exploitation on "research" into the behavior of the species.

The gravity of the problem in the northwest Atlantic Grand Banks and Gulf of Maine areas deepens as a controversial bill extending protection for Massachusetts' contiguous seas to 200 miles was signed into law in 1971.

During the Fourth Governor's Conference on Marine Resources, held in Portland, Oregon in 1971, Iceland's distinguished Ambassador Hans Anderson electrified delegates with the announcement that Iceland had officially extended her fisheries jurisdiction to 50 miles.

And early the same year, Senator Ted Stevens (R-Alaska) introduced a bill to extend U.S. contiguous fisheries jurisdiction to the necessary nautical mile interpretation to correspond with 550 meters in depth, or roughly 1000 fathoms. *This is the first proposal even considering depth as the limiting factor in the extension of controls over the contiguous seas.*

Obviously, an extension of U.S. exclusive fisheries zoning, or perhaps a trustee ship based on our interest as a coastal state with a primary interest in preserving and maintaining its own coastal fisheries, must respect the specie involved.

Such an extension must take the form of controls based on the continental shelf and slope. In order to fully protect bottom-feeding fish, a "restricted fisheries zone" or RFZ must be established to the 1000-fathom curve, not to exclude foreign fishing fleets, but to control their exploitation of the living marine resources to that depth.

Severe controls are necessary on the continental shelf to a 300-fathom curve. Restrictions and controls within the 300-fathom curve will in essence protect every inch of the continental shelf and 90% of our fisheries stocks.

The 300-fathom and 1000-fathom controls on all fishing vessels must include licensing, restrictions on types of gear to be used, catch limitations and quotas, and closed seasons to protect spawning. An important new feature, that of boarding and inspection of catch and gear by fisheries specialists of the concerned coastal nation or state, must also be included.

Unfortunately, establishing a Restrictive Fishing Zone to the 1000-fathom curve would provide only limited protection for the highly migratory tuna, albacore, salmon and whale. However, multilateral negotiations establishing the 1000-fathom RFZ would present a united front to those nations exploiting these pelagic species without consideration for quotas or conservation by the simple expediency of refusing licensing of their vessels in the highly important 1000-fathom curve fisheries.

Thus, unprecedented international accord is called for to end the anarchy which plagues the world's richer fishing grounds. Will the Russians, Poles, Germans, Bulgarians, Rumanians, Yugoslavs, Japanese, Spanish, Norwegians, Cubans, and Americans be able to settle the issue? This, like many environmental questions, is indeed unsure; but the oceans and their inhabitants are finite and must be considered a delicate biological system, demanding intelligent management and strict international cooperation. Otherwise, these optimists who yet feel free to consider the marine eco-sphere as "watershed" of protein may well vanish along with the once fertile fishing grounds—ravaged under their complacence.

The second excerpt is from the May 1972 Report on Foreign Fishing Off U.S. Coasts, prepared by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration of the U.S. Department of Commerce. I emphasized the sections of particular relevance to New England.

REPORT ON FOREIGN FISHING OFF U.S. COASTS
(May 1972)

The number of foreign fishing and fishery support vessels sighted off the U.S. coasts in May 1972 increased to almost 730 vessels, or 80 more than were seen in April.

In the Northwest Atlantic, off New England's coast, almost 270 foreign vessels were seen, the second largest concentration. Most of them (201) were from the Soviet Union, which maintained its fishing effort higher than in any prior year . . . The main species fished by the foreign fleets were sea herring, mackerel and hakes; smaller fisheries for ocean perch and argentines took place between Georges and Browns Banks. For the first time this year, small fishery for herring developed off the New Hampshire and Maine coasts. The Soviets began to fish for herring and mackerel with purse seiners on a large scale (57 vessels); this gear may considerably increase Soviet catch of these species per vessel and hour of fishing. Of some concern is Soviet fishing in closed area B on Georges Bank and the uncooperative attitude of East German fishermen shown towards conservation measures introduced by the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries.

IN THE NORTHEAST ATLANTIC

A total of 267 individual foreign fishing and support vessels from the Soviet Union, Poland, East Germany, Bulgaria, Romania, Spain, Greece, and Denmark was sighted off the New England and Mid-Atlantic coasts in May . . . The Soviet fleet was the most numerous, with weekly concentrations of 125 to 150 vessels. Of the 201 individual vessels sighted, 58 were medium freezer and factory stern trawlers, 124 medium side trawlers (including 57 purse seiners), 8 factory base ships, 9 refrigerated fish carriers and supply vessels, and 2 were tankers.

Also sighted in May were 38 Polish, 11 East German, 7 Bulgarian, 3 Rumanian, 3 Spanish, 1 Greek, and 3 Danish vessels.

OFF THE SOUTHERN NEW ENGLAND COAST AND ON GEORGES BANK

Soviet: Several fleets, totaling about 190 vessels, operated along the edge of the Continental Shelf on Georges Bank, fishing in waters 30–100 fathoms deep from Block Canyon to Corsair Canyon primarily for sea herring, mackerel, and hakes . . . Throughout May, the Soviet vessels were seen on the borders of closed area B where fishing with demersal gear is not allowed from March through May, according to regulations of the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic (ICNAF). The Soviet vessels would cross into the closed area, but when joint Canadian-U.S. fishery surveillance patrols appeared, they usually left. It was impossible to determine what species they were fishing. On May 27, when 40–50 vessels were seen inside the closed area B, they were fishing with purse seines for herring.

EAST GERMANS DISREGARD ICNAF REGULATIONS

On May 15, during a joint Canadian-U.S. fishery surveillance patrol, 3 East German vessels were sighted fishing well inside the ICNAF closed area B in the vicinity of the Corsair Canyon. They were the stern trawler *Herbert Baum* and the side trawlers *Dresden* and *Henningsdorf;* 2 were fishing with gear "capable of catching demersal species" which is illegal under the ICNAF regulations. The captain of the Canadian patrol vessel *Cygnus* contacted the East German Fleet Commander and advised him that his vessels were fishing in an area closed under ICNAF regulations from March through May. The German replied that East Germany, not a member of ICNAF, does not recognize the regulations of the Convention and that his vessels will fish wherever they choose and for whatever species they like. The East German trawlers then reset their nets and continued fishing.

VETERANS' APPRECIATION OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from a constituent which expresses the feelings of many of our U.S. Army veterans. It is refreshing to read such a letter from a grateful recipient of the GI bill's financial assistance, especially during a time when much of the publicity has been of an adverse nature.

This is a well-written letter and I am inserting it in the RECORD at this point for the benefit of my colleagues.

The letter follows:

PALM BEACH JUNIOR COLLEGE,
Lake Worth, Fla., June 8, 1972.

Hon. PAUL ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROGERS: I am a retired U.S. Army Colonel who served his country for 26 years and who has taken advantage of undergraduate and graduate work through the assistance of the Federal Government through the Veterans Administration Agency.

On June 13, 1972 I will graduate from Florida Atlantic University at Boca Raton, Florida with my Masters Degree in Education. Let me say that my undergraduate degree was obtained through benefit of the G.I. Bill through attendance at colleges and universities the world over.

The purpose of this letter is to inform you

that I am proud of my past Army service for my country; and let me say further that I am justly proud of the financial assistance my country has given me in attaining my educational goals. Without Governmental financial assistance the attainment of both my Bachelors and Masters Degrees would not have been possible.

I request that this letter be read into the Congressional Record to show that one U.S. Army Veteran does appreciate the educational opportunity afforded him by his Country and Congressmen, and that he has taken full advantage of their offer.

Respectfully yours,

LAWRENCE D. TUTTLE,
Chairman, Law Enforcement Department.

OUTREACH TO SPACE

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor of April 18, 1972, offers a profound commentary on the significance of our national space effort. Our ability to master our own environment and improve our quality of life is largely dependent on our knowledge of the world in which we live and our mastery of the technology necessary to utilize that knowledge. The editorial of the Christian Science Monitor speaks to this issue and the importance of our national space effort for the benefit of all mankind.

The article follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 18, 1972]

OUTREACH TO SPACE

Vice-President Agnew is right. Technicians luanch an Apollo moon rocket with a smoothness that seems almost causal. Sunday's brilliant performance again shows how skilled they have become. It tempts us to believe that, as spacemen, this generation has already arrived.

How salutary then for the U.S. National Academy of Sciences to point out we have scarcely tottered beyond earth's threshold. As a recent report of the NASA space science board explains, we have yet to fathom the challenge space flight presents to man himself.

American and Russian exploits have proved the worth of our hardware. But they merely raise questions as to the physical and mental fitness for space of human beings. The board calls these questions "formidable". It says only major research in what amounts to self-knowledge can fit us for more than brief forays across the space frontier. The body's response to long-term space conditions remains unknown. Hazards of deep-space cosmic rays are not yet proved.

What intrigues us most is that the board insists on the need for mental self-knowledge and control. To successfully undertake long space missions, men must make togetherness work in confined quarters. They must learn what home and habitability really are and express these in seemingly deprived environments.

And most significantly, the board notes, men must learn to recognize when their thinking is manipulated by the fantasies of a brain challenged by feeling of isolation and boredom. They must learn to master such manipualtions. They must keep a clear view of reality to make space flight work, the board says.

These requirements for outreach to the universe sound like a basis for more harmonious living on Space Ship Earth. Perhaps this is space flight's larger challenge: to expand our range even a little way into the cosmos requires us to transcend human shortcomings through deeper self-knowledge. This should help us solve a more abundant life on earth as well.

TIMOTHY LUPFER HEADS WEST POINT CLASS

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, recently a resident of Metuchen Borough in my congressional district received a very great honor which I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues. Lt. Timothy T. Lupfer was graduated at the head of his West Point class which was the largest group to graduate in the school's 170-year history.

I have followed Tim's career since he first wrote to me while a senior in high school. He had a burning desire to go to the Academy at West Point, and the record he had built throughout his high school years made him an excellent candidate. During high school Tim excelled in scholastics and sports. He was a leader in his church and in student activities. Now he has graduated at the head of his West Point class. I feel certain that these are most definitely steps in his young life, and that we will hear much more from him.

At this time I would like to place in the RECORD an editorial from the Home News of New Brunswick, N.J. This editorial reflects the pride of those who have known Tim all his life. I would like to take this opportunity to join them in extending to Tim my warmest congratulations on his fine achievement.

The editorial is as follows:

WE SALUTE LIEUTENANT LUPFER

Cadet Capt. Timothy T. Lupfer of Metuchen achieved national recognition when he was graduated on Wednesday at the head of the largest class in the 170-year history of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point.

Cadet Lupfer's success at West Point was not a complete surprise to faculty members at Metuchen High School who knew him during his four preparatory years there. He was among the top 15 in his graduating class, where his knowledge of history was particularly noted. He was prominent in athletics, both wrestling and cross country. He was a member of the Student Council, Varsity Club, Key Club, yearbook staff. His full academic program included 12 honors courses.

At West Point, Lupfer continued his journalistic activity by being editor of the Cadet publication, "Pointer."

Metuchen High School faculty and staff members remember Lupfer for his high leadership qualities, for his scholarship, for his participation in extracurricular activities, for his integrity.

He stood high in the regard of his fellow students as well as of the faculty. We rejoice with his parents and his high school in the high honor his achievements at West Point have brought to his hometown, to our county and our state.

STATEMENT BY AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

HON. EDWARD W. BROOKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission has prepared a statement in conjunction with the Fourth of July observance next week. This statement stresses our continuing commitment as a nation to the goals of equality of opportunity, human decency, environmental improvement, and peace for all mankind by the beginning of our bicentennial commemoration 4 years from now.

I ask unanimous consent that the Commission's statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION, JULY 4, 1972

Six years ago on July 4, 1966, the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission was established by a Joint Resolution of the Congress. The Commission was specifically charged by that Resolution to plan, encourage, develop and coordinate observances and activities commemorating the historic events that preceded and are associated with the American Revolution. The Commission was further instructed in all its planning to give special emphasis to the ideas associated with the Revolution which have been so important in the development of the United States in world affairs and in mankind's quest for freedom.

Those ideas, all based on the essential worth and dignity of the individual human being, were both heretical and evangelical in their day. It was the "troika" of heresies contained in the second paragraph of the Declaration of Independence—the heresy that all men are created equal, that they have a right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and that governments are instituted among men to secure those rights—which inspired 13 small, poor and weak colonies to defeat the Armed Forces of the British Empire.

But, they did not stop there. They went back with General Lafayette to France, became "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity" and inspired the French Revolution only 13 years after our own began. Since then, those heretical ideas have resulted in the overthrow of autocratic governments and the establishment of representative democracies around the world. Literally hundreds of millions of human beings have owed and now owe their personal freedom to the 56 men who had the courage to sign the Declaration 196 years ago.

Those ideas are no longer heretical. They have become respectable, and as they have gained respectability they have lost their original evangelical fire. We tend to take them for granted. But we must resist that tendency because those three ideas are worth more to America and Americans than all the gold at Fort Knox, all the oil beneath our soil, more than the combined resources of the richest, most powerful and most generous nation the world has ever seen, because they created that nation. And when those ideas die, America will be dead.

In this Bicentennial Era, the challenge to all Americans is to revive and revitalize those ideas, to make use of their eternal truth and their demonstrated power to show a tired old world what we have been able to do in only two centuries.

The challenge is to demonstrate by our 200th birthday that we have brought full and true equality of opportunity where once there was slavery and male domination, that we have brought decency where there was poverty, sufficiency where there was hunger, conservation where there was devastation and exploitation, beauty where there was ugliness, peace where there was war.

It is the hope and intent of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission that each Independence Day for the next four years will bear witness to dramatic increases in such involvement and support until on Liberty Day, July the Fourth of 1976, every community in the United States can celebrate with good conscience the unqualified success of the greatest experiment in representative government the world has ever witnessed.

RESOLUTIONS ON THE DEATH OF PHILIP J. PHILBIN

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, the death of Phil Philbin was an occasion of great sorrow in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Phil was known throughout the State for his dedication to his constituents and to the Nation.

The Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts adopted on June 15, 1972, a resolution expressing their sympathy and condolences on the passing of the late Phil Philbin. There could be no more fitting tribute to this fine public servant than from the legislators of his home state.

I am submitting for the RECORD the resolution offered by the Senator Joseph D. Ward, and adopted by the Senate.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTIONS ON THE DEATH OF PHILIP J. PHILBIN

Whereas, The Massachusetts Senate has learned with deep sorrow of the death of Philip Joseph Philbin of Clinton, a former representative in Congress from the third congressional district of Massachusetts; and

Whereas, Philip J. Philbin, born in the town of Clinton, graduated from Clinton high school with honors and was an outstanding athlete on the football and baseball teams; and

Whereas, He continued his education by graduating from Harvard University where he was a member of Harvard's last Rose Bowl football team and by attaining a law degree from Columbia Law School and becoming a practicing attorney in Massachusetts; and

Whereas, Philip J. Philbin served Massachusetts and his country as a Congressman of the United States for twenty-eight years, distinguishing himself as the vice-chairman of the House Armed Services Committee; and

Whereas, In his long and honored career in the public service, he also served as personal representative for the late United States Senator David I. Walsh, as special counsel to the United States Committee on Education and Labor, as a referee for the United States Department of Labor, as a member of the Massachusetts Unemployment Compensation Commission, as chairman of the Clinton Finance Committee and as president of the Clinton Chamber of Commerce and gained the reputation of being ever conscious of his obligations to the people he represented and dedicated to the honorable discharge of his duties; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate hereby extends to the family of the late Philip J. Philbin its deepest sympathy and condolences in their bereavement; and be it further

Resolved, That these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Clerk of the Senate to the family of the late Philip J. Philbin.

REMARKS OF VICE ADM. HYMAN RICKOVER AND CHAIRMAN GEORGE MAHON AT THE LAUNCHING OF THE U.S.S. "NIMITZ"

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, a memorable event took place in Newport News, Va., on May 13, 1972. The mighty aircraft carrier U.S.S. *Nimitz,* CVAN–68, was launched.

I was fortunate enough to have been present.

My good friend, the very distinguished gentleman from Texas, GEORGE H. MAHON, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, made the principal address upon the occasion of the launching. He was introduced by Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the introductory remarks of Admiral Rickover, father of the nuclear Navy, and the address of Chairman MAHON at this historic event for the Navy and for our Nation.

INTRODUCTION OF THE HONORABLE GEORGE H. MAHON, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, BY VICE ADM. H. G. RICKOVER, U.S. NAVY, ON THE OCCASION OF THE LAUNCHING OF THE U.S.S. "NIMITZ"

It is a privilege to be called upon to introduce the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the United States House of Representatives, Congressman George H. Mahon of Lubbock, Texas.

I have known Congressman Mahon for a quarter of a century. In all that time he has never wavered from his ceaseless devotion to a strong defense for the United States. He has been and continues to be at the forefront of those in Congress who fight for a modern nuclear powered Navy. He knows that in today's troubled world, if one might err in judgment it is better to err on the side of strength than on the side of weakness.

To know him is to be attracted to him. Not that he has ever made any attempt to curry favor or radiate charm. On occasion he can be sharp, even curt. He is not a man to suffer fools gladly. But no one can be associated with him for long and not sense an underlying warmth and kindliness.

The casual observer, considering this man who began his working life so modestly and became what we have known him to be, might say that fortune smiled on him and that he was lucky. But has anything—any advancement, any distinction, any responsibility—ever come to him that he has not earned by application and industry, by sheer force of mind, character and integrity?

There is no affectation in him, no false humility. He knows his capacities, and takes pride in them. He looks on them as a trust of which he must be the diligent and faithful steward. The people to whom he responds are those who have ability and put it to full use, who daunted neither by toil nor difficulty, give themselves without reserve to the work they have in hand.

He is a prodigious worker himself. Nothing less than full mastery of any subject he tackles will satisfy him. When circumstances make it impossible to realize that goal, he regards it as a matter for self-reproach. A man of intense convictions, he is always open-minded, and he is not beyond persuasion until the last word has been spoken.

He knows what his goals are at all times, and he has the ability, the experience, the determination, the strength of character combined with high resolve and patriotism, to perform his duties in the best interest, as he honestly concieves it, of this nation.

He is patient, laborious, and intelligent at his task. He is shrewd in judgment and sound in decision. He has the gift of instantly seeing the main point at issue, no matter how much it is covered up with a mass of details, and the courage to speak out his mind at once. He has vividness, he has sensitivity, sharpness; he has wit, he has a tremendous sense of the essence of human character.

Ever a gentleman, he is thoughtful of individuals regardless of viewpoint. He is helpful and understanding in all official matters, affectionate and sympathetic in any private concern.

His standards of high integrity and honor, professional conduct and competence, are of immense importance to the well-being of our country in an age when the values on which the continuance of civilization and organized human society depend are being questioned. He is an idealist and pragmatist, a complex of courage and expediency, intolerant of pettiness and sham.

Some may find themselves in disagreement with the way he applies his philosophy, but no one ever doubts the sincerity with which it is held, or the integrity with which it is offered. And those who work with him and see his day-to-day conduct, in Congress and outside it, know that he is sensitive, honest, intelligent, aware of and often sympathetic to opposing arguments, generous even to those who oppose him, and capable of admitting a mistake.

Sometimes he is tough. One has to be and ought to be when dealing with such important matters as the defense and welfare of this great nation. But he is always fair.

As the Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee he is one of the few officials in our Government upon whom the responsibility rests to recommend to Congress the specific allocation of funds for each and every phase of work to be supported by the Federal Government. His experience on the Appropriations Committee for over three decades and as Chairman of the full committee for the last eight years has provided him a unique vantage point from which to view our defense.

The record he has made is memorable and outstanding in its import and impact upon the national welfare. His decisions affect the life of every American.

Ladies and gentlemen, it gives me great pleasure to introduce to you Congressman George H. Mahon.

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE GEORGE H. MAHON, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE OCCASION OF THE LAUNCHING OF THE U.S.S. "NIMITZ"

Admiral Rickover is the master of many things, but it is now apparent from what he has said about me that he is not the master of the understatement. Admiral

Rickover, I am overwhelmed by the warmth of your introduction, but, in all humility, I must take note of the extravagance of your remarks. It has been a great privilege to work with you through the years in the interest of our country.

* * * * *

There is always something dramatic and exciting about the launching of a ship—any ship. When the ship to be launched is as impressive and as important to our national defense as the U.S.S. *Nimitz*, the drama is increased many fold.

We know that what is said here today is of little moment. What has been done here is the important thing that brings us together. The efforts of those who conceived, designed, and built this mighty ship make this a momentous occasion. We come today to celebrate that achievement with them.

I am not surprised that this Yard has done such a fine job in the construction of the U.S.S. *Nimitz*. In spite of the disposition of Texans to be modest—and I hope I'm not losing credibility—let me say that after all, this Yard had the experience of building the battleship *Texas* and both versions of the cruiser *Houston*, and would of course, be expected to do a superb job on the U.S.S. *Nimitz*.

This Yard has a proud history and tradition. The U.S.S. *Ranger*, the first ship designed as an aircraft carrier from the keel up, was built here. Since that time, 20 aircraft carriers have completed construction here. In the World War II period Newport News built 8 aircraft carriers, completing them on a schedule of a new one every 15 weeks. No other shipyard has approached that record. The Navy and the nation owe a debt of gratitude to these shipbuilders and their forebearers. It is a timely moment to recognize the employees of this great Yard as they pause for this launching ceremony.

To the workers whose toil and skill went into the building of this ship, to the engineers who designed her, to the great Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Company, and to those in the Navy who worked with them, it is appropriate to say "well done." And may I also say "well done" for Congress too!

It is a special honor to join with all who are assembled here today in paying tribute to the great Naval leader for whom this ship is named.

Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz of Fredericksburg, Texas, my home State, was one of the foremost Naval strategists that this country has ever produced. It is most appropriate that this mighty ship should bear the name of this great man of the sea.

Under his guidance while Commander-in-Chief of the Pacific Fleet in World War II, the fast carrier task force concept was fully developed and exploited. This concept became a crucial and decisive factor in the success of the Pacific Campaigns of World War II.

Admiral Nimitz was already a distinguished Naval officer at the time of Pearl Harbor, stationed at the time in Washington, D.C. On Christmas Day, 1941—18 days after the Japanese attack—he left the mainland and flew to Hawaii where he assumed command of the Pacific Fleet.

He pulled together and rebuilt our shattered Naval forces. He provided leadership and restored confidence. He had the wisdom to select the correct strategy to defeat the Japanese Navy. Under his command, the heroic and successful Naval campaigns of the war in the Pacific were executed.

This nuclear powered carrier is all the more appropriately named because Admiral Nimitz provided early support of nuclear propulsion for our Navy when others were reluctant to embrace the concept.

On December 5, 1947, just before leaving office as Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Nimitz recommended by letter to the Secretary of the Navy that the Navy develop and construct a nuclear-powered submarine as the first step toward a nuclear Navy. This letter was the first major support that the then Captain Hyman Rickover had received in his effort to gain approval for the development of a nuclear power plant for Navy ships. With the impetus of this recommendation, the Congress took the initiative and urged that nuclear power be provided for the Navy and provided the financing.

Admiral Nimitz was a great favorite with Members of Congress. His sense of humility accounted in part for his success in getting things done. His humility, his talent for saying and doing the right thing at the right time, his brilliant perception of the needs of the nation were recognized and had a great influence on the Congress.

As a result of the foresight of this great military leader, and with the encouragement of members of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the House and Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees, the Navy now has at sea over 100 nuclear submarines and surface warships.

This magnificent ship before us today is in itself strong testimonial to the proven capabilities of nuclear propulsion in Naval ships.

Ten years ago, the *Enterprise*, built in this same Shipyard, joined the Fleet as the world's first carrier with nuclear propulsion.

The *Enterprise* is living up to our expectations in her operational service and is demonstrating the advantages of nuclear propulsion in every area of the globe.

Along with many of my colleagues, I have long been an advocate of nuclear power for the Navy, and it is with deep satisfaction that I witness the solid achievements of the Navy in this regard. I measure my words when I say we shall see to it that further progress in Navy modernization continues.

We are a maritime nation, and in our own self-interest we must maintain a Navy second to none. We depend very heavily on a constant flow of essential materials from many parts of the world. And we export to nations around the globe a long list of American products. The strength of our economy is closely related to this world-wide trade. Vital trade routes traverse the oceans of the world. The vulnerability of these trade routes to coercion by any nation possessing a modern navy is readily apparent.

A major role of the Navy is to counter any challenge to these economic lifelines. In this respect the Navy has never failed the nation. I make bold to say that it never will.

As we move toward a reduction of an American military presence in some parts of the world, while at the same time, retaining our commitments to our friends and assuring the free flow of commerce on the seas, the flexibility and operating range afforded by the U.S.S. *Nimitz* and her sister ships, become all the more necessary to our national interests.

The U.S.S. *Nimitz* will accommodate our latest sea based aircraft and the aircraft of the foreseeable future. She will play a vital role in the control of the sea and the air over the sea. A Naval force must maintain air superiority and the *Nimitz* will be a major instrument to achieve that purpose.

It is also particularly fitting that the launching of this great carrier occurs during the year which marks the 50th anniversary of Carrier Aviation.

It is hardly necessary to say that the differences between this complex, new ship we launch today and the very first aircraft carrier, the U.S.S. *Langley*, are dramatic, indeed.

The *Langley* was a steamship, converted to an aircraft carrier, by a 1919 Act of Congress. She was recommissioned 50 years ago last March 20th.

I am glad that this ship will have a strong flavor of my State of Texas. This is a great moment for the family of the late Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz. In the Lone Star State, the name of Nimitz is symbolic of stability and strength and loyalty to country. The State of Texas takes pride in the record of this great man and we rejoice in his being recognized in the christening of this vessel, and we are happy that a number of members of the family are here with us today and that the U.S.S. *Nimitz* will be christened by his daughter, Catherine Nimitz Lay.

The launching of this ship today makes plain to friend and foe alike that the U.S. continues to believe in military strength as a major element for the promotion of peace. Our thanks are extended to those who built this ship. May God's blessing be upon those who man her. Let us pray that she will always sail under the sunlight and starlight of peace.

In conclusion, let me say that I am impressed by the fact that the deck of this mighty ship extends over the platform upon which I stand, and it extends over the flag which flies over this platform. This means to me that the mission of the U.S.S. *Nimitz* is to shelter and protect the Flag and our great country. May God bless America.

EPILEPSY SOCIETY FOR SOCIAL SERVICE

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the Epilepsy Society for Social Service recently presented me with the second annual humanitarian award, for which I am most grateful. I would like to acknowledge the fine work that this organization has done for the many individuals who are afflicted with epilepsy. A special tribute should be paid to the president of the society, Dr. Theodore Kahn, for his untiring efforts in the field of epilepsy. Dr. Kahn's remarks at this gathering were particularly enlightening. For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to include them in the RECORD at this point:

SPEECH BY DR. THEODORE KAHN

Thank you for your generous welcome. I acknowledge it on behalf of the officers and our loyal members.

Now it is my turn to greet you our distinguished audience . . . for each and every one of you are distinguished by virtue of the fact that you are present tonight, and we are very proud of you.

Friends, before I introduce Congressman Mario Biaggi, the recipient of our humanitarian award, I have a message. Please lend me your ears for a few minutes.

George Bernard Shaw who in his day had known some pretty snooty people—once said, "The worst sin towards our fellow man is not to hate them but to be indifferent toward them." How guilty we all are.

We snub people who do not interest us. We do not partake in causes if it upsets our job, our daily routine, or if it makes us uncomfortable.

But we must help each other—we must become more altruistic. We must give of ourselves.

Dr. William James who wrote about man's behavior to fellow man, declared, "No more fiendish punishment could be devised were

such a thing possible than that one should be turned loose in society and remain absolutely unnoticed by the members thereof."

We never dream that when we ignore the needs of people we are inflicting punishment. Conversely when we are aware and take action we cause people to become aware of us—and this consideration becomes a happy boomerang.

Awhile back the Western Canadian newspapers were conducting a contest for an ad for Epilepsy. The following message was entered and bears repeating.

"TO SOME PEOPLE ROBIN SHARPE IS A SIDESHOW"

He has been ridiculed.

Pointed at.

Whispered about.

Treated with scorn and suspicion.

All because he has one of the oldest, most widely misunderstood conditions known to man: Epilepsy.

He is three years old and has grand mal seizures . . . what some people call fits. Yes, he falls down, turns blue and convulses violently. He is an Epileptic in the full sense of the word.

Yet his condition will never hurt him as much as the attitude of other people.

In school other children will scorn him as "the kid who has fits".

Because he has fits and they don't understand.

Parents will add to the problem by refusing to let their children play with him . . . because it might be catching.

Later in life, he might have a seizure on a dance floor of a teenage party. Again the hostile stares, the whispers the emotional stress.

As an adult, he will be discriminated against in more subtle but equally painful ways. Many employers will refuse to hire him, or pass over him in favor of a non-epileptic employee.

The extent of prejudice against epileptic is incredible.

All of these attitudes are unjustified . . . based entirely on ignorance.

An Epileptic fit is just an occasional over-release of energy from the nerve cells of the brain. The brainwave is slightly upset. (Similar to going over a gravel detour between two stretches of highway). The nervous system triggers a muscle workout throughout the body.

The causes are varied. Many can't be pinpointed exactly.

However the public seems to have its own opinions and diagnosis of the epileptic. This cloudy, outdated thinking influences your attitude toward him.

If you see someone having a seizure, the best thing to do is make sure he is on his side or stomach and let him go to it.

When he recovers make sure that you say something reassuring to him.

That's all.

There is no pain involved whatsoever during an epileptic seizure.

There is no permanent disfigurement.

It does not cause feeble-mindedness or insanity. The epileptic and the mentally retarded are two different conditions entirely.

Seizures as such are in no way inherited.

It can happen to anyone. At any time. At any age . . . to anyone in this room.

Some seizures are no more than a brief pause in awareness, resulting in a blank stare or broken sentence.

Most epileptics are of average to superior intelligence. The list of distinguished people who were epileptics is legendary. Caesar, Socrates, Van Gogh, Handel, Dostievsky.

Your employer might be an Epileptic.

Robin Sharpe takes two pills a day which helps control his seizures. Through medical research it is hoped that his seizures will be held completely in check.

Yet pills will never get him accepted as a completely normal healthy bright little boy.

Many relatives or parents of epileptics are responsible for outdated opinions. Many parents hush-hush their child's condition. Then they criticize others for doing the same thing.

If your child is an epileptic or if you are epileptic, don't be afraid to tell people. Say it as matter-of-fact.

Don't hide it.

Compared to muscular dystrophy, rheumatoid arthritis or mental retardation, epilepsy is nothing.

It is a condition not a disease.

Robin Sharpe doesn't want your money. He wants your understanding and acceptance. You can help cure the real problem of epilepsy.

I know you will understand and help.

Thank you.

PRO-SALT ARGUMENTS ARE ANSWERED

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in the weeks ahead there will be an extensive debate on this body regarding the merits or lack of merits of the SALT agreements. I strongly oppose this agreement and feel it is against our vital interests. My esteemed colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER), recently presented his rational argument for the SALT agreements. I think that some of his arguments should be answered and present here a different view.

I believe there are certain fallacies in the arguments my colleague presented and offer arguments in opposition to some of the basic statements he made. The fallacies and facts follow.

FALLACIES IN PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT FOR SALT PACT

Fallacy: "It is generally conceded that America and Russia cannot risk attacking each other because their nuclear arsenals are sufficient to withstand surprise attack and still have enough undamaged retaliatory hardware left over to inflict unacceptable harm on the aggressor."

Fact: This is not generally conceded at all. In a speech on April 13, 1972, Dr. Edward Teller, one of the greatest living nuclear scientists, was asked the question, "If the Soviets launch a surprise nuclear attack against the United States, what would be the result?" He replied, "The question is when. Right now, they could do terrible damage. In a few years, if present trends continue, it is practically certain that it will be the end of the United States. The United States will not exist—not as a state, not as a power, not as an idea. I think that more than 50 percent of our people would be killed. I believe that the Soviets could so behave that there would be very few casualties in Russia because we would not have forces enough left to retaliate. They have excellent defenses: air defenses, missile defenses, civil defenses. It is possible that, in a few years, we shall be at the mercy of the Soviet Union, unless present trends change."

Dr. John Foster, Director of Defense Research, told U.S. News & World Report that the Soviets "would require a little over 400 SS–9s to knock out all but a small fraction of our Minuteman" missiles. The Soviets have 313 now.

Fallacy: "The rationale of the ABM limitation is obvious. Each new ABM built by one side can be nullified by the other's new offensive installation. It is in nobody's security interest to spend money for that kind of an arms race only to end up poorer, but no safer than before."

Fact: This is like saying that, just because arsonists can buy more and more matches and gasoline cheaper than we can buy fire engines, we should stop maintaining fire departments. Rational men are willing to spend money to protect their homes and families against destruction, regardless of the cost. Arguments like this have kept our 200,000,000 Americans completely defenseless against Soviet nuclear missiles and it overlooks the clear fact that while we have stood still, the USSR has moved full speed ahead.

Fallacy: "The actual number of nuclear warheads in the U.S. deterrent package considerably exceeds those of the Soviets because of our many multiple independently guided re-entry vehicles (MIRVs)."

Fact: The United States simply has no reliable information on how many warheads the Soviets have. The Soviets won't tell us, satellite reconnaissance cannot detect this, and the SALT Pact does not allow any on-site inspection.

The most important error in this equation, however, is that the Soviet warheads are so vastly more powerful than ours that there can be no comparison. Many of our warheads, such as those on our MIRVed Poseidon, are only 50 kilotons; whereas the warheads on the Soviet SS–9s are 25 megatons, and they are getting ready to deploy super SS–9s of 50 megatons. Thus, *one Soviet warhead* now may carry 24,950,000 tons of TNT-explosive equivalent *more* than one of ours can carry, and will soon carry 49,950,000 more than ours.

Thus, when SALT proponents talk about "warheads" they overlook the fact that they equate 50,000 with 25,000,000. When we add up the destruction that these warheads can cause, the Soviets have a tremendous superiority over the United States.

Fallacy: "The greater accuracy of the U.S. warheads gives them a proportionately large kill capability, ample for nuclear sufficiency."

Fact: There is *no* proof that the U.S. warheads are any more accurate that the Soviets. In fact, the reverse may be true. Deputy Secretary of Defense David Packard specifically admitted while he was in office that the United States deliberately did not improve the accuracy of the Minuteman because the Soviets might think that was provocative.

In October 1971, Senator James Buckley proposed an amendment to appropriate a small amount to do the research so that we would have the option of improving the accuracy of our Minuteman and Poseidon missiles if we want to. The Administration lobbied against and defeated that amendment.

Fallacy: "U.S. allies and near allies possess strategic deterrent forces which augment the Free World's over-all deterrent posture."

Fact: The Soviet Union has at least 600 IRBMs and MRBMs targeted on Western Europe, against which Western Europe has neither defense nor deterrent. In conventional weapons, the Warsaw Pact has the NATO powers outgunned by at least two to one.

It is ridiculous to imply that our allies can help us protect the United States against the Soviet nuclear missile force. In fact, our allies' only hope of defending themselves is *our* nuclear umbrella.

Fallacy: "The arrangements impose no limitations whatever on certain U.S. systems contributing to our deterrent strength, such as Strategic Air Command bombers and U.S. aircraft based overseas on land and on aircraft carriers."

Fact: It is vastly more advantageous to

the Soviet Union than to the United States that certain strategic forces were excluded from the SALT Pact. In strategic bombers, the Soviets now outnumber us by 900 to 450. (Their medium-range bombers are refuelable and also can use Cuba as a base. McNamara scrapped our 1,000 medium-range bombers and abandoned the bases close to Russia from which they operated.) Our B–52s have now developed metal fatigue because of excessive use in Vietnam, and no replacements for them have even been ordered. The Soviets are at least five years ahead of us in their version of a new supersonic bomber, called the Backfire, which has already been flight-tested. Our B–1 is still only a wooden mockup.

The SALT Pact imposes no limitations whatever in many areas in which the Soviets are now ahead and now can, under the terms of the treaty, go even further ahead, namely, (1) missile megatonnage, (2) space weapons, (3) fractional orbital weapons, (4) mobile ICBMs, (5) reload capability of their ICBMs, (6) cruise missiles, and (7) satellite interceptors.

Fallacy: "Sufficiency to deter is something in the mind of the beholder, and when one side feels a mix of bombers, IBCMs and SLBMs with which it is satisfied, the other side would need to assume very large and unknown risks of miscalculation in order to assess it as insufficient."

Fact: Countries which falsely and foolishly believed they had "sufficiency to deter" and were "satisfied" with it, have gone down to ignominious defeats. In 1939, France was supremely confident that the Maginot Line give it "sufficiency to deter." France found out that she was wrong.

On December 7, 1941 the United States did not have overwhelming sufficiency to deter. As a result Japan attacked us and Germany declared war on us. Wars are prevented by overwhelming superiority. Instead of superiority, the SALT Pact freezes the United States as a poor second to the Soviet Union in every category of the nuclear weapons which will control the future.

Senator Henry Jackson summed up the SALT Treaty very well: "Simply put, the agreement gives the Soviets more of everything: more light ICBMs, more heavy ICBMs, more submarine-launched missiles, more submarines, more payload, even more ABM radars. In no area covered by the agreement is the United States permitted to maintain parity with the Soviet Union."

History proves that weakness invites aggression. The now-officially proclaimed military inferiority of the United States to the Soviet Union is a dire threat to the lives and freedom of all Americans. We should heed the omnious warning of Winston Churchill (who unsuccessfully tried to warn his country to rearm in time to prevent World War II):

"Sometimes in the past we have committed the folly of throwing away our arms. Under the mercy of Providence, and at great cost and sacrifice, we have been able to recreate them when the need arose. But if we abandon our nuclear deterrent, there will be no second chance. To bandon it now would be to abandon it forever."

ACES WEEK

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the system of capitalism, of competitive private enterprise has been the foundation for prosperity, for growth and accomplishment in this Nation. While such a free system has not been without its challenges—nor will it be devoid from future question—it has been the ability of our economic-political system to respond to such testing that is the measure of its success.

I am particularly pleased therefore, Mr. Speaker, to note that New Jersey Governor William T. Cahill declared ACES—Americans for the Competitive Enterprise System, Inc.—Week. ACES is a nonprofit, economic-educational corporation which conducts 3-day seminars in high schools throughout New Jersey on the operation of the free economic system. The importance of the educational aspects of discussion, dissemination of information and providing a forum for question, cannot be overestimated. And, I would especially like to commend ACES officers, Robert W. Kane, Jr., chairman of the board; H. Alan Christenson, president; and Robert M. Moran, executive director for their valuable efforts in the operation of this program.

Following is the text of the executive proclamation declaring ACES Week:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, there are many misconceptions concerning the operation of our free enterprise system by students and teachers alike; and

Whereas, only two percent of our high school students study economics during their four years of high school; and

Whereas, the free enterprise system has contributed to one of the highest standards of living in the world; and

Whereas, Americans for the Competitive Enterprise System, Inc., fulfills a vital educational need by discussing the difference between the various economic systems throughout the world with high school students; and

Whereas, bringing students from over 70 high schools in Northern New Jersey to visit local businesses exposes many of them for the first time to the world of work;

Now, therefore, I, William T. Cahill, Governor of the State of New Jersey, do hereby proclaim May 14–20, 1972 as ACES Week in New Jersey.

LATE J. GORDON CANFIELD, NEW JERSEY

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned recently of the death of former New Jersey Representative J. Gordon Canfield.

Gordon Canfield, as he preferred to be known, first served as an assistant to another New Jersey Representative, George Seger. After this experience he went on to serve for 10 consecutive terms in the House from what was then New Jersey's Eighth Congressional District.

Congressman Canfield had recognized the need for strong drug enforcement laws before many of his colleagues and fought for authorization for U.S. narcotics agents to conduct investigations overseas. He was also interested in a strong American merchant marine and traveled incognito to London during World War II to study U.S. merchant marine operations there.

He was instrumental in bringing into use multicolored postage stamps in the U.S. mails.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues join me in an expression of deep sympathy to Gordon Canfield's beloved wife, Dorothy, and their two sons, Carl and Allen, as well as their five grandchildren.

A REPLY TO MR. MEANY

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, there have been charges by many leaders of organized labor to the effect that corporate profits have been rising at a faster rate than have the wages of individual workers.

In considering the real meaning of statistical data there is a tendency to compare figures which are unrelated, or which are based upon different criteria. This seems to be the case with much of the consideration of corporate profits and wage rates.

Discussing this problem in a letter to Mr. Nat Goldfinger, director of the department of research of the AFL–CIO, Mr. R. J. Ryan, chairman of the board of the Nooter Corp., points out that—

Increases in wages and salaries are usually stated on a "unit" basis as a percentage of base pay for each worker. . . . On the other hand, profits of corporations are usually stated "in total" *which includes* increases in capacity due to demands of a gradually expanding population and work force.

Mr. Ryan points out that—

A better analysis of corporate profits would be made if profits were shown as a percentage of sales and as a return on stockholders' equity.

He calls attention to the fact that—

Since 1966 to 1971, which covers our greatest period of inflation, both profit on sales and return on stockholders' equity *are down*.

If statistical measurements are to be meaningful, they must measure the same thing. Thus, states Mr. Ryan:

If *unit* measures are used in defining wages, this same measure should be used in defining profits.

Similarly, he notes:

If *total profits* are used as a measure then *total wages* likewise should be used as a measure. In other words, compare "apples and apples".

I wish to share Mr. Rayn's thoughtful analysis with my colleagues, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

NOOTER CORP.,
Saint Louis, Mo., June 9, 1972.

Mr. NAT GOLDFINGER,
Director, Department of Research, AFL–CIO, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GOLDFINGER (AND MR. MEANY): Many thinks for your detailed response of

May 17th to my "Open Letter to George Meany".

I think there is a common error committed by many people when comparing wages and salaries with corporate profits. Increases in wages and salaries are usually stated on a "unit" basis as a percentage of base pay for each worker, or in cents or dollars per hour per worker, etc.

On the other hand, profits of corporations are usually stated "in total" *which includes* increases in capacity due to demands of a gradually expanding population and work force. Labor is not alone in this type of comparison!

Industry and financial reporting institutions often make the same type of comparison which is very misleading to the average person who might not be trained to catch this difference.

Note attached item from the Wall Street Journal which states that profits are up 6.5% in the first quater of 1972.

A better analysis of corporate profits would be made if profits were shown as a percentage of sales and as a return on stockholders' equity.

This would make proper allowance for corporations' increased sales and capital expenditures due to an increasing population and employment. I attach hereto schedules showing profits of corporations for the last 15 years indicating both the percentage return on sales and return on equity.

You can see that since 1966 to 1971, which covers our greatest period of inflation, both profit on sales and return on stockholders' equity *are down.*

If *unit* measures are used in defining wages, this same measure should be used in defining profits.

If *total profits* are used as a measure then *total wages* likewise should be used as a measure.

In other words, compare "apples and apples"!

Industry is negligent in not doing a better job of communicating this fact to their employees, unions, and the public along with the colleges and the high schools!

Respectfully submitted,

R. J. RYAN,
Chairman of the Board.

]From the Wall Street Journal May 19, 1972[

Corporate profits climbed 6.5% in the first quarter from 1971's final period to a record seasonally adjusted annual rate of $91.6 billion. Also cheering administration economists was an upward revision in the first quarter's GNP gain to $30.7 billion, and less of that was due to inflation than had been thought.

TRIBUTE TO KENNETH M. SMITH, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Government has benefited tremendously through the years by the talents and abilities of leaders in the American community—educators, financiers, and industrialists—who have answered the call of Presidents, who have put down their private practices, laid aside personal ambitions to give unstintingly of their highly specialized skills and talents in the building and betterment of America.

One such man who answered the call of his President is Kenneth M. Smith, Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration. Mr. Smith leaves Government on July 15, 1972, to return to industry in Texas, having served Mr. Nixon and the United States since May 1970. He leaves an indelible mark of accomplishment on the rolls of the Federal Aviation Administration and the Department of Transportation. He has made many friends in both the Congress and the executive branch. He can leave the Government with the satisfaction of having made a substantial contribution to the betterment of our country.

The Administrator of the FAA, Jack Shaffer sums up Ken Smith's outstanding service eloquently:

He has given this vital element of the Department of Transportation a great spirit of purpose and dedication. His many contributions include a significant role in the implementation of the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970. The management innovations and the personnel training program he introduced to the FAA have set new high standards of professionalism in Federal Government.

Ken Smith is a friend of mine. I take this opportunity to join with his many friends in saluting him for his dedicated and outstanding service as Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration. Our country owes a debt of gratitude to men like him who do so much to promote the best interest of the Nation.

SECOND DISTRICT OPINION POLL HEADING TO 258,000 HOMES

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, this week the 1972 Colorado Second Congressional District Opinion Poll is being received in 258,000 homes in my district. At my request, the Postal Service is leaving a card at each mailbox in the second district. Also, because mail so delivered cannot be forwarded, opinion poll cards are being sent to students attending colleges and universities in my district at their home addresses. This should assure full participation by those newly enfranchised voters.

This year's poll includes 10 questions on a variety of national issues which range from the conduct of U.S. foreign policy to the desirability of the Government's making health insurance available to all Americans for catastrophic illnesses. As in the past, I have prepared the questions with the assistance of specialists at the Library of Congress to assure their impartiality. Having the thinking of the residents of the second district on the issues polled will enable me to gain insight into the thinking of my constituents on a number of questions likely to come to the attention of Congress in the near future.

Since its introduction in 1964, the Second Congressional District Opinion Poll has become one of the largest samplings of public opinion in the Nation. Each year the poll draws as many as 50,000 responses, and because the poll utilizes a punchcard it is possible for business machines to accurately count the opinions of all who participate.

Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues, I would like to present the format which I utilize:

(NOTE.—Provision is made for two persons to reply "yes," "no," or "undecided."

1. Do you favor further increases in U.S. diplomatic contact with Communist China?
2. Do you favor increased scientific and trade contacts with the Soviet Union?
3. Do you generally support the current U.S. strategy in Southeast Asia?
4. Should the power of the President to commit U.S. troops to combat without prior consent of the Congress be reduced?
5. Should some form of amnesty be granted now to those young Americans living abroad to avoid serving in the armed forces in Vietnam?
6. Do you favor proposals for an all-volunteer military except in times of grave national peril?
7. Do you favor a federal program to make health insurance for catastrophic illnesses available to all citizens?
8. Do you believe the Administration's current economic policies are working?
9. Would you favor an Enviromental Quality Corps to put unemployed youth and veterans to work improving the environment?
10. Should the Indian Peaks area northwest of Boulder, Colorado, be accorded National Wilderness Area status?

Your age group: a. 18–29 b. 30–54 c. 55 and over.

Occupation head of household: A. Bus. or Prof.; B. Indus. worker; C. Government; D. Farmer; E. Student; F. Retired.

HANDICAPPED WORKERS, INCLUDING THE BLIND, HAVE PROVED THAT THEY CAN DO THEIR JOBS WELL

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, one of the ironies of our society is that, while we adhere to the credo that justice is blind, there is too little justice for our blind population in the area of job discrimination. At the 25th anniversary dinner last month, the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped presented the President's Trophy to the Handicapped American of the year, Dr. Robert A. Bottenberg.

Dr. Bottenberg is chief of the Computer and Management Sciences Branch of the U.S. Air Force Human Resources Laboratory at Lackland Air Force Base, Tex. In this position, he manages more than 100 professional and technical personnel.

His career would be acclaimed a success by any measurement, and especially so since Dr. Bottenberg has been blind and partially deaf for the past 27 years. He suffered loss of sight, smell, taste, and partial hearing when he was struck by an artillery fragment during an assault operation with the 63d Infantry Division in Germany during World War II.

I know that my colleagues will enjoy a stirring account of his ordeal and tri-

umph presented during the awards ceremonies by television personality Max Robinson. It demonstrates what the blind and other disabled persons have always maintained—that they can do the job if the opportunity is given. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that remarks I made as keynote speaker at the 25th anniversary dinner of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped be inserted in the RECORD. In reviewing the past quarter-century of the committee's activities, it is significant to note that many of the prejudices and injusticies inflicted on the handicapped in the past have diminished. But there remains much work to be done in our efforts to remove the last vestiges of job discrimination against the handicapped.

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

A TRIBUTE TO COURAGE

(By Max Robinson)

"Well, Andy, it looks as if I'll have to start over."

These were the first words of a newly-blind soldier to the friend who had dragged him from the path of exploding mortar shells. It was just one day after both men had been wounded in an assault on German fortified positions east of the Rhine River, in the year 1945. The Place was a field hospital where casualties of the U.S. Army's 63rd Division had been rushed for medical care.

The private first class who made this statement was 21-year-old Robert A. Bottenberg, whom we honor as Handicapped American of the Year.

Fate, or the hand of God—call it what you will—had brought him blindness on the battlefield. What had brought him this acceptance of his state, the recognition that one life had been shattered and another must be built?

Mankind calls it courage, which we revere, strive for and can never fully comprehend. To help us understand its embodiment in Robert Bottenberg, we must start at the beginning.

Robert was born in Kansas City, to Grace and Homer Bottenberg. They were wise and loving parents, who encouraged their son's eagerness for learning, his enthusiasm for athletics, camping and nature and his interest in church and Boy Scout activities.

Academically, he was at the head of his class, and he excelled in baseball, football and other sports.

Although an only child, he had warm ties to cousins and others in a close family relationship, and many friends.

After high school, Robert went to Kansas City Junior College, with the intention of majoring in chemical engineering. But World War II broke out and he joined the service. He trained with the 63rd Infantry Division in Centerville, Mississippi, and left for Europe in 1944, to see action in France and Southern Germany.

He was a good soldier, his platoon leader recalls, and well liked by his buddies and superiors. He had a habit of saying, "If I get back to Kansas City, I'm going to marry Gene." Gene Laffoon was a girl who went to his church at home, and to the same junior college.

Six months after he arrived in Europe, Robert Bottenberg's optic nerve was destroyed by a shell fragment that pierced his left temple, passed behind his forehead and lodged against his right temple. In addition, he suffered considerable facial damage, some loss of hearing and lost his sense of smell. And it was on the next day that he said: "It looks as if I'll have to start over."

The first month was grim. Robert was transferred from the field hospital to a hospital in Paris, where the emphasis was on medical treatment, with no attempt at rehabilitation. Then, he was flown to Dibble Hospital, Minelo, California, which specialized in treatment of eye injuries.

This is where Robert's new life began. He was taught to do many things, and new ways of doing others. He learned braille, typing and how to travel. A friend who went to see him reported: "At the end of the visit, Bob said, 'Take my arm and I'll get you out of here.' When he said that, I knew he'd never have a problem."

Three months at Dibble were followed by stays at other hospitals for plastic and medical surgery and a final period of concentrated rehabilitation.

Recalling this time of his life, Robert Bottenberg says: "While I was still undergoing medical treatment, I made the decision to go to college. It was really only a question of how I was going to school, not whether I was." He was encouraged in this decision by the doctors and other staff at the hospitals where he convalesced.

In July 1946, Robert was separated from the Army, returned to Kansas City and in the same month, keeping his promise to himself, he married Gene.

They moved to Columbia, where Robert attended the University of Missouri. He had given up the idea of becoming a chemical engineer, realizing that blindness would limit participation in laboratory work, and decided instead on a degree program in psychology, with the tentative goal of teaching at the college level.

Under Public Law 16 which applied to disabled veterans, he was able to hire sighted individuals to read his text book assignments for recording on a sound scriber. He took lecture notes in braille, which Gene, too, learned. And she was a readily available reader. Another help was a keen memory which Robert further developed, along with his reasoning powers, by doing calculus problems in his head.

In two years he earned his BA degree, graduating Phi Beta Kappa.

Next came a non-academic achievement—the first of the Bottenbergs' three daughters, born in 1949.

Robert earned his MA degree the following year and the family moved to California. At Stanford University he began to work toward his PhD in psychology, with a minor in mathematical statistics. By a quirk of fate, the Bottenberg apartment was in a building that once had been part of Dibble Hospital, where Robert's new life had started just five years earlier.

By 1953, he had finished the written part of his thesis and his faculty adviser, impressed by his brilliance, contacted the Air Force's Personnel Research Laboratory at Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, and recommended Robert for employment there. That same year, he started work at Lackland. Four years later, he completed his thesis and was awarded his PhD.

During his years at Lackland, Dr. Bottenberg had climbed steadily up the career ladder, enriching his background by attending seminars and courses in computer sciences, mathematics, statistics and psychology. In 1963, with Joe H. Ward, Jr., he co-authored a book, "Applied Multiple Linear Regression," which is a classic in the field of applied statistical techniques.

Today, he is Chief of the Computer & Management Sciences Branch, Personnel Research Division, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory. In this capacity, he manages a work force of over 100 professional and technical personnel engaged in the solution of Air Force personnel management problems. He is the focal point in the Air Force for the formulation and development of mathematical models of its personnel system. He also acts as consultant on scientific and operational operations to Federal agencies, educational institutions and research foundations.

Impressive as his academic and professional achievements are, they reflect only part of the man who is Robert Bottenberg.

When called upon by the Texas Commission for the Blind, he tutors blind youngsters in mathematics and braille, and helps them adjust to their handicap. He encourages and inspires blind veterans at Brooke General Hospital, where they undergo medical treatment before receiving rehabilitation. He has served as president of the Blinded Veterans Association, was a member of the Advisory Committee for the Blinded Veterans Research Project carried out by the American Foundation for the Blind, and serves on the Advisory Committee to the Sensory Aids Evaluation Research Center at M.I.T.

In his community, he belongs to the Kiwanis, and is on the session of the Grace Presbyterian Church, where he and his wife teach in the church school. No doubt because he is the father of daughters and Mrs. Bottenberg remains active in the Girl Scouts, he is as enthusiastic a spokesman for Girl Scout cookies as can be found anywhere.

He is a father who built a playhouse for his girls when they were small, and played and went bike riding with them. He never tired of their constant "What's for dessert?" query, which he answered with "Chocolate covered nails" until the night they persuaded their mother to serve exactly that.

He taught his wife and one of his daughters to drive a car, and when someone asked in amazement, "How could you do that?" he replied: "It didn't bother me a bit. I couldn't see a thing."

With Mrs. Bottenberg he enjoys theater-going, dining out, bridge, and working in the garden. And in their garage is a bicycle built for two.

Dr. Robert A. Bottenberg—soldier, scholar, scientist, citizen and family man—we pay tribute today to your courage, your achievement and your humanity, and we salute you as Handicapped American of the Year.

LOOKING BACK—A GIANT LEAP FORWARD FOR THE HANDICAPPED

(By Senator Jennings Randolph)

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, and friends of the handicapped, I am honored to be with you this evening and conscious of the presence of so many who have done so much for our cause.

If I have any regret, it is that Dr. Henry Kessler, a true pioneer in physical medicine, is unable to be at the microphone. But I am happy to join with the President's Committee in a nostalgic look backward to the past quarter century.

I am most gratified that people of my home state of West Virginia have had a personal interest in the handicapped. Senator Kilgore was one of the original sponsors of the bill for National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. Senator Neely long was their champion, and it has been my responsibility to assist in the effort.

Members of Congress frequently receive more credit than they deserve, for if we are honest with ourselves we must give credit to those who call needs to our attention—and help us to work out solutions to those needs.

Such a man was Leonard Robinson, who convinced me of the need to assist the blind in achieving the dignity of work. As a result, we have the Randolph-Sheppard Act for vending stands for the blind in federal buildings. Incidentally, our Subcommittee on the Handicapped last week reported to the full Labor and Public Welfare Committee a bill amending the Act. One of the principal features of this bill, which I authored, is that it will require the federal government to provide for blind vending facilities in the design for construction of new buildings and the renovation of existing buildings. It is our

goal, over the next five years, to expand the program to more than double the number of blind persons presently self-employed.

Another such man was Paul A. Strachan, who convinced us that the handicapped need a week of their own and later convinced the Secretary of Labor of the necessity of a Presidential Committee for the Employment of the Handicapped.

Both of these men loom large in our look back over the past 25 years.

The young man, who is still young, Bill McCahill, has for a quarter of a century effectively guided this important effort as Staff Director.

Tonight we must set some things in context or we won't be able to remind ourselves why some things happened and why others fell by the wayside. Had it not been for the breakthrough of the Social Security Act in 1935, we might not have had a blind vending stand program in the following year. And it might have been 1948 instead of 1938 which gave us the Wagner-O'Day Act on blind-made products sold to the government. Both of these were ideas whose time had come, but it helped to have a large psychological nudge from another major innovative program.

Some of these laws were considered radical at the time, but today we are busy updating and perfecting them to make them work better. The seeds planted in the 1930's are blooming today. And, the seeds we plant today will blossom in the year 2000.

Tomorrow morning the Subcommittee on the Handicapped, which I chair, will begin hearings on the House-passed amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. Senator Alan Cranston has agreed to chair these hearings, which will continue through the month of May. With this legislation, we hope to break new ground in the treatment and rehabilitation of the severely disabled, and develop new programs to help those long-neglected in the areas of the deaf-blind, the spinal cord injuries, the older blind persons and those requiring dialysis or transplant following kidney failures.

A 25-year backward look gives us an opportunity to be nostalgic and express tribute to those who have gone before, some of whom have gone beyond. It was Representative Augustine Kelley who sponsored legislation for the President's Committee in the House, and Senators Sparkman and Aiken in the Senate. Gus has left us, but John and George are active in the Senate of the United States, continuing their service to humanity.

When President Truman suggested calling a group together which eventually became this vital committee, the first trip to the White House was in a single bus. When the President addressed the first few meetings in the Departmental Auditorium, the Secretary of Labor had to fill the hall by allowing employees to hear the President speak.

During those first struggling years, Hines Hospital was beginning to pioneer in the Veterans' Administration its magnificent work of training the newly blind. Spinal cord centers were doing equally splendid pioneering work for newly-injured veterans.

I suppose some of today's young activists who do not have the rear vision of some of us older folks see us as some sort of Uncle Toms for the handicapped. But I feel it is safe to say, in the parlance of the day: "We've come a long way, handicapped baby."

The work of the government in the post-World War II days was being matched by many private groups—some like the 52 Association of New York, dedicated to serving the war-wounded; others like Just One Break, also in New York, speaking out for all the handicapped. Still others taking care of their members, like Paul Strachan and Mildred Scott's American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Millard Rice's Disabled American Veterans. And there was the United Mine Workers John L. Lewis who literally placed hundreds of paraplegic miners on their feet and back to work, writing one of America's brightest pages. These pioneer groups and others like the Easter Seal Society really showed how to "give a damn" for others long before it became a slogan on a button.

The Korean War, coming on the heels of the post-World War II employment dislocation, provided jobs and opportunities for many GI Bill graduates entering the labor market after Public Law 16 vocational rehabilitation training. This gave struggling workshops and new businesses such as Hank Viscardi's Abilities, Incorporated, a chance at subcontract work and the opportunity to prove that the handicapped can do almost anything if given training and a chance to demonstrate that America no longer moved on muscle but on skills and brains.

Just the other day a colleague questioned the use of the word "cafeterias" in our vending stand bill. "You mean that this would permit blind people to operate cafeterias?" he asked with a note of incredulity in his voice. I assured him that this was exactly what it means, explaining that the blind already are operating cafeterias in California and conducting demonstration programs in operating and maintaining automated vending machine cafeterias in Washington, D.C.

He accepted this explanation with relief, for I am sure that he had envisioned blind workers behind steam tables slinging mashed potatoes and peas at defenseless customers.

Many of the legislative and other vehicles we are recalling for repair today weren't even among the working tools of yesterday. The interesting film you will see tomorrow morning, the printed booklets of this 25th Anniversary, Russ Dean's lively history of the President's Committee which you have been given tonight—all of these are proof that we have much more to be satisfied for than we have to be dissatisfied with. And, having ended with a preposition, I hasten to add that someone sitting in the audience will probably be able to say 25 years from now that our future, their past, was like nothing ever before seen or heard on this planet. I sincerely hope so. You'll get an advance look at the future on Friday morning, so don't miss the look ahead.

But my job here is to look back. And looking back I see the smiling face of Admiral Ross T. McIntire, our first chairman, who resigned to run as a Democrat for Congress. And the friendly face of General Mel Maas, shrouded in cigar smoke, who left his Republican seat in the Congress to give what proved to be the best years of his life to the handicapped. We salute them, just as we do those who left us within the year—Mary Switzer and Marion Preminger and other dear friends.

Mel Maas was a Republican and proud of it, but he was reappointed by a Democratic President as Chairman, and our present leader, Harold Russell, with a Democratic background, was reappointed by a Republican President. Three chairmen in 25 years during six Presidential administrations certainly indicates the non-political nature of this Committee.

During the Eisenhower years, the Republicans controlled the Congress in 1953 and 1954, and it was in those years that both parties joined in establishing the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This action dramatically escalated the opportunities of the handicapped through Public Law 565. Once again this is proof to the world that politics knows no boundaries where the handicapped are concerned.

I understand that I am the only member of Congress who is a card-carrying member of this Committee. Actually, members of Congress aren't eligible, but I was working for Capital Airlines when first named to the Committee and I've been on the roster since. Of course, I get the same pay as the rest of you—the satisfaction of helping others to help themselves.

In the Biblical three score and 10 years of my own lifetime, we have gone almost from launch pad to outer space as far as the handicapped are concerned. This is another giant leap forward for humanity. In fact, many of the space marvels of science are being used successfully in serving the handicapped today. The Apollo 16 crew which returned to earth last Thursday would have been hopelessly handicapped in space without the life-saving equipment devised for them by our scientists, engineers and doctors.

Looking back 25 years, I can see with you a long procession of rehabilitation centers and sophisticated sheltered workshops like many of the newer Goodwill Industries. I see prosthetics and orthotics as different from yesterday as is the astronaut equipment to the early automobile.

Most of all, I see the change in public attitudes, a change brought about not only by the media and the professionals in and out of government, but also in and out of agencies, organizations, clubs and concerned groups. But a change has been brought about by the achievements of the handicapped themselves. No product can survive in our market place today if it is not a good one, if it is not actually as good or superior to its competition. The truth is that the handicapped themselves have been the best salesmen for their own employment.

I don't think anyone who has ever met our Chairman Russell has ever felt the same again about people who suffer the loss of limbs. I don't think anyone who meets or reads about the tremendous achievements of the outstanding man we honor Dr. Robert Bottenberg, will ever feel the same again about blindness.

As we take one last look back we can joyfully tell the world that the honor roll of those who helped the handicapped to help themselves includes the names of our last six Presidents: Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, Dwight Eisenhower, John Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon.

And I remind you that Roosevelt had polio, Eisenhower had ileitis and heart trouble, Kennedy had a bad back and Johnson is now recovering from another cardiac incident. We have proved to the world that the handicapped can make it to the highest office in our land. You must walk a mile in another man's moccasins to know what troubles him—an old Indian truism, and these four Presidents knew what disability was and were the greater for rising above it. Truman and Nixon have empathy for the handicapped which enables them to be practical in bringing about a change for the better. This is a proud galaxy of servants of the Republic.

I would be remiss if I did not also remind you that it was President Kennedy who turned around the attitude of the entire world toward the retarded. With the help of Congress, we see the first faltering and now magnificent response of the American people to training and employment for the retarded.

The next 25 years, hopefully, will show as great an improvement in public attitudes toward victims of mental and emotional illness, those we call the mentally restored, as the last 10 years have shown toward the retarded.

Hopefully, long before the 50th anniversary of this unique Presidential Committee—bolstered as it is by both Act of Congress and Executive Order of the President, men and women with epilepsy or disfigurement will no longer face the mindless discrimination at home, school, office and society as too many of them do today.

As we look around us at the more than 8 million gainfully employed handicapped men and women of America today, in and out of government—and our government's record is better than any other government in the world—we must remind ourselves of the unfinished work ahead. The effort we must make in removing the blight of "un-

deremployment" from the all too many handicapped now in our work force.

The Lord's words are, "I know mine and mine know me." I cannot speak for the Congress of the United States, but I do know my fellow lawmakers, and I can promise you that if you will continue to call our attention to the unmet needs of the handicapped, you will have eager and willing listeners. If the handicapped themselves, including those who plan to march to the Capitol this week, will tell it not only like it is—but the way they would like it to be—we will listen.

The so-called "establishment" on the Hill may be a little hard of hearing, a bit short of breath, a little dim of sight after laboring for many years, but we are not short of intelligence—or of good will—or of empathy for the underdog. Many of us have had our own bouts with disability and, although disability may not show, we haven't forgotten how it was. Many of us have loved ones who are familiar with wheelchairs and other devices like pacemakers and have a working knowledge of barriers to accessibility, of the idiocy of rampless buildings and thoughtless design in both public and private planning.

Some of us in the "establishment" are proud and happy to place our authority and our votes on the side of tomorrow, on a future that does not penalize the less than average, physically. We want transportation systems which will be a friend and not the enemy of the disabled and elderly people of America. We want rehabilitation laws in tune with tomorrow and tomorrow's tomorrow.

So, in looking back, we can see we have come far on a road strewn with problems and difficulties, in looking around, we can see a plateau of sorts where disabled veterans and others can better realize the American Dream. In looking *ahead*, We can thank God for the blessings of the past and present, and ask His help and guidance that, together, we can bring more of heaven on earth for the handicapped of the world.

CALIFORNIA NATIONAL GUARD: AN ASSET TO THE COMMUNITY

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, in recent years the National Guards in our country have been criticized for overzealous action in the quelling of campus and urban disturbances. In some cases, particularly Kent State, these criticisms have been justified. Let us not make the mistake, however, of condemning all National Guard units for the mistakes of a few.

Many National Guards, including that of my own State of California, ably perform their constitutional duties and much more. The California National Guard is not only a fine security force, it is active in numerous community activities ranging from involvement in reclamation projects to assistance to youth and other community groups.

These activities, moreover, do not diminish the normal activity of the Guard. These programs are conducted on a strictly voluntary basis by each Guardsman and unit.

Maj. Gen. Glenn C. Ames, commanding general of the California National Guard, has been kind enough to supply me with a summary of the Guard's "Domestic Action Program," which I include at this point in the RECORD:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, STATE MILITARY FORCES, MILITARY DEPARTMENT

Sacramento, Calif., June 23, 1972.

Hon. ROBERT L. LEGGETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LEGGETT: It is my pleasure to submit to you the 1971 California National Guard "Domestic Action Program Report." The California Guard force of 27,500 has a commitment to involvement in our community activities, especially in today's environment. The Guard either initiates or assists in these action programs which are conducted on a strictly voluntary basis by each Guardsman and unit. Many hours of personal time and money are given by our members to these various causes. This support and activity is not allowed to diminish or otherwise degrade our normal training mission.

During 1971, in the Domestic Action field, we increased our activity by 20% over the same period last year. The attached report indicates the state-wide involvement of the California National Guard for calendar year 1971. For convenience, the report has been broken down into five categories as summarized below:

a. *Ecology and Reclamation Projects:* During this past year, our Guardsmen assisted over 7,000 residents of the State in ecological programs. A few of these projects were the collection of trash in the San Fernando Valley with the Boy Scouts as part of their "Keep America Beautiful" campaign; providing trucks and drivers to assist in cleaning up the San Joaquin River; assisting in loading six tons of glass for recycling; and many other projects of this type.

b. *Assisting Needy and Underprivileged:* Over 700 National Guardsmen gave personal support to the needy and underprivileged within California. Many gratifying incidents were noted during 1971, especially at Christmas when toys were collected and repaired and Christmas parties were given to those children who would never have known that there truly is a Santa Claus, and that there is someone who really cares.

c. *Support to Community Service Organizations:* Our Guardsmen have been involved in supporting local community projects in 1971 more than ever before. We have increased our exposure to the community during 1971 for a total of approximately 65,000 civilian and Guardsmen participants. Projects that supported local civic groups were the March of Dimes Walk-O-Rama, Camp Fire Girls, Boy Scouts, transportation for youth camp-outs, and many other similar projects.

d. *Support Given to Governmental Organizations:* On twenty-three different occasions the California National Guard was called upon to assist governmental agencies in helping promote community and youth programs. There were over 15,000 governmental and Guard personnel involved in such projects as assisting the Merced Welfare Department, U.S. Forest Service, San Bruno County Jail, and many youth training programs such as Head Start.

e. *Guard-Initiated and Conducted Programs:* Guardsmen participated in many programs that were initiated and conducted by the local unit in their communities. These projects involved over 30,000 local citizens and Guardsmen in twenty-nine communities throughout the State of California. These programs included painting a handicap school, giving lessons in gun care and hunter safety; visiting veterans hospitals; and training disadvantaged youths.

Many of the above projects are continued year-round. In addition, many other programs and projects were assisted by the California National Guard which did not fall within reported categories. These included parades, concerts, radio broadcasts, ball games and speeches which involved over two and one-half million residents of California. These programs are a vital part of our relationship with the general public.

I believe that you can take pride in our 1971 accomplishments. Our young soldiers and airmen do really care about their communities. Because of such personal interest and involvement on their part, our commanders are able to undertake, plan and execute many taxing programs that are of great value to the communities. I am looking forward to an even greater involvement during calendar year 1972. I would welcome receiving from you any observations, suggestions or ideas on how these programs can be improved.

Sincerely,

GLENN C. AMES,
Major General, Commanding.

YOUR VOTE—IT DOES COUNT

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial entitled, "Your Vote—It Does Count," prepared by the American Historic and Cultural Society, Inc., for July 4, 1972—a day to honor America:

Across the country today poltical candidates are skirmishing with more than the usual degree of fervor at this stage of an election year.

The professionals are motivated by the knowledge that in 1972 the election process is being opened up to major new elements.

People from all walks of life—young and old—the rich and the not-so-rich—men and women of all races and creeds—are climbing into the political arena with firm ideas of their own about shaping the country's destiny. And this is their right, protected by our Constitution of 200 years.

To our traditional electorate will be added in 1972 over 11 million young adults, 18 to 20 years of age, now enfranchised by the 26th Amendment. Additionally, some 14 million Americans who have turned 21 since 1968 will be eligible to participate, for the first time, in a Presidential election.

This 25 million potential could have a decisive impact on the outcome.

These first voters comprise a massive force for accomplishment. The newcomers are turned on and eager to become involved in such problems as peace in Vietnam, disarmament, inflation, joblessness, education, minority rights, housing, health care, dangers to life from air and water pollution, and countless other problems. Undoubtedly, many of these young adults can help the United States remedy its national and international illnesses.

As an essential first step, they should be aided and encouraged to register and vote. If they should fall victim to the apathy which already exists among their elders toward the electoral process, the nation will continue to suffer.

The dismaying truth is that only 73 million citizens cast ballots in the 1968 Presidential election. Then only 60.2 percent of the 121.5 million eligibles went to the polls. 47 million stayed away. Here in the world's greatest democracy, a smaller percentage voted in a major election than in any other nation of the free world.

Of the 47 million non-voters, some 15 million who were qualified to vote passed up the opportunity. Another 10 million could have qualified but didn't bother. Many, of course, were prevented by harsh state residency requirements, or by illness or disability, or by

being unexpectedly away from home or overseas on election day. Thanks to the Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970, the right to register and vote by absentee process for President and Vice President, regardless of where one may be in the world on election day, now belongs to those who take the initiative in exercising that right.

Perhaps you are one of those who asks, "Does my vote really count among all the millions eligible to vote?" Here's your answer:

In the 1960 Presidential election, Richard Nixon lost to John Kennedy by less than one vote per precinct out of a total exceeding 69 million votes.

In 1968, Mr. Nixon won over Hubert Humphrey by less than three votes per precinct out of more than 73 million votes cast.

A shift of 64,000 votes or 1.2 percent of the 5,573,810 ballots cast in Illinois and Missouri in 1968 would have thrown the Presidential election into the U.S. House of Representatives for decision. There, 26 votes—one from each of 26 states—is the maximum needed to elect the President.

Do you still wonder whether your vote counts? Hopefully, you are prepared to make it count.

Begin today to familiarize yourself with your precinct's requirements for registration and voting. Mark these important dates on your calendar and rearrange your daily timetable to meet these deadlines.

You—and every other American citizen—can take the first important steps toward answering today's challenges:

If required, be sure to register to vote;

Become knowledgeable on candidates and major issues;

And then, in the General Election of November 7, exercise your most prized possession—your right to vote for the candidates and party of your choice.

On each individual rests the responsibility for implementing this right. No one can do it for you. Start today. Become informed. Register. Make your vote count!

You can Honor America, and yourself, by your action.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. LAURIE JOHNSON

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, June 24, my constituent, Mrs. Laurie Johnson, was awarded a proclamation by the Studio City Chamber of Commerce for the distinguished contributions she has made to her community.

An outstanding resident of southern California for 20 years, Mrs. Johnson has been honored with the title of vice president of Avco's board of directors, and has been named Outstanding Woman of the Year by the Studio City/North Hollywood Soroptimist Club.

Mrs. Johnson is also president of the Studio City Chamber of Commerce and has inaugurated many new programs, as well as established a policy of giving more people a voice in chamber affairs. She has worked long and hard to involve all facets of the community in the chamber program—not only members, residents, merchants, and service clubs, but also churches, schools, and the police department.

I know my colleagues will join with me in commending Mrs. Johnson for her outstanding service to Studio City.

SAM A. VENABLE, SR.

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express the great sense of loss felt by all Tennesseans at the death of Sam A. Venable, Sr. Sam Venable was an outstanding educator, a leading sports figure, and a man of high Christian character.

Despite his impressive titles and many awards, Sam Venable never forgot those less fortunate than himself. Our district will always be grateful for his willingness to act as Santa Claus each year for many young children including the sons and daughters of our servicemen missing or killed in Vietnam. The old adage that "a man never stands so tall as when he bends over to help a child" clearly described Sam Venable's dedication to serving his fellow man. The world has lost a kind and generous man.

The following is a brief biography of Sam Venable, Sr., which appeared in the June 19, 1972, edition of the Knoxville Journal. I would also like to share with the Nation two editorials which describe the respect and admiration all Tennesseans held for Sam Venable, Sr.:

[From the Knoxville Journal, June 19, 1972]

VENABLE, SR., FUNERAL SET FOR 2 TODAY

An associate professor of physical education at the University of Tennessee, Mr. Venable was a member of the Knox County Board of Education, of which he served as vice chairman in 1969.

Dr. Mildred Doyle, county schools superintendent, announced that her offices close at noon today for Mr. Venable's funeral.

He was elected this year as president of the Tennessee School Boards Association, from whom he received an award for his service to education.

As a sports figure, fans recognized him in the capacity of official scorekeeper at UT basketball games, down's marker at UT football games, track official—having served as former president of Knoxville Track Club—and tournament director, also past president of the YMCA.

Following graduation at UT in 1935, Mr. Venable began teaching there in 1945 and received his masters in 1946. He has been with UT since then.

Interim years were spent in World War II as an infantry major and teaching within the Knoxville school system.

Recent activities included president of the Tennessee Recreation Society, chairman of the mayor's committee for evaluation of recreation in the city, director of the U.S. Volleyball Association Tournament and member of the advisory council for Treemont Job Corps Camp in the Smoky Mountains.

He was honored with "Sam Venable Day" in 1969 for his services rendered to the Treemont camp.

Other awards included "Man of the Year" honors in 1961 from Knoxville Civitan Club and "Man of the Year" service award in 1965 from the YMCA.

He was also one of the founders of the Fellowship of Christian Athletes in Knoxville.

A member of First United Methodist Church, where he served on the board of directors and taught a fellowship Sunday School class, Mr. Venable was active also in the American Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation and the Knox County Council of Community Services.

[From the Knoxville News-Sentinel, June 19, 1972]

SAM VENABLE, SR. C.R.

We'll miss Sam Venable Sr. at the Knox County School Board meetings, the football and basketball games and at the track meets. He used to stroll into The News-Sentinel office once or twice a year and everyone enjoyed his visits so very much.

Mildred Doyle, superintendent of Knox County schools, perhaps said it best when she described Sam as nonpartisan. He always voted for what he thought was best for the young people despite the political implications. That was his creed, fairness.

Sam was such a good teacher that one of his former students, Andy Kozar, became his boss as head of the men's physical education department at UT. Sam was the inspiration which moved Andy, a former Vol football star, to get his doctorate in physical education.

Our loss is great but we're all better for Sam's having lived such an inspirational life in our midst.

[From the Knoxville Journal, June 19, 1972]

SAM A. VENABLE, SR.

When a big man departs this life he leaves a big void, and his loss is deeply felt. So it is with the death Saturday of Sam A. Venable Sr., educator, public servant and great-hearted friend of young people and children. He was a big man in every good way.

His influence on public education and clean athletics went far beyond the bounds of Knox County, pervading the entire state. Sam Venable was a man of the highest principles. It was no matter what his partisan politics were. His ways of thinking and his resolute convictions always looked to what was right and best for the community. Republican Mildred Doyle, county superintendent of schools, never had more loyal backing on the board of education than was given her by this man too big for petty differences.

In mourning the passing of Sam Venable, the citizens of Knoxville, Knox County and Tennessee can only pray his place will be taken by someone at least half his size.

SUPREME COURT RULING ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a sad day for our Nation and for the millions of law abiding citizens in our country.

The U.S. Supreme Court, by a vote of 5 to 4, has ruled that capital punishment is cruel and unusual punishment and consequently, is unconstitutional. During the past 20 years, the Supreme Court has made a number of decisions that I have disagreed with; it has made some decisions I could not understand. The ruling on capital punishment fits into both categories.

I have always believed that capital punishment is a strong deterrent to crime. While it has not been imposed for 5 years, its threat has always been present. It is impossible to determine how many murders have been prevented because of the electric chair, the gas chamber and the scaffold. This threat, however, no longer exists.

The Supreme Court has issued a slap in the face to millions and millions of Americans by this ruling. I would think the judicial branch of Government owes more to our citizens and particularly to our police officers than a ruling which will, without a doubt, further increase the lawlessness in this country.

STEPHEN W. ROBINSON GAVE COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Stephen W. Robinson, 21, son of Col. and Mrs. William C. Robinson, of Alexandria, Va., was the president of the student body for the 1971–72 school year at the Washington and Lee University in Lexington, Va. Stephen plans to return to the Washington and Lee Law School this fall.

As student body president, Stephen gave a commencement address on June 1, in which he called for a return to traditional values and academic excellence. While his address was directed to the administration, faculty, and student body of his own college, his message should be of interest to those connected with institutions of higher learning all across the Nation.

I insert the text of Stephen Robinson's address at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS BY STEPHEN W. ROBINSON

Initially, I would like to add my congratulations to those you have already received. Each of you certainly deserves all the praise you are getting.

In the four years I have spent at Washington and Lee, the university has undergone many changes. Included in the progress of the undergraduate school has been the new curriculum, an innovative calendar, and participation in an eight-college exchange program which has, in a very minor way, allowed Washington and Lee to enjoy some of the benefits of coeducation.

The law school has also had its share of success. The number of applications for positions in the freshman class has quadrupled in the past four years, and the quality of the applicants has also risen markedly. In addition, the law school, in three years, will move into Lewis Hall, which will be the most modern and best equipped law facility in the country.

The law school is just a part of a $56 million, decade-long development plan, which will also include a new undergraduate library, renovation of many existing buildings and a substantial increase in the size of the endowment.

However, not all the changes in the past four years have been beneficial.

At one time, not too long ago, Washington and Lee was a very placid, sheltered place in which to get an education. One could come to a small, picturesque village in the Shenandoah and spend four years in an atmosphere of honesty, trust, and cooperation while studying the liberal arts. Washington and Lee has always placed great responsibility in the hands of students, and much of this utopian-like quality of Washington and Lee has been a result of the students' acceptance of this responsibility.

Unfortunately, that is not the situation now. Washington and Lee men recently have exhibited a frightening fear of responsibility, and because of this attitude, the atmosphere and quality of an education at Washington and Lee has suffered.

The Honor System, once the most distinctive mark of a Washington and Lee education, is not nearly as effective as it was just a few years ago. In innumerable instances, students have failed to accept their responsibility as members of a community governed by the principles of honor. Too many men have decided it is better to abuse Washington and Lee's honor system than protect it. And because of this, Washington and Lee is no longer the community of trust it once was.

In addition to this problem directly related to the Honor System, there have been other difficulties caused by the irresponsibility of students. Washington and Lee men have trouble negotiating checks, even in Lexington, because of the number of bad checks written by students; the word of a W & L student is no longer taken at face value, and local girls' schools, alarmed by the behavior of men from Washington and Lee and other schools, have begun to disregard the normal inter-institutional disciplinary procedures and now carry their grievances to civil authorities.

There have also been other conflicts, within the university community itself. Since Washington and Lee began to obtain a truly diverse student body, which I believe has helped the university overall, the W & L community has became a fragmented collection of small groups, with each polarized contingent caring little about any of the others. Several blatantly racist incidents have occurred, while many students feel alienated from the W & L community as a whole. Partially because of this lack of unity, the speaking tradition has vanished, as have several other facets of the once-congenial atmosphere of Washington and Lee.

All of these difficulties combined have begun to place a strain on the student-faculty relationship, another key to the Washington and Lee educational experience.

Despite this decline, I feel that my education at Washington and Lee has been outstanding, and I'm looking forward to spending three years here studying law.

It is traditional for a commencement address to contain a challenge to the graduates to do well in the world and strive for success. However, I feel the class of 1972 is well aware of what it will face in the world. Instead, I would like to challenge the administration, faculty, and most particularly the current and future students of Washington and Lee, in the next four years, or longer if necessary, to recapture what the University has lost in our four years here. W & L is, and always has been, a place for men to obtain an excellent education, and I feel this tradition will be continued. The university has a dedicated faculty, many talented students, and fine physical facilities. There is not any reason why academic excellence can not be perpetuated at Washington and Lee.

However, W & L, primarily through its students, must try to regain its atmosphere of mutual trust, its feeling of cooperation, and its spirit of union. If this is done, Washington and Lee will regain its intellectual environment so conducive to learning and its self-dignity.

Again, congratulations and good luck, and may God be with you.

PROGRESS IN CANCER TREATMENT

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. ROGERS. Mr Speaker, earlier in this Congress we passed into law the National Cancer Act to accelerate this Nation's scientific efforts in the area of cancer detection, prevention and cure.

At that time hundreds of scientists were already proceeding with research aimed at the same goal. Time magazine recently noted some encouraging results of an outstanding nature which were reported at the meeting sponsored by the National Cancer Institute.

Dr. Edmund Klein of Roswell Park Memorial Institute of Buffalo, N.Y., a good friend of mine, has been working for some time on the treatment of skin cancer and at the meeting reported progress he has made in the area of applying his work in immunotherapy on patients with breast cancer.

The results are indeed encouraging and although additional tests and work must still be done, I think the work done by Dr. Klein holds great promise.

I would like to include the article from Time into the RECORD at this time for the information of my colleagues and commend Dr. Klein for his work.

The article follows:

FIGHTING BREAST CANCER

Perhaps no diagnosis is more feared by women than breast cancer. Medicine's efforts to cut the death rate from breast cancer have been far less successful than with other malignancies to which women are vulnerable. This year alone, 71,000 American women will learn that they have breast cancer, and some 30,000 will die of it. At least 1,000 a week are undergoing surgery. The operation usually involves radical mastectomy, a disfiguring procedure that includes removal of the breast and surrounding tissue. Though surgery can save their lives, many women feel that the price is their femininity. Doctors report a common reaction: "I feel like half a woman."

Medical science is a long way from keeping all these women whole, but reports at two medical meetings last week indicate progress in two important aspects of breast cancer: controlling recurrence and providing an alternative to radical mastectomy in certain cases. Meanwhile doctors are also working on ways to reduce the psychic misery of those who must undergo full-scale surgery.

FIVE SUCCESSES

The most dramatic announcement, made at a session sponsored by the National Cancer Institute at Gatlinburg, Tenn., concerned immunotherapy, or use of the body's own defense mechanisms to protect itself against cancer. Dr. Edmund Klein of Roswell Park Memorial Institute in Buffalo, N.Y., who has already had some success treating skin cancer, tried a variation of the treatment on five women. The patients had all undergone breast surgery already and were suffering recurrences of cancer. Klein injected a serum containing tuberculin—a substance that rouses the body to counterattack—directly into the women's cancerous lesions. Then, as the cancers showed signs of healing, he switched from the painful shots to regular applications of a tuberculin skin cream. Most people at some time in their lives have had tuberculosis antibodies naturally activated in their system, and tuberculin awoke the women's immunological "memories", triggering the production of more antibodies. The treatment induced an immune response to cancer as well.

Though much study and testing remain to be done before immunotherapy can become an anticancer weapon, Klein's results indicate that the effort is likely to prove worthwhile. All five of the women are still alive two years after treatment began and have shown improvement in varying degrees.

More controversial was the report of Dr. M. Vera Peters, of Toronto's Princess Mar-

garet Rose Hospital, on simpler surgery for early breast cancer. Dr. Peters told a meeting at the Indiana School of Medicine that doctors should attempt the most conservative procedures possible "in order to preserve the patient's morale." Thus, for certain of her patients in whom early diagnosis has been made, she favors "lumpectomy," the removal of the cancer alone rather than the entire breast. She claims that the operation, which is followed by radiation therapy, offers selected patients essentially the same survival rate as racidal mastectomy.

Other doctors doubt the long-term results of this method. Last week Dr. Peters offered figures that tend to support her case. Of 81 women who had radical mastectomies between 1955 and 1965, 70.4% were alive five years after the operations. Peters paired each of these patients by age and other factors with 81 women who had only lumpectomies, then compared the two groups' survival rates. There were only slight differences each year, and after five years, 71.6% of the lumpectomy patients were still alive.

Many surgeons still question Dr. Peters' procedure and take issue with women's magazine articles that advocate it as an alternative. "Deciding about treatments for breast cancer shouldn't be like choosing a brand of toothpaste," says Dr. Guy Robbins, acting chief of the breast service at New York's Memorial Hospital for Cancer and Allied Diseases. Dr. Robbins cautions that lumpectomy may fail to locate or remove all the cells and he maintains that only radical mastectomy offers the physician and the patient a semblance of certainty that all malignancy has been removed. He also warns that half of all lumpectomy patients eventually have local recurrences of cancer and says that many end up paying for their respite with a subsequent—and more serious—operation.

COSMETIC JOB

But Robbins acknowledges that male doctors are often insensitive to women's psychological problems. He and his colleagues support efforts to ease the shock of breast removal. Many doctors are spending more time acquainting their patients with the necessity for radical surgery. Reach for Recovery, a program run by former mastectomy patients, is helping women through the convalescent period with exercise drills and counseling.

Nothing has done more to relieve postoperative depression than development of techniques for reconstructing the breast after surgery. Dr. Reuven Synderman, a plastic surgeon at Memorial, has found that explaining the possibilities of reconstruction has helped many women to accept mastectomy calmly. The cosmetic job involves implantation of a silicon form and substantial surgery to restore the breast to a near-normal contour. But according to Synderman, most women are so pleased by the initial implant, which makes the breast look normal under clothing, that they do not even bother with the later stages necessary to complete the process.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT AND BIAFRA—SOME QUESTIONS RAISED

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, several years ago, on January 22, 1970, I inserted remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD concerning the urgent starvation crisis in Biafra after the surrender of the Ibos to the Nigerian troops. It will be remembered that newspaper accounts told of the plight of hungry families and the dire necessity for large-scale food shipments to avert a major catastrophe. How many men, women, and children actually succumbed before the crisis was resolved will probably never be accurately ascertained.

My interest was naturally aroused recently when attention was drawn to the subject of Biafra and the involvement of our State Department in that crisis. The occasion was the confirmation hearing of Clinton L. Olson, the Deputy Chief of Mission in Lagos during the crisis, who had been selected to fill the ambassadorial spot in Sierra Leone. Opposition to Mr. Olson's appointment was raised by Roger Morris, serving during the Nigerian war with the National Security Council and knowledgeable about the formulation and execution of U.S. policy in that area at that time. Mr. Morris submitted a statement to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee dated June 4 in connection with the confirmation hearing and later summarized orally his position when appearing before the committee on June 23. Mr. Olson was subsequently confirmed as Ambassador to Sierra Leone.

The June 4 statement of Mr. Morris as submitted to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee follows:

JUNE 4, 1972.

TESTIMONY OF ROGER MORRIS—CONFIRMATION OF CLINTON L. OLSON, SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman: Thank you for the opportunity to offer the Committee this written testimony on the confirmation of Clinton L. Olson as United States Ambassador to Sierra Leone.

I regret that family illness in Oklahoma made it difficult for me to present this testimony in person; I shall certainly be available to the Committee in the future in any way I can be helpful in this matter.

I regret even more that questions need be raised about the record of an Ambassadorial nominee. But those questions seem compelling. They deal with evidence of a reign of inefficiency and bias in a U.S. Embassy which may have inhibited the mission's professional performance in a critical situation, may well have suppressed information important to the conduct of national policy, may have damaged or broken personal careers in punishment for policy dissent, and, most disturbing, may have had the result of subverting a public commitment of this Government to try to relieve one of the great human catastrophes of our time.

I wish to make clear at the outset both the limits and relevance of my perspective on the questions to be raised here. From September 1968 to my resignation on April 29, 1970, I served on the staff of the National Security Council, with principal responsibility for African affairs. During that period, I was in daily liaison with the Department of State and other foreign affairs agencies. I routinely read reports from our African embassies. And because of the intense interest of both President Johnson and President Nixon in humanitarian relief for victims of the Nigerian Civil War, I was particularly occupied with the formulation and execution of U.S. policy toward that conflict.

It was in this position that I encountered gathering indications of unprofessional conduct in the Lagos Embassy, a failure reportedly the result, at least in part, of Mr. Olson's tenure as Deputy Chief of Mission in that post.

Mr. Olson was DCM in Lagos throughout my service on the NSC staff. I never visited the Lagos Embassy, never witnessed Mr. Olson's work on the scene, met him personally only in passing at an inter-agency meeting in January 1970, and have not seen him or observed his work since I left the NSC.

Therefore, as I shall make clear in presenting them, some of the following questions are based on second- or third-hand accounts given me of what had happened, or was happening, in the Lagos Embassy from 1967 to 1970. Yet those reports were so unfailingly similar, so often repeated by honest, conscientious officials, that I felt it proper to bring them to the attention of the Committee, however indirect my knowledge.

Moreover, and I shall also indicate this where appropriate below, I do have personal knowledge of a number of facts—deficient reporting from Lagos, various disciplinary missions from the State Department to the Embassy from 1967 to 1970, the failure of the Embassy to carry out national policy in the humanitarian crisis of January 1970, etc.—all of which tends to support questions raised by the experience of others much closer than I to Mr. Olson's role in the Lagos Embassy.

I should emphasize again, Mr. Chairman, that I am raising here no more, and no less, than several questions which the Committee may wish to pursue in considering Mr. Olson's confirmation. If these questions are somehow mistaken, complete Department of State files on the matter and other authoritative witnesses (some of whom I suggest at the conclusion of this testimony) should certainly be able to clarify the record. And even if these questions should be substantiated, the Committee will still face the matter of Mr. Olson's personal responsibility. In that respect, I should only point out that the following incidents took place during Mr. Olson's service as DCM under two Ambassadors, two Administrations, and over a three-year period. Whatever happened in our Lagos mission during that time, I should think that Mr. Olson as DCM either directed it, acquiesced in it, or was oblivious to it. In any case, the answer seems relevant to his qualifications for an Ambassadorship.

Once regarded as the most promising of new African states and a major recipient of U.S. assistance to the Continent, Nigeria fell into political chaos in the mid-1960s. Tribal and regional rivalries issued in assassination of a Prime Minister, the takeover in Lagos by *coup d'etat* of a military regime, mass atrocities against the Ibo tribe, and eventually civil war between Biafra (the country's former Eastern Region) and Nigeria from 1967 to the Biafran collapse in January 1970.

The Committee will recall that Presidents Johnson and Nixon both resolved, with broad Congressional agreement, that the United States would *not* become involved on either side of this political and military conflict, yet within the context of our neutrality do everything possible to help relieve the mounting suffering of millions of civilians, many of them children, on both sides of the battle. It was in these extraordinary circumstances that questions arose regarding the efficiency and fidelity to national policy of the Lagos Embassy.

Through my twenty months on the NSC staff I was told privately and informally the following:

From 1965–66 to 1970, the Lagos Embassy deliberately excluded junior officers with wide contacts and independent views from (i) major political reporting cables to Washington, (ii) staff meetings with the Ambassador, (iii) numerous policy instructions from Washington, (iv) social and professional contact with high-ranking Nigerian officials.

The leadership of the Embassy deliberately refused to report to Washington developments discrediting the military regime in Lagos; for example, (i) in the fall of 1967, the murder of Ibo civilians by the Nigerian Army aboard the American-owned vessel *Niger Tide;* (ii) in the summer of 1967, the prospect of a Biafran invasion of Nigerian's Midwest state, despite the fact the Embassy had warning two months in advance; (iii)

in April 1968, an Embassy staff eyewitness report of failures in rehabilitation and military discipline in territory captured by Nigerian troops; (iv) in October 1968, a documented staff report of military atrocities and repression in the Nigerian capture of the port of Calabar.

The Lagos Embassy attempted to discredit reports from U.S. Consuls in Ibadan and Enugu indicating unrest and instability. (I was told that Mr. Robert Barnard, the last U.S. Consul in the East who had predicted Biafra's rebellion, was officially upbraided by the Embassy for his "pessimism." The Department reportedly reprimanded Mr. Olson verbally for that attack on Barnard, and subsequently gave Barnard an award for distinguished service!)

That the Embassy relied heavily on British Embassy reports of events in Nigeria to the detriment or exclusion of an independent American analysis, despite the fact that British policy, unlike ours, firmly supported the Nigerian side of the civil war and persistently sought to influence U.S. policy in that direction.

That the Embassy accepted and reported without critical analysis or dissenting views the official Nigerian Government point of view on (i) starvation in Biafra, which the Embassy failed to appreciate throughout the conflict; (ii) conduct of Nigerian soldiers; (iii) popularity of the military regime in Lagos; (iv) the Nigerian position vis-a-vis Biafra on the matter of peace negotiations or negotiation of relief arrangements.

That morale in the Embassy, from coderoom clerks to political officers, was extremely low, centering on resentment of Mr. Olson's management.

That State Department frustration with the Embassy's bias and incompetence became so great that (i) junior officers at the Embassy were given to believe by State officials that "private" reports of events would be welcome; (ii) between 1966 and 1970 there was a heavy correspondence between the Department and the Embassy leadership regarding the Embassy's "responsiveness."

That Mr. Olson attempted to discredit one dissenting junior officer by writing a critical efficiency report, which was apparently the main cause of that officer's later selection out of the Foreign Service. Three of the six junior officers who served as poltical reporters in Lagos between 1965 and 1969 were reportedly forced to resign from the Service by 1970.

I have personal knowledge of the following developments bearing on the efficiency of the Lagos Embassy under Mr. Olson's management:

That the Department sent several special missions to Lagos to identify and remedy the "problem" with the Embassy; for example, (i) Rosenthal-Smith mission sent by Undersecretary Katzenbach, I believe, around Christmas 1967; (ii) the Newsom trip in January 1970; (iii) the Kennedy-Ruser mission sent by Undersecretary Richardson in January–February 1970.

That reporting from Lagos was so biased and deficient in 1969–1970 that both the White House and State Department were astonished and grateful when the Canadian Embassy in Washington began to share with us the reports of its Canadian mission in Lagos, which provided information and insights unavailable through U.S. channels.

That by 1969–1970, policy-making officials in Washington were all but dismissing reports from the Lagos Embassy as hopelessly one-sided and misleading.

That other foreign affairs agencies initiated their own "private" assessments of the Nigerian situation, and, in one case, even "investigated" the reasons for the shortcomings in reporting from the regular Embassy channels.

That following the collapse of Biafra in 1970, Undersecretary Richardson ordered a Department study of what went wrong in communications between the Department and Lagos, and how to prevent such a breakdown in the future. (I never saw that study; I do not know if it was completed.)

All of these indications bear on the professional quality of the Embassy and its leadership in the sense of providing information and guidance. But there was, of course, a much more serious dimension to the problem: the corresponding failure of the Embassy to execute energetically and faithfully the policies of two Presidents to speed the flow of life-saving relief to Biafra and refugees on the Federal side as well. That failure was apparent in a number of ways. Faulty or incomplete reporting on the starvation delayed or distorted relief policy decisions in Washington; when President Nixon appointed a Relief Coordinator (C. Clyde Ferguson) to expedite relief in 1969, Ferguson and his staff reportedly encountered not only lack of cooperation but sometimes open resentment by the Embassy.

Surely the most conspicuous failure, however came in the weeks after the collapse of Biafra, when relief shipments were stopped and the United States had authoritative scientific evidence that millions of Biafrans were in danger of death and disease. Whether out of lethargy, fear of contradicting the Nigerian regime, personal disbelief, or sheer indifference, the Embassy first ignored that evidence (the Western Report), then neglected to give its findings to the Nigerian Government, then transmitted it routinely at a low level, and only after the most urgent representations from Washington, by cable and in person, gave it to responsible officials in the military regime. In the end, however, the Embassy's eventual obedience to national policy was unavailing. Accustomed to a U.S. mission which had readily agreed with its reseate view of the hunger problem and which had earlier resisted "interference" from Washington, the Nigerian regime suspected political motives in the belated American approach on the Western Report, and largely disregarded it. We will never know how many people died in Biafra between the collapse and interruption of relief on January 9–10 and the resumption of partial relief in February–March 1970. But whether the estimate is hundreds or thousands, I find it hard to escape the conclusion that they may well have been the price of attitudes and practices in the United States Embassy in Lagos, for which Mr. Olson was in some way responsible.

There is one last sequel to these developments that bears examination. In February 1970 Senator Edward Kennedy asked the GAO to investigate U.S. relief efforts in Nigeria-Biafra. GAO investigators were never given visas to conduct their investigation on the scene; and some in government and out suspected that the Lagos Embassy had "warned" the Nigerians against granting the visas. I have no personal evidence of that charge, except to observe that it would not be inconsistent with what I earlier saw of the Embassy.

A final word. I shall, of course, be ready to appear before the Committee to pursue this brief and hastily assembled written testimony. I would strongly urge the Committee, however, to call many other witnesses who can confirm or refute the questions I have raised about the Lagos Embassy and, Mr. Olson. Specifically, I suggest that the Committee consult:

Undersecretaries Katzenbach and Richardson

Assistant Secretaries Joseph Palmer and David Newsom

Former Nigerian Desk Officers Roy Melbourne (now at War College), Robert Smith (now in Pretoria but an *important* witness), Raymond Wach (now at OEP; served in Lagoes; *key* witness), William Brubeck (now in Amman, I believe)

Former U.S. Officials in Nigeria: Robert Barnard, Fritz Picard, Ambassadors Elbert Mathews and William Trueheart

State Department Officials: Claus Ruser, C. Robert Moore, C. Clyde Ferguson

New York Times Reporter Jack Rosenthal (who accompanied Robert Smith on a disciplinary mission in 1967)

Col. Richard Kennedy of the NSC staff

Oliver Troxel (former African branch of State Intelligence and Research, now Ambassador to Zambia)

Private sources who have written or are writing books on the Nigerian crisis: Christopher Beal of Manufacturers' Hanover Trust in New York; David Robison of New York; Daniel Jacobs of New York

I presume the Department did not raise these matters in submitting the nomination of Mr. Olson. And I scarcely need to speculate on why these disturbing questions were overlooked or ignored. The State Department and Foreign Service are a bureaucracy only fitfully beginning to discipline itself. It seems far from devising a way to deal with substantive failures of the kind suggested here, or with its customary immunity from Congressional and public oversight. We are still dealing with a career system which rewards compliance and punishes independence. And we are also dealing with a system which confers on officials such as Mr. Olson in far-off Lagos frighteningly unaccountable power over the careers of others perhaps more competent than he, over the national interest, and in this case over the lives of numberless people.

Perhaps the Department simply judged, as they often do, that none of its—the Lagos problem, the appointment to Freetown, the waning career of Mr. Olson—was worth the storm. But if the office of Ambassador, or the Senate perogative in confirming its occupants, is to mean anything, that routine must be challenged at last.

Most important, beyond one man or one office, we must surely tell ourselves the truth about our policy in Biafra, just as someday we must tell the truth about Bangladesh. We must tell that truth, I think, now only for our own sakes, but also for the millions in this world who still live on the fringes of survival, who will inevitably suffer in the coming decade natural or man-made catastrophe, and who will look—as the suffering have so long looked—to America as their last hope for succor. And the American people, as always, will answer, or at least will *want* and expect to answer, that plea.

I believe the Senate owes those who suffer and those who respond, standards of public service that do nothing to dilute the mercy that is part of our nobility as a nation.

Thank you again, Mr. Chairman. I hope the Committee will give this confirmation the closest consideration.

THE DAVCO STORY

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am including the story of an activity that members of the Scott County Chapter of the Disabled American Veterans have undertaken to raise funds. In light of the difficulty faced by many veteran's organizations in raising funds through normal methods of contributions, their experience should be very helpful to other groups facing similar problems.

The story follows:

THE DAVCO STORY

In March 1971 I brought to the attention of the House certain activities of Scott County Chapter Two of the Disabled American Veterans (D.A.V.), highlighting the 2,000 children who receive toys each year through the "Trading Stamps for Needy Children" Program.

In addition to aiding needy children, the Chapter provides services and entertainment for disabled veterans in Veterans Administration (VA) and Military Hospitals, and vastly assists all veterans and their dependents in processing claims or effectively satisfying any of their administrative and clerical needs. There are many more philanthropic, community endeavors sponsored by the Chapter which time simply will not permit me to amplify. All the fine activities of the Chapter have one thing in common—however—they all require money to successfully continue.

Most similar organizations use conventional methods for raising funds, but it is becoming increasingly more difficult to acquire the amounts necessary to carry on the many worthy programs. Today I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a unique method that Scott County Chapter Two had devised for raising additional funds. This enterprising group of disabled veterans have organized a separate fund raising entity called DAVCO. DAVCO, a autonomous unit, headquartered in Davenport, Iowa, with extensive plans for expansion in major metropolitan areas, is completely devoted to campaigning for contributions of excess salvageable property from the Industrial Sector. It seeks donations of property normally earmarked for disposal such as discontinued product lines of consumer goods, obsolete or residual industrial materials and components, capital and ancillary equipment, and in some instances even real estate. DAVCO receives goods which are properly segregated, processed and converted to cash to the maximum extent possible. Suitable items of consumer goods are turned over to Chapter Two and are distributed to veterans in hospitals or to worthy charitable causes.

This means of supplementing the much coveted cash donation assures not only the continuation of Scott County Two's Chapter present programs, but permits them to ultimately envision the expansion of their charitable activities including the creation of jobs for disabled VETS. In short, requests for donations of salvageable industrial property always sold at a fraction of cost, are often met with less resistance than requests for cash donations.

Since the DAV is a non-profit organization and a duly recognized charity, donations to it in the form of salvageable property are deductible in accordance with the Laws and Regulations of the Internal Revenue Service.

DR. DJURIC BROUGHT TO COURT

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vojislav D. Pantelich, Washington, D.C., has forwarded to me a translation of an article which appeared in the paper "Liberty" on May 12, 1972, the organ of the Serbian National Defense in Chicago, with the request that I insert the text in the RECORD. Mr. Pantelich hopes by this means to inform our colleagues about events taking place in Yugoslavia, as described by a reporter in Munich, a M. Vukotich-Birchanin. I insert the text of the article, entitled "Dr. Djuric Brought to Court," at this point in the RECORD:

DR. DJURIC BROUGHT TO COURT, LIBERTY, YEAR XX, NO. 823, MAY 12, 1972

(By M. Vukovich-Birchanin)

The regular professor of the Faculty of Law in Belgrade Dr. Michael Djuric was subjected to a court investigation in Belgrade because of a "criminal act of enemy propaganda" according to paragraph 118 of the Criminal Code.

Dr. Mihailo Djuric was born August 22, 1925 in Shabac, graduated in 1949 and acquired in 1954 a doctorate with the thesis: "Natural Law and Political Theories of the Sophists." He became an assistant at the university in Belgrade in 1954, afterwards a dean in 1957, a special professor in 1964 and finally a regular professor in 1969. His scientific works are numerous, as in the country itself, so in foreign countries, and he was considered the central figure of the Serbian intellectual university circle.

During the great student strike in Beograd in June 1968, professor Dr. Mihailo Djuric gave a strong and fearless speech in the hall of the Faculty of Law June 6, which was printed in the paper "Student" in the issue of June 18 of that year, in which he brought out the famous classical Heldering statement, that poets and philosophers have one eye too many, and figuratively transferred that to the Communist leadership in the country with the words:

"It should be openly said that the political factors in this country have one eye less. If not all the political factors put together, at least the majority of them."

Men among us who busy themselves with politics do not understand the world in which they live, they do not understand the movement which has seized the student youth, they do not see the reality of the student movement . . ."

His conclusion was, in connection with the authorities in the country: "As if they would wish to maintain the ruling order of things, and to impose upon us the slavery of an everlasting yesteryear . . ."

The Last Crossroads of Serbdom.

In March of last year the Association of Teachers of the Faculty of Law in Belgrade organized a three-day discussion on the question of so-called "constitutional amendments," where participated over 30 doctors of science and magistrates. At that gathering the central personality was Dr. Mihailo Djuric, whose presentation was brought in the next copy of the paper "Student" which was immediately forbidden.

This presentation, multiplied, is considered as the guide to Serbdom in its struggle for survival and identity.

"It is necessary to clearly understand that today Yugoslavia is only a geographic idea" said professor Dr. M. Djuric, and that there are being created "several independent, self-sufficient, even mutually opposed national states."

Serbdom is at its last crossroads, because the "Serbian people is in a position of not having equal rights with the other peoples of Yugoslavia" concluding that the "constitutional change in the final analysis is aimed at the deepest interests" of the Serbian people.

The present boundaries of the Federal Republic of Serbia "are neither national, nor historic borders of the Serbian people.

"It is necessary to remind you that outside of Serbia proper lives around 40% of Serbs, or almost as many as there as Croats in the Federal Republic of Slovenia, in other words as many Slovenes, Macedonians and Mohammedans together!"

The Serbian people because of the pressure of conditions has been brought to that that it again has to establish its national state and cannot "be indifferent toward its numerous parts outside the present borders of Serbia."

After the First World War the Serbian people according to professor Dr. Djuric "magnanimously repudiated the London pact which offered it the possibility of creating a Great Serbia and after the Second World War" with dignity overlooked the terrible crime which was committed toward it "with the Ustashi slaughter of Serbs in the nondescript "Independent State of Croatia."

"The Serbian people has to turn to itself, has to start thinking about its existence, has to start fighting for its seriously threatened national identity and integrity. That is the basic prerequisite for its further historical confirmation . . ."

Tito Desires to Deprive Serbdom of Leadership.

Just as the dahiye at the beginning of the last century with the killing of Serbian village leaders headed by Aleksa Nenadovic and Ilija Birchanin, wanted to deprive Serbdom of leadership, so Tito with his terroristic "Criminal Code" under the present conditions is doing the same thing. In any case history is the teacher of nations. After the killing of the village leaders came the First Serbian Revolution, which the bloody Tito seems to have forgotten.

When in the little village Brezna not far from Upper Milanovac, while dedicating the newly built church Bishop Dr. Vasilije invited several thousand peasants to sing the Serbian hymn "God of Justice" he was taken to court.

However when Tito not too long ago went to Zagreb for an "official visit", the federal hymn "Oh, Slavs" and the Croatian Republic hymn "Fair Fatherland" were played . . . And this example can serve as an illustration of how unequal is the position of Serbdom in communist Yugoslavia.

Where Serbdom is headed from the Krayina was indicated by the case of the president of the organization of lawyers Dr. Slobodan Subotic, who with the whole intellectual circle was put under the "Criminal Code."

WHAT BUGS AIRLINE PASSENGERS

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a recent speech by the Civil Aeronautics Board's Director of Consumer Affairs points up problem areas facing today's airline travelers.

As Mr. Jack Yohe, the CAB's consumer chief stated:

The real story, the real problem areas, are not statistical. The real problems are human—and—many of the complaints brought to the Board's attention could be eliminated through responsive and thoughtful treatment of any particular passenger who has something "bugging" him.

I recommend reading Mr. Yohe's statement, which he delivered to the steward and stewardess section of the Airline Pilots Association at that group's recent meeting here in Washington.

The statement follows:

WHAT BUGS AIRLINE PASSENGERS?

(By Jack Yohe)

I have the rather strange feeling that when it comes to cataloguing the various things that "bug" passengers, I might just as well throw the floor open to comments

and spend the next 15 minutes listening to you.

I say this in all honesty, because you are daily dealing with the very problems which are brought to the board's attention in the thousands of letters which the board receives annually from less than happy passengers.

You are, so to speak, out there in the "real" world where the "real" people have their "real" problems.

Nonetheless, I am of the opinion that there is a certain benefit in having an outsider trespass into your area of competence, if for no other reason than to add that certain naive perspective which characterized the clever boy whose comments on the emperor's new clothes gave the community a new and necessary perspective on reality.

Last year, something in the vicinity of 6,000 individuals wrote to the board expressing dissatisfaction with any number of air transport related topics.

In the first four and a half months of this year, approximately 2,500 have made their views known.

Each letter is scanned and catalogued by the staff in my office. From these letters we can distill certain statistics which we publish on a monthly basis.

The comments made in the letters are not necessarily accurate, and no evaluation is made as to their validity.

However, it is my belief that our report does point rather clearly to problem areas. It does so because it points to those areas of air carrier performance which the passenger really believes to be problem areas.

Much as beauty is in the eye of the beholder, so are complaints.

What is normal to a person who has flown 100,000 miles is often a major event to the first-time flyer.

If you'll bear with me for a few minutes, I believe that the following breakdown will be of some assistance in showing the general areas of concern which passengers find important enough to bring to our attention.

Flights, whether they be delayed or cancelled are the perennial winners in the numbers game. On occasion there are variations on the theme which question the wisdom of lowering the oxygen masks of a particular flight when there was no oxygen to be had, or the wisdom of dumping a load of fuel into the sea in this era of pollution consciousness.

But on the whole, it is the creeping delay and unexplained cancellation which gall Mr. and Mrs. America with greater frequency than anything else.

Reservations: Perhaps second in the pecking order of gross aggravation product is the general area of reservations. After Ma and Pa Kettle have driven eighty-six miles to the Waterloo airport, checked in three hours early and patiently wait as the departure time for flight "Number 1" draws near, they may find that their seats are being filled by a total stranger.

They react negatively, but often with great ingenuity.

I can recall at least one instance in Baltimore where an Allegheny Convair 580 was disabled because one irate oversold passenger handcuffed himself to the nose gear and simply could not be moved.

But determination to be accommodated is no less real than that of thousands of others who "thought" they had a reservation for a flight and found later that in actuality, they only had a reservation for a front row seat to watch their flight depart.

I cannot help but speculate that one airline has not heard the last of one oversale in particular. Mr. Ralph Nader is not one to let a simple apology for the carrier's action pacify him.

Baggage problems are indeed both bothersome and annoying to passengers and carriers alike. There is no doubt in my mind that inflated claims and false claims are growing both in number and cost to the carriers.

But there also is no doubt in my mind that many innocent people are losing much baggage.

Part of the problem derives from the human factor. Baggage *is* often mislabeled and consequently sent to the wrong airport.

Interline transfers are especially vulnerable to this sort of accident, since interline tags are not color coded as to destination.

Containerization has helped to cut down on baggage loss and damage, but the problem of baggage delivery remains enormous.

Other features of passenger related service which draw criticism are such things as fare misquotes, customer treatment, poor in-flight service, discrimination, and any one of a thousand other topics which are usually lumped into the handiest of all categories—miscellaneous.

I suppose I should apologize for being so obscure as to what it is that really "bugs" passengers. But, I am firmly of the opinion that statistics do not tell the whole story. If you are interested in a statistical breakdown of the complaints which we receive, copies of a recent survey report are available for you.

The real story, the real problem areas, are not statistical. The real problem areas are human. Man, as we all like to believe, is an intellectual being. He is given to thought, and quite often gives himself to thought.

Many of the letters which are received in my office clearly show that the complainant has given considerable time and effort to his presentation.

He is not simply begging for assistance to get money from a carrier.

He is offering suggestions on the improvement of the air transport system.

This is a most admirable goal, and one toward which all of us in this room are devoting a considerable part of our professional and private lives.

Many of the complainants with whom we have contact seem to share certain basic assumptions which govern the tone of their comments. These assumptions, often wrong, but always sincere, are intended to be my contribution to the new and necessary perspective to which I alluded a few moments ago.

Generally speaking, air travel is now a democratic phenomenon.

In the tourist cabin of any aircraft you can easily find people who variously fall into the standard categories of millionaire, hippy, haus-frau, professional man, student, "redneck" or infant.

Simply stated, everybody is now flying.

No longer do air carriers have the consolation that they carry only the "best" citizens, and most "respectable" people, the so-called "cream of the crop."

This may have been true in the decade of the 50's, but beginning with the 60's and continuing into the 70's air travel has become a democratic experience. The human factors have changed and adaptations have had to be made in long cherished policies and procedures.

The bluntest way to put it is probably to say that since there ain't no trains from Cleveland you gotta fly to the promised land.

You are now dealing, in a certain sense, with people who are the product and producers of the mass media.

They share certain assumptions, though they often apply them differently.

The Madison Avenue approach to air travel is what the public mind has accepted as the norm.

Mr. America does not expect a full length movie on a flight from Seattle to Spokane, but certainly the seven course meal is due.

Air carriers have sold their product very well.

I have no criticism of their aggressive marketing techniques.

But I feel obligated to point out that people believe carrier advertising and use it as the basis of any judgments they may later make about a given air carrier or the industry as a whole.

When a carrier advertises the best on-time performance record in the industry, and a particular flight is late, the individual passenger feels a very real and very personal disappointment.

He feels he has paid a premium price for a premium product which has been found deficient.

When a person pays for the Madison Avenue image of first-class travel and the service rendered does not come up to his estimation, he feels cheated, personally cheated, by a large and inefficient bureaucracy which flies airplanes.

In sum, I would advise you to take note of the passenger who firmly believes that the sum of the parts does not equal the image purveyed.

Another basic assumption which relates to "democratization" and "image" is that of progressive obsolescence.

This is particularly true of aircraft types. When a new aircraft is introduced, it becomes the norm.

Therefore, it is not uncommon for a passenger whose flight has experienced an equipment change to complain.

The 747 and DC–10 are the new norms.

People do not like the "antique" jets like the 707 and DC–9.

They absolutely detest older equipment.

"Is there any logical reason that you can provide as to why Kalamazoo should not have 747 service to Detroit and Chicago?", or at least that the service on Convairs and DC–9's should not in every respect equal the much touted 747 service. The cost per mile from Kalamazoo to Detroit is higher than that from Detroit to L.A.

We would like to think that there is enough flexibility in the public mind to allow for variations from the norm.

But I would again caution you that the degree of latitude is very small indeed.

People do not allow for variations to the same degree that you or I might.

We are familiar with the problems that exist; *we* are daily trying to cope with them; and *we* are continually attempting to resolve them.

But Mrs. Jones from Cedar Rapids does *not* have our perspective.

This is the first time *you* lost *her* luggage, this is the first time that *her* flight was aborted, this is the first time *her* connection *was missed.*

Mrs. Jones is an individual. It must be carefully pointed out that passengers are not simply cocktail swilling, food consuming, parcels of cargo who happen to occupy seats.

No passenger considers himself to be an oversale statistic, and no passenger considers his bag to be merely one of the thousands lost annually.

Each problem even though we may like to lump them into categories, is a completely unique experience to the person who is dealing with it on the first person singular level.

Inherent in my concepts of democratization and that of the importance of the first person singular approach of each passenger, there is a conceptual and an actual contradiction.

Bridging the chasm between what is expected on a mass basis and what is provided on an individual basis is the function, in many instances, of those people like yourselves and your associates who deal with passengers on both levels, often simultaneously.

A plane load of people is not only a quantitative lump of mam's and sirs, but also a collage of individual persons.

If there were indeed six million stories in the Naked City, there are at least as many stories as there are passengers in a given airplane.

The variables in any situation are astounding.

You are certainly to be applauded for the exceptional competence which you have shown in dealing with problems of every size and type, and I of course do join that applause, but you must remind yourselves that your perspective on air travel is one which is conditioned by experience and one which is not shared by the bulk of the traveling public.

In sum, I suppose what I have been trying to say is that there is an enormous difference in the approach to the question "What bugs passengers?"

The first approach is obviously quantitative.

This approach is simple and often effective but tends to obscure an underlying answer to the same question.

The underlying answer is the one which I prefer to emphasize, namely that a passenger's complaint is often the product not of anger, but of some injury caused by the absence of those features of air travel which he has come to expect.

The average complainant is not a vindictive old man out for blood, but a person concerned with the quality of the product he has purchased in terms of his own personality make-up.

Mr. and Mrs. American consumer are willing to allow deviation from the norms which the industry has projected, but only when Mr. and Mrs. America are fully appraised of the reasons for their problem.

The public has a capacity for understanding which is all too often overlooked in the mad rush to preserve the image which the industry has projected.

Many of the complaints which are reported to my office would never have been written, if somebody, presumably one of you, had taken the time to simply tell him what was going on.

Or giving him the consideration which any person merits simply because he is a person not a part of a mass.

In practical terms, I suggest that there will be continuing problems relating to baggage, reservations, flight irregularities, and the like, but that in your area of primary concern, many of the complaints brought to the board's attention could be eliminated through responsive and thoughtful treatment of any particular passenger who has something "bugging" him.

Thank you.

RALPH NADER CITES HEPATITIS PERIL IN SCREENING OF BLOOD DONORS

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been working on legislative solutions to the problems of unsafe blood in the United States for over a year. During that time I have brought numerous articles on hepatitis and blood banking to the attention of my colleagues, but none of them have generated the volume of mail and public interest that Ralph Nader's column in the July issue of the Ladies Home Journal seems to have sparked. I am delighted that public awareness of this scandal is growing so strong. This in itself will improve the situation by making people aware of the need to voluntarily donate blood, but legislation is still urgently needed to aid in recruiting donors and to regulate some of the shoddy practices that are giving all blood banks bad names. I am hopeful that the House and Senate committees will be able to schedule hearings on this important problem in the near future. I commend Mr. Nader's informative article to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Boston Globe, June 22, 1972]

NADER CITES HEPATITIS PERIL IN SCREENING OF BLOOD DONORS

NEW YORK.—Consumer advocate Ralph Nader yesterday charged the major cause of 3000 deaths and 50,000 cases of serum hepatitis annually is our blood collection system that accepts donations from donors "who conceal their poor health in order to earn $5 or $10 for a pint of their blood."

According to Nader these donors are "derelicts, alcoholics, drug addicts and others with a high incidence of hepatitis."

Writing in the July issue of Ladies' Home Journal, Nader stated, "Unfortunately, many commercial blood banks make little effort to control anything about the donors they accept . . . some experts estimate that we could eliminate 90 percent of the cases of serum hepatitis if, when transfusions are needed, we used only blood donated by volunteers."

The consumer advocate noted that although most banks now test for contaminated blood, the test currently used for detecting hepatitis is effective only 25 percent of the time.

"Few other precautions," asserted Nader, "are taken to weed out donors who may have hepatitis or who may be carriers of the virus because they live in unsanitary ghetto conditions or administer drugs to themselves with unclean hypodermic needles."

Nader urged in his article that corrective legislation be supported. He stated a bill to establish a national blood bank program to regulate all blood and encourage volunteers has been introduced by Rep. Victor Veysey (R-Calif).

The bill would enable the Federal government to inspect, license and regulate all blood banks, require labeling of blood from paid donors as "high risk"; and institute a $9-million program to recruit volunteer donors.

Nadar added it would also set up a national registry of donors so that blood banks can crosscheck for hepatitis carriers.

[From the Ladies Home Journal, July 1972]

RALPH NADER REPORTS

(Note.—Many Americans who receive blood transfusions this year will contract serum hepatits from contaminated blood. Here's an exposé of our faulty blood collection system and some ways you can help correct it.)

Just before Thanksgiving last year Joseph W., 55, underwent open heart surgery in a large Eastern city. The operation was a success, but 80 days later Mr. W. was back in the hospital, suffering from serum hepatitis, a serious, often fatal liver disease. Subsequent investigation determined that he had picked up the disease from contaminated blood he received during his heart operation.

Mr. W. was lucky; he recovered from a disease that kills at least 3,000 Americans every year and endangers the lives of another 50,000, who contract serum hepatitis from transfusions of bad blood. But his experience underscores one of our most critical medical problems: contaminated blood.

The major reason for tragedies of this sort is a blood collection system that accepts donations from derelicts, alcoholics, drug addicts and others with a high incidence of hepatitis donors who conceal their poor health in order to earn $5 or $10 for a pint of their blood.

About 20 percent of the nation's blood donations come from commercial (profit-making) blood banks, which are only a small portion of the establishments that pay donors for their blood. To get an idea of who gives blood for money, look up the blood banks in your phone book. Their addresses are too often in the heart of slums. Explains one commercial blood bank manager: "You have to pick an area where low-income people live. They use the money to buy a dress or augment their salaries. We hope it's not used to buy alcohol, but you can't control that."

Unfortunately, many commercial blood banks make little effort to control anything about the donors they accept. Although most banks now test for contaminated blood, the test currently used for detecting hepatitis carriers is effective only 25 percent of the time. Few other precautions are taken to weed out donors who may have hepatitis or who may be carriers of the virus because they live in unsanitary ghetto conditions or administer drugs to themselves with unclean hypodermic needles. Some experts estimate that we could eliminate 90 percent of the cases of serum hepatitis if, when transfusions are needed, we used only blood donated by volunteers.

Reporters for the *Chicago Tribune*, in a nine-month study of blood banks, turned up gruesome accounts of the way people who are health risks make a "living" by selling blood. "Professional" donors say they could always find a bank to accept their blood. They simply answered "no" to perfunctory questions about their past illnesses and gave fake names and addresses so they could not be traced and blacklisted if their blood was found to be contaminated. Reporters searching for donors at addresses on blood bank records ended up at park benches, vacant buildings and service stations. They also found banks that accepted blood from donors who had fresh puncture marks on their arms from giving blood the day before (accepted standards limit whole blood donations to once every eight weeks).

Rep. Victor Veysey (R.-Calif.) recently exposed a blood bank in Washington, D.C., that paid donors with vouchers to be exchanged at a nearby liquor store! Moreover, the bank was found to be operating the same way elsewhere. In the wake of the publicity, this bank closed its Washington operations, but it still operates elsewhere under its legal government license. No. 345.

Many blood banks are loosely regulated at best, and some are not required to meet any standards. The Federal government has the authority to inspect only 165 of the country's 7,000 blood banks—and the case of the Washington bank is an indication of the government's ineffectiveness. The rest of America's commercial blood banks operate outside Federal control, often under no regulation whatsoever. Seventeen states have no laws at all on blood banking. Twenty-one others have only one law—and that protects blood banks, hospitals and doctors from liability when transfused blood infects a patient. Only seven states license blood banks and only five inspect them.

You or a member of your family may well be among the 2,500,000 Americans who will receive blood transfusions in the next 12 months. Women should be particularly concerned. Studies indicate that, between the ages of 20 and 50, twice as many women as men suffer from serum hepatitis. These are the years when most surgery connected with child-bearing and most radical breast cancer operations are performed, according to Dr. J. Garrott Allen of Stanford University, one of the nation's leading authorities on blood transfusion problems. Thus women in this age group end up receiving 20 to 25 percent more transfusions than men—along with more than their share of serum hepatitis.

What can you do to clear up the blood bank scandal?

1. Donate your blood. The whole process takes less than an hour, does not hurt and may assure you or your family of having blood available if you need it. If you have received blood, your responsibility to give it is even greater: paying for blood does not replace the precious supply of low-risk volunteer blood.

2. Check the policies of your hospital. Unless it uses only volunteer blood, you have no assurance that you won't receive high-risk commercial blood. Every community can supply enough volunteer blood for its needs. Seattle, San Francisco and Milwaukee are examples. Organize your community to rely solely on volunteer blood banks.

3. Find out how volunteer blood banks operate in your community. Are they open at least one night a week and at least one weekend a month? Are they located at shopping centers or other areas convenient for women as well as men? (Most aren't, which may be why women give far less blood than men.) Do they operate on campuses, where students are a large, untapped source of healthy blood? They provide baby-sitting for donors?

4. If you or a member of your family contracts serum hepatitis after receiving donor blood, find out whether the blood was given by a volunteer or if it was commercially bought. If your hospital can't tell you, it's a sign of seriously inadequate administration. A case now in the Montana appeals courts may set a precedent by permitting victims to sue hospitals for negligence when high-risk commercial blood was used. Find out whether the donor of contaminated blood has been traced, his blood removed from the supply and his name removed from lists of suppliers. Find out whether the doctor reported your hepatitis to the health department.

5. Support corrective legislation. A bill to establish a national blood bank program to regulate all blood and encourage volunteers has been introduced by Rep. Veysey. The bill would enable the Federal government to inspect, license and regulate all blood banks; require labeling of blood from paid donors as "high risk"; and institute a $9 million program to recruit volunteer donors. It would also set up a national registry of donors so that blood banks can cross-check for hepatitis carriers. (In his health message to Congress last March, President Nixon mentioned the lack of an adequate supply of donated blood. He has directed the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to study the possibilities of a nationwide system for collecting and distributing blood.)

For information about the Veysey bill, write to Rep. Paul Rogers, Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Health and Environmental Issues, House Committee on Interstate Commerce, Washington, D.C., or to Rep. Victor Veysey, Longworth House Office Building, Room 1227, Washington, D.C. 20515.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ACT THREATENS REA

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6962, the Department of Community Development Act, poses a threat to the U.S. Department of Agriculture that could affect all of rural America.

Specifically, I see in H.R. 6962 a serious threat to the proper administration of the rural electricfication program currently administered under the Rural Electrification Administration of USDA.

I am concerned about what happens to the rural electric systems because I regard them as integral parts of the American success story and essential ingredients of our economy. In the 20th Congressional District of Illinois, which I represent, I have worked closely with six locally owned rural electric cooperatives serving about 35,000 member-consumers.

REA would be just one of many programs for which the new Secretary of the Department of Community Development would seek appropriations. Because of the strong influence of urban interests the Secretary would have to serve, rural people might be forced into a weak position.

Also, the decentralization proposed under the Community Development bill would put most REA decisionmaking in 10 regional and an as yet undetermined number of subregional offices. This would introduce new layers of bureaucracy and complicate and slow down REA loan processing.

The bill does not spell out how the REA loan program in the new department under a decentralized administration would be coordinated with rural electric cooperatives' new supplemental financing institution, the National Rural Utilities Cooperative Finance Corporation.

Rural electric cooperatives provide electricity primarily in rural service areas. In some cases, electricity is provided in organized communities. But this is a result of unforeseen community development and not a long-range plan of the cooperatives or REA. These cooperatives want to continue serving rural areas and not diffuse and dilute their services.

For these reasons, I believe REA activities should remain a part of the Department of Agriculture where they will continue to be considered a part of rural affairs.

WHERE IS ANGELA'S LOGIC?

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting comparison between the judicial system of the United States by application of the Soviet judicial system is drawn by Dumitru Danielopol writing in the San Diego Union, June 13, 1972.

The difference between the two systems is well made in this column. I trust that the perennial critics of the American system would do well to read this insert closely:

WHERE IS ANGELA'S LOGIC?

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—Where would Angela Davis be if she lived under the system she is advocating?

She would probably be dead; at best in a lunatic asylum or labor camp.

Miss Davis, a militant Communist and revolutionary, advocates a system that gives no person accused of any sort of crime a chance.

Under our free, albeit, imperfect judicial system, Angela Davis was acquitted of all charges of murder, kidnapping and criminal conspiracy for which she had been indicted in connection with the death of a northern California judge, in a courtroom "shootout" in August, 1970.

Nonetheless she is not satisfied. She is exonerated and promptly promises to continue her efforts to destroy the system that set her free.

Where is logic of a Communist?

Miss Davis should be given an opportunity to learn what happens to dissidents like herself under communism in the USSR.

She should read some of the observations of one of the foremost Soviet physicists, Andrei D. Sakharov, in his "Thoughts on Progress, Peaceful Coexistence and Intellectual Freedom," published in the West in 1968.

"Was it not disgraceful to allow the arrest, 12 months detention without trial and the conviction and sentencing to terms of five to seven years of Ginsburg, Galanskov and others for activities that actually amounted to a defense of civil liberties . . .?" Sakharov asks.

I haven't heard of any Angela Davis supporters being punished for peaceably expressing their ideas.

Intellectual freedom is a luxury few dare covet in any Red society.

In Russia, after 50 years of complete domination, the Kremlin still fears free discussion of its actions.

Why, Miss Davis?

Is this what you covet for the United States?

For the moment you can luxuriate in your courtroom victory, but you'll get more honest and meaningful applause on the day you admit that only the American system of justice can be fair to Angela Davis, Huey Newton, James East Ray and the man who shot George Wallace.

Until she recognizes that fact, Miss Davis is still just another Communist.

HOMEWOOD-BRUSHTON NEIGHBORHOOD COMMUNITY CENTER

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Homewood-Brushton Neighborhood Health Center, in 3 short years, has fulfilled an important gap in this Pittsburgh community. The center, only the third of its kind in the Nation. was originally financed by the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity in July of 1969. It has served thousands of citizen health needs with both emergency and clinical care.

At the present time the center is equipped with complete dental facilities along with service in such diverse areas of medicine as pediatrics, optometry, and urology.

Under the highly competent direction of Dr. Charles Greenlee, the center not only benefits the entire community from a health standpoint, but economically, too, by hiring personnel from the neighborhood. I applaud Dr. Greenlee and the Homewood-Brushton Neighborhood Health Center, and I will continue to offer my support in all the center's endeavors.

I would like to introduce an article

from the Pittsburgh Press, which discusses the positive effect the health center has had on the entire community.

NEW HOMEWOOD HEALTH CENTER—GOOD MEDICINE FOR RESIDENTS

A Homewood woman who has spent many hours in the emergency room of Pittsburgh Hospital with her nine children has been relieved of that problem.

She now goes to the Homewood-Brushton Neighborhood Health Center, which opened last year for dental care and treatment.

Mrs. Priscilla Stanton, 30, of 7446 Susquehanna St., likes the center because it is "quicker, cheaper, and very close to my home."

The center, the first of its kind in the Pittsburgh area and the third in the nation, was established by the Homewood-Brushton Community Improvement Association.

It was financed by the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO). Construction began in July, 1969.

Mrs. Arlene Daykins, a mother of three, said her family fell sick after the Christmas holidays, and was taken to the center, and received immediate medical attention.

The center is staffed by 15 doctors and 10 nurses, and has more than 100 people on its payroll. Most of the employes are neighborhood residents.

About 175 patients are treated daily at the center, which has facilities for complete dental service, pediatrics, urology, optometry, audiometry, family planning and a childcare unit.

Dr. Charles Greenlee, project director, said the center has had an impact on the community economically, socially, and politically.

He believes the center's future is very bright, but said "this will depend on how much influence the University of Pittsburgh, the county and other governing bodies may want to exercise."

The center is a nonprofit corporation with a board composed of one-third neighborhood residents, one-third health providers (hospitals), and one-third from the industrial community.

Before the center opened, area residents with minor ailments had to wait for hours in crowded hospital emergency rooms.

If the center is able to raise $73,863, it will qualify for $295,453 grant from OEO to establish a drug treatment center.

Such care, will meet federal guidelines, "which call for comprehensive centers to cater to addicts, find them jobs, and teach them work habits instead of detoxification only," Greenlee said.

No drug treatment centers in the county now qualify under state and federal regulations.

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED TO AMEND INTERNAL REVENUE CODE TO PROVIDE FEDERAL TAX INCENTIVES TO UTILIZE MORE RECYCLED SOLID WASTE MATERIAL

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which would amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide Federal income tax incentives aimed at encouraging a significant increase in the utilization of recycled solid waste materials and which would simultaneously offset and substantially reduce industrial dependence on existing, outdated Federal tax advantages which unfortunately impede recycling and promote the unnecessary depletion of some of our most critical natural resources.

When Congress overwhelmingly passed the Resource Recovery Act in 1970, the statute itself specifically directed the Environmental Protection Agency to investigate and determine what might be done to modify or eliminate existing Federal tax benefits, such as percentage depletion allowances and capital gains treatment, which effectively preclude and restrict recycling and reuse of materials, while they concomitantly frustrate and defeat even our most earnest conservation efforts.

The act went on to direct EPA to make prompt, periodic reports and recommendations on this subject to both the President and the Congress. To date, no definitive reports have been filed with Congress, but recently the Assistant Administrator of EPA was quoted in the New York Times to the effect that his agency now favors the enactment of a recycling income tax credit or a recycling income tax deduction as a means of shifting industrial reliance on virgin raw material to maximum utilization of recycled solid waste materials. More recently, the Wall Street Journal reported that the administration itself had appointed a special study group to review various alternative recycling income tax incentives and I understand the President's Council on Environmental Quality has been urging the introduction of appropriate legislation without further delay.

In the meantime, last November the Joint Economic Committee's Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy of which I serve as chairman, conducted detailed hearings regarding the economics of recycling solid waste materials. Testimony was received from Members of Congress, from the Environmental Protection Agency, the New York City Environmental Protection Administration and from numerous public witnesses. These hearings convinced me that it is absolutely imperative for the Congress to move in this legislative area without additional delay. Accordingly, after a careful review of the hearing record and information derived from these hearings before my subcommittee, I have prepared the recycling tax proposals embodied in the bill which I am introducing today and I sincerely hope that this legislation will receive early, favorable consideration in this body.

THE NATURE OF THE SOLID WASTE CRISIS

Early action on this legislative proposal is clearly necessary because our Nation is confronted with a solid waste crisis of staggering proportions. In August 1970, the President's Council on Environmental Quality reported to Congress that solid waste materials are piling up here in the United States at the alarming rate of 4.3 billion tons a year, including agricultural wastes. Industrial solid wastes alone account for 110 million tons, of which more than 15 million tons are scrap metal; 30 million tons are paper and paper product wastes; while the balance consists of waste plastics, bales of rags, and other textiles and assorted wastes. Alarmingly, the President's Council projects that these solid waste materials will double by 1980.

In addition, statistics compiled by the President's Council show that each year Americans throw away more than 250 million tons of residential, commercial, and institutional solid wastes. Collected wastes alone in these categories include 30 million tons of paper, 60 billion cans, 30 billion bottles, 4 million tons of plastics, 100 million tires, and millions of discarded automobiles and major appliances. Again, the President's Council projects that these types of solid waste will also double in volume by 1980.

The record simultaneously shows that while our domestic recycling industries have done a truly remarkable job over the years in the reclamation of waste materials and in supplying critical raw materials required in times of emergency, adverse economic pressures—promoted in large part by the Federal Government—have made it impossible for them to keep pace with the growing mountains of solid waste. For example, only 3 million tons of nonferrous scrap metals and 11 million tons of waste paper are recycled each year, meaning that, on the average, only about 40 percent of the waste nonferrous metals and 19 percent of the waste paper available for reuse is presently being recycled here in the Unitied States. The percentage is even lower in the textile industry where only 17 percent of the available textile wastes are being recycled.

But, the tragedy does not end there. While our Federal policies and inaction have stifled recycling growth, the evidence shows that the costs borne by State and local governments to collect, bury or burn solid waste materials have spirited out of control. Simultaneously, available land-fill areas are evaporating and municipal incinerators are usually among the worst air pollution offenders. In New York City, which struggles daily to dispose of ever increasing piles of solid waste, collection costs alone have risen to $36 a ton, and they are still climbing.

Finally, the economic impediments to increased recycling automatically near that the drain on our precious natural resources is unnecessarily continuing at a ravenous rate. Indeed, our existing Federal tax policies seem to proceed on the theory that our resource abundance will last forever, and that those who deplete our forests and our mines should actually be rewarded for doing so. In 1970, the Senate Committee on Public Works stated in its report in support of the Resource Recovery Act—

> This Nation has always enjoyed resource abundance and has acted as though that abundance would last forever. Studies prepared for the Senate Committee on Public Works, testimony before the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, and information generally available suggest that the anticipation of continued resource abundance is not only unwise—it is folly.

And, in its 1970 Environmental Report, the President's Council on Environmental Quality state:

> Population growth threatens the Nation's store of natural resources. Currently, the United States with about 6% of the world's population, uses more than 40% of the

world's scarce or nonreplaceable resources and a like ratio of its energy output. Assuming a fixed or nearly fixed resource base, continued population growth embodies profound implications for the United States and the world.

An excellent example of how recycling operates to reverse this disastrous exhaustion of our natural resources is found in the paper industry today. As stated above, recycled paper stock presently accounts for about 19 percent or 11 million tons of the paper industry's total raw material needs. The industry's utilization of this recycled waste paper thus saves 200 million trees a year. If the industry's consumers would increase that utilization to only 50 percent of their raw material requirements, the result would be an annual saving of approximately 500 million trees—that is a forest roughly equal to the area covered by all of New England, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Maryland.

FEDERAL INCOME TAX DISCRIMINATION AGAINST RECYCLED SOLID WASTE MATERIALS

The hearings before the Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy made it clear beyond doubt, however, that recycling will never be able to play its proper role unless and until the Federal Government acts to remove or modify all of the existing economic impediments to recycling which it has unfortunately fostered over the years.

By far the most important of these impediments is Federal income tax discrimination against recycled materials. Presently, the income tax laws, which provide, first, capital gains treatment on income derived from the increase in value of timber and second, the percentage depletion allowance applicable to the extractive industries, favor the utilization and depletion of virgin natural resources over the utilization of recycled materials.

As a result of capital gains treatment applicable to trees, integrated paper companies using trees as a source of raw material invariably have an overall normal effective tax rate that is lower than companies which utilize recycled materials. The lower tax rate resulting from the use of trees obviously results in higher after-tax profits. Paper companies are thus effectively compelled to utilize trees rather than recycled waste paper.

In the case of metals, percentage depletion allowed under the Federal tax laws places virgin metal ores in a more advantageous competitive position than recycled metals. Percentage depletion for iron and copper is 15 percent of gross income, while for most other metals the depletion allowance is 22 percent. In addition, there is a special tax provision similar to the timber capital gains treatment which applies to the disposal of domestic iron ore. Because of these special tax provisions, mining industries have a much lower effective tax rate than manufacturing industries. The 1969 Treasury Department Tax Studies show that the mining industries, excluding petroleum, have an effective tax rate of only 24.3 percent of net income as opposed to 43.3 percent for other manufacturing companies. A company which uses recycled metals would fall into the higher bracket manufacturing category. Again, therefore, integrated metal manufacturers and smelters are rewarded by the Federal tax laws for continuing to deplete our dwindling virgin ores while the recycler is penalized for taking actions which alleviate the solid waste problem and conserve virgin resources that are becoming increasingly vital to our national security and welfare.

PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE SOLUTION

As stated before, for almost 2 years the administration has been studying this serious problem without offering any solution. In the meantime, unnecessary depletion of our virgin natural resources continues and the utilization of recycled materials has actually declined. Plainly, the national interests involved can no longer be ignored and effective steps must be taken now before the solid waste build-up gets completely out of control.

My first inclination was to propose an outright repeal of the existing tax advantages which lie at the heart of the problem. Ultimately that may be the best solution, and for this reason, among others, I have supported Chairman MILLS' recent proposal to carefully review all so-called "tax loopholes," including the existing capital gains and depletion allowance tax provisions, to determine whether they should be repealed or substantially modified.

However, as stated, the recycling problem I have outlined cries out for remedial legislation now, so until Congress is able to make a final judgment on the wisdom of retaining, repealing or modifying the present capital gains and depletion allowance rules, the bill I propose today seeks to deal with the recycling dilemma as follows:

First, to offset preferential depletion allowances and capital gains treatment applicable to virgin timber and metals and to give the industries involved a true incentive to move swiftly from the depletion of natural resources to the utilization of recycled materials, my bill provides a percentage deduction for recycled solid waste materials approximately equal in each case to the percentage advantage now enjoyed by each of the competing virgin materials. This deduction would vary with the specific type of solid waste material involved and would go to the purchaser of solid waste materials who manufactures same into useful raw materials or salable products.

The purpose of this deduction, of course, is to cause manufacturers, who presently shun solid waste utilization in favor of the depletion of natural resources because of the tax advantages new reserved for the latter only, to switch to the greatest feasible degree to the use of solid waste materials in lieu of the virgin material.

In order to stimulate the early accomplishment of this purpose, my bill empowers the Environmental Protection Agency constantly to monitor the program, and if it finds, in any taxable year, that the tax deduction provided is not required or being employed by a taxpayer to alleviate the depletion of any virgin natural resource and to promote the solid waste recycling purposes of the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965, as amended by the Resource Recovery Act of 1970, then EPA may act to suspend the availability of the deduction for that taxpayer until he again operates his business in a manner which will accomplish the purposes of my bill.

The proposal I make, if properly administered, should not result in any substantial revenue losses to the Treasury. The theory of the proposal is to shift a portion of the tax benefits now received by taxpayers from the utilization of virgin materials to the utilization of recycled materials.

Assuming a fixed total requirement of raw material to be supplied from either virgin or recycled sources, the tax benefits derived from the use of recycled materials will tend to be matched by corresponding reduction in the tax benefits which would otherwise result from the utilization of virgin materials. In essence, the proposal attempts to reallocate the tax benefits derived from virgin materials to recycled materials.

In addition, the recycling industry, which has the higher overall effective tax rate, will produce additional revenues for the Government as its business volume expands as a result of the new tax benefits my proposal gives to the users and manufacturing consumers of recycled materials.

A second feature of my proposal is extension of the 5-year amortization provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, now provided for investments in air and water pollution control plants and equipment, to recycling facilities. My purpose, of course, is to increase sorely needed recycling facilities at every level, starting with the collection of solid waste right on through the facilities required to manufacture such waste into a new, useful raw material.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the bill I propose today thus seeks to accomplish effectively one of the principle goals Congress had in mind when it enacted the Resource Recovery Act of 1970. Every day we fail to pass this necessary, remedial tax legislation, vast quantities of solid waste which should and could be recycled are continuing to plague us throughout the Nation. I sincerely hope, therefore, that the administration and the Congress will act in partnership to enact this proposal before we finally adjourn this year.

GORDON CANFIELD

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness and a deep sense of loss that we learned of the passing of our friend and former colleague, Gordon Canfield. Americans have lost one of their ablest and most dedicated spokesmen.

None of us will ever forget his compassionate recommendation of aid to the

European countries following the devastation of World War II, or his tremendous efforts in behalf of our merchant marine and Cost Guard. In fact, the honorary title of "Father of the Coast Guard" was bestowed upon him, because of these efforts. Nor will we soon forget his personable manner and the high esteem and respect with which he was regarded by all of his colleagues in the Congress, regardless of political affiliation. He ably represented his constituents, and each individual among them had his utmost concern.

Mr. Speaker, Gordon Canfield is perhaps best remembered by many as the man who, along with Senator HUGH SCOTT—then a U.S. Representative—traveled the seas incognito as a crew member aboard a tanker to investigate conditions in the merchant marine. This valiant effort was not put aside and forgotten, for Gordon Canfield continued throughout his distinguished career to work for the progress and development of a modern, efficient merchant marine. He realized and frequently cited the importance of the merchant marine to the economy and defense of our great Nation. Those of us who had the opportunity to serve with him in the Congress will always recall that in everything he did, Gordon exhibited the same determination and dedication exemplified by his stint in the merchant marine.

Gordon Canfield was a personal friend of mine. For a number of years prior to his election to Congress, he was the able secretary to Representative George Seger, whose lovely daughter was married to Frederick Dominick, for 16 years the Congressman from the same district of South Carolina that I now represent.

Mr. Speaker, our deepest sympathies go out to Mrs. Canfield, her sons and family, and to our friends in New Jersey, in their great loss.

OPPOSITION TO AMENDMENT PROHIBITING FOOD STAMPS FOR STRIKERS

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the agriculture appropriations bill which passed the House today contained several amendments on which I would like to comment.

First is the amendment offered by Mr. MICHEL, which would prevent families whose breadwinner is on strike from receiving food stamps. I voted against the amendment and will do so if the necessity ever arises again in the future.

Congress enacted the food stamp program for one reason: To provide food for people who are hungry. Food stamps can only be used to purchase food; other laws restrict eligibilty only to those who are in genuine need. This amendment would deny benefits to otherwise needy and eligible persons—families of those engaged in labor strikes—for reasons unrelated to the program's purpose.

Even if such an argument is not persuasive to defeat this amendment, purely humanitarian instincts would dictate opposition. For the amendment would deny food stamps to families of strikers as well. We have learned a great deal in recent years about the terrible damage malnutrition does to young people. Children who are denied wholesome and balanced diets early in life often suffer grave physical damage from which they never fully recover. It is neither humanitarian nor just to expose children to that risk solely, because their parents are involved in a labor dispute. Can the economic cost of any strike ever be weighed in good conscience against that risk? That is the route the supporters of this amendment wished us to take, and I reject it.

The intent of this amendment is to punish, or at least deter, workers from striking by withholding food. If the amendment were to pass it would create a siege of starvation for many workers—workers with legitimate grievances—who undertake legal strikes, recognized by numerous Federal and State labor laws. Such a blatant coercive measure flies in the fact of our legal tradition of collective bargaining over differences of opinion between labor and management. The amendment violates governmental neutrality in labor disputes by singling out one class of eligible and needy recipients and telling them that they cannot have the assistance they need to feed their children.

There is a second amendment relating to food stamps which I did support. This amendment would make available for the coming year the $375 million appropriated last fiscal year for food stamps—money which the Department of Agriculture has refused to spend.

The Congress last year appropriated $375 million for the food stamp program. By that act the Congress told the President and his agencies that the money should be spent. Increasingly, however, we see that the administration, ignoring the wishes—indeed the mandate—of the legislative branch, impounds vitally needed funds. I find it intolerable that the Agriculture Department refuses to expend money appropriated by the Congress to feed hungry people. It is time to tell this Department that we mean business that these funds have to be spent in fiscal year 1973.

In December 1970, the House passed the food stamp authorization for fiscal year 1971–72, stating that these appropriations shall "remain available for the purpose of this act until expended." Consistent with that provision, this amendment would carry over into next fiscal year funds vital to the accomplishment of the program's goal.

At a critical time of rising food prices, not only would this amendment allow expansion of the food stamp program into areas where it is not presently operating, but would also make it less expensive for current recipients to participate.

When the House originally appropriated these funds, we recognized that poor people needed them to escape from hunger. With rising food prices putting even more families in need of the support the food stamp program provides, it is our obligation to release this already once-appropriated money. We must answer the needs of hungry Americans by restoring the unexpended funds to the food stamp program.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I supported the amendment by Mr. CONTE to limit individual farm subsidy payments to $20,000 per crop. Frankly, I favor no subsidies but the $20,000 payment ceiling would help curb big agribusiness, which continues to force the small farmer into an economic corner, largely because of these payments.

Two years ago, we enacted a $55,000 limit with the same intended result. From our vantage point today, it is clear that it has not succeeded. It has not been effectively enforced, resulting in increased subsidy payments and increased difficulties for the small farmer.

Our response should be to enact further effective reductions in the payment ceiling. Basic equity requires it. Over 40 percent of the subsidy payments go to only 5 percent of all U.S. farmers. In fact, in one recent year nearly $40 million was paid out under this program to just 23 farmers.

Such statistics clearly show the boon to large corporate farmers provided by this program. The effect on smaller farmers is devastating. An estimated 100,000 of them are going out of business every year, even with the $55,000 ceiling. Unless subsidies are redistributed in a more equitable manner, larger farms receiving huge bonuses from the Federal Government will continue to outcompete and drive under these small farmers. We cannot allow our programs to confer benefits so inequitably, especially when the result is so damaging.

Not surprisingly, smaller farmers, those who are facing extinction, because of high payments to large, mechanized operation, support this amendment. One poll showed that 80 percent of all small farmers favor the $20,000 payment ceiling. The original purpose of the entire subsidy program was to aid those individuals who were being pressured out of business by the economy. We can help the farm support program achieve that goal by passing this amendment.

GOV. WINFIELD DUNN OF TENNESSEE—A RECORD OF LEADERSHIP

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, we in Tennessee are indeed fortunate to have as our Governor a man of the caliber of Winfield Dunn.

Described by many as a "political phenomenon," Winfield Dunn was a Memphis dentist largely unknown in the rest of the State before his dynamic and successful 1970 campaign for the Governorship of Tennessee.

Inaugurated in January, 1971, Governor Dunn became our State's first Republican Governor in 50 years.

Since then, Gov. Winfield Dunn's record has demonstrated that the people of Tennessee were correct in placing their trust in him. His leadership in Nashville has belied his previous inexperience in government. Those of us who have observed the diligence and preception Governor Dunn has demonstrated in working to solve Tennessee's problems have to remind ourselves this outstanding man had never before held public office.

One of Governor Dunn's greatest accomplishments has been his progressive record in upgrading education in Tennessee. His leadership in his home State has brought him still another in a long list of honors. Governor Dunn recently assumed chairmanship of the Education Commission of the States at its recent annual meeting in Los Angeles. Governor Dunn, who succeeds Gov. Robert W. Scott of North Carolina, will serve a 1-year term as ECS head.

I congratulate Governor Dunn for this latest achievement and commend him for his continuing efforts to ensure high quality education in Tennessee and throughout the Nation.

Following his election as ECS chairman, Governor Dunn said:

It is my sincere hope to strengthen the progress already made and to take even greater strides toward improved education for all the Nation's youths.

I know his year in this new post will be marked by the same competence he has displayed in the Tennessee Governor's Office. I join all Tennesseans in wishing our Governor well as he assumes his new duties.

HIGH PRICES OF LUMBER AND PLYWOOD

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution, cosponsored by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL) which calls for an immediate investigation by the Banking and Currency Committee of the high prices of lumber and plywood.

Once again lumber and plywood prices are getting completely out of hand. The lumber manufacturers are taking advantage of the tremendous demand for lumber and plywood because of the great increase in the number of housing starts in this country. Five-eighths inch standard exterior plywood which is used in all house construction has increased from an August 1971 price of approximately $118 per thousand freight on board mill, to a price today of $175 to $190 per thousand. Douglas fir unseasoned 2 x 4 averaged at the mill in May 1971 $89 per thousand; $108 when the August freeze took place and today is over $120.

The price of logs does not come under the Price Control Act and this is used as a partial explanation for the increase in lumber and plywood. It is interesting to note, however, that the average length of time from the purchase of timber to when it is manufactured is from 2 to 3 years. Consequently, timber purchased at lower prices, 2 to 3 years ago is being cut today and the mills are taking advantage of the tremendous demand by constantly increasing their prices.

A dealer called me on the telephone this week and advised that a car of five-eighths inch standard exterior sheeting plywood cost him $7,000 earlier this spring. His most recent car cost $10,000. We need another indepth investigation into the high prices of lumber and plywood. I hope that the Banking and Currency Committee will proceed immediately with hearings into this very important matter.

ON THE ELECTION OF HENRY TANAKA OF THE JAPANESE-AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I have learned that Henry Tanaka, of my congressional district, has just become the president-elect of the Japanese-American Citizens League. Mr. Tanaka is executive director of the Hill House for Mental Health Rehabilitation. He received his master's degree from Case-Western Reserve University's School of Applied Social Science. He has served as the past president of the Cleveland JACL Chapter and as council governor of the midwest district; which includes eight States.

All of our community is proud of Henry Tanaka's achievements, not only with the JACL, but in our Greater Cleveland community. Having had the opportunity of working with Hank in his work at Hill House, I have seen him demonstrate his professional skill and commitment in a very difficult area of endeavor.

We extend to Hank and to his wife, Sachie, and four sons, David, Steven, Rob, and John, our congratulations and wish him great success in the course of his tenure as president of the distinguished and exciting Japanese-American Citizens League. The challenges which lie ahead under Hank's stewardship for the Japanese-American community can only be enhanced by his leadership and outstanding ability to work for and with all people.

Congratulations should also be extended to the Japanese-American Citizens League for their good judgment in electing Henry Tanaka as their president.

The following is a summary of the history of the Japanese-American Citizens League:

HISTORY OF THE JAPANESE AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE

Forty-two years ago, a handful of Nisei's (Japanese Americans) from California, Oregon and Washington met in Seattle to form the Japanese American Citizens League (JACL). The formation of the organization was a direct result of the discrimination practiced and in some cases made legitimate through legislation, particularly by state laws. Most of the states in which these Americans of Japanese ancestry resided had laws which prevented their parents from buying land, which prevented adults from marrying persons of their choices for racial reasons, and which denied citizenship to oriental immigrants regardless of length of stay or service in World War I as members of the United States armed services.

On December 7, 1941, prejudice and discrimination flared into mass hysteria on the West Coast. The result was the evacuation of 120,000 men, women and children, most of whom were American citizens. No charges were filed against them. No hearings were held. Their names, their parental origin and their oriental features were sufficient cause in those dark days to confine them behind barbed wired fences. The barely finished barracks were euphemistically called "relocation centers".

It was during this turmoil that the JACL realized its full maturity. With a basic belief in the Nation's institutions, the JACL launched a vigorous program of public education, legal action, and government petition. A test case challenging the legality of Evacuation was taken to the Supreme Court. In California, when the Native Sons of the Golden West sought to strike the names of Nisei evacuees from the rolls of registered voters, the JACL took successful legal action to block this attempt.

Simultaneously, after having to petition the government to reinstate Selective Service for the Nisei, the celebrated 442 Regimental Combat Team was formed. The 442 became the most decorated unit of its size and length of service in American military history.

The post War saw the JACL step up its legislative front. Most significant was the goal of citizenship privileges for the immigrant parents who were in fact the real first generation Americans of Japanese ancestry. The elimination of the Immigration and Nationality Act eliminated race as a qualification for naturalization.

Today the JACL has chapters in over 30 states and the District of Columbia; they are 25,000 members strong. From many of these chapters communities and cities are finding leadership active on school boards, city councils, state legislatures and in elective offices.

Recently, in keeping with its motto, "Better Americans in a greater America," the JACL spearheaded an effort to assure that no other group of Americans would be subject to the mass mistreatment they underwent. On September 14, 1971, history came full cycle with the repeal of the Emergency Detention Act. 356 Congressmen voted for the repeal as the JACL won one of its most heart felt battles. The bill of repeal was sponsored by an American of Japanese ancestry.

I am of course delighted to have cast my vote for the repeal of the Emergency Detention Act.

REVIVING RURAL AMERICA

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the rural people of central Illinois and all across the country feel reassured with the recent conference report on the Rural Development Act of 1972. Recently, the Illinois State Journal-Register of Springfield, that serves Illinois 20th Congres-

sional District, expressed that resurgence of optimism in an editorial. That editorial is as follows:

[The Springfield, Ill., State Journal-Register June 25, 1972]

CONGRESS BOOSTS: REVIVING RURAL AMERICA

One of the most promising developments in the current session of Congress has been the attention paid to legislation designed to help revitalize rural America.

This effort was climaxed with a Senate-House compromise on a bill that will enroll the vast resources of the federal government in the developing movement to stem the rush of Americans into the giant and already far overcrowded metropolitan cities.

We in Central Illinois can appreciate probably better than most the importance of strengthening the farms, villages and small cities which make up so much of the midwest and have contributed so much to the building of the United States.

There is no logical reason why these areas should be neglected and as a result encouraging successive generations of young people to emigrate to the big cities in search of wider opportunities. There, too often they find only misery and unhappiness.

It would be far better not only for the economic basis of the country but also for its moral health if more families were to remain in the vast and uncrowded spaces far more suitable to the raising of children than the streets of the cities.

Furthermore there is no valid reason why the rural areas cannot be revived into a strong economic force. They were before and in Central Illinois it has been obvious in recent years that the will is there.

We have seen many advances in this area including the Shelbyville dam and complex, the lake and power plant developments in Christian County.

The steady expansion of state super-highways has made commuting to jobs in Springfield and other medium-sized cities comparatively easy for thousands in the predominantly rural counties in this area.

The situation is no doubt duplicated in many other areas of America.

It is indeed encouraging that Congress has now authorized up to $500 million a year to help attract job-creating industry to rural areas and to help rural residents with problems ranging from pollution control to fire-fighting. The new legislation provides many other tools for stimulating the rural revitalization.

The will and the desire is there. Central Illinois can attest to that. Now that the federal government has thrown its great support behind the effort the outlook for a promising future for rural America has been immensely brightened.

NATION'S FIRST ECOLOGY PARK

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, at last our country has set aside a 200,000-acre park where ecological studies and experiments can take place. About one-fourth of the reserved area lies in the First Georgia District, which I serve.

In recent months, millions of words have been written and thousands of speeches delivered on the subject of pollution. We suddenly became aware that we had fooled around too long and developed problems which challenge our very lives, as well as our way of life. Too many people and too little concern teamed up to thrust us into a dilemma.

The set-aside acres for the research park surround the Savannah River plant of the Atomic Energy Commission. The area borders the Savannah River for 22 miles, and includes swampland, pine forests, an old townsite, a manmade lake, fields, streams, and watersheds.

The Savannah River plant already has monitoring devices set up, but these will be greatly expanded as research increases in the years ahead. Those of us in the park area take great pride in the project as the fulfillment of a national need.

The Augusta Chronicle of June 21, 1972, carries a lead editorial and a six-column news story about the research park, as follows:

NATION'S FIRST ECOLOGY PARK IS LOCATED ON SRP PROPERTY

The Nation's first environmental park will be located on nearly 200,000 acres surrounding facilities at the Savannah River Plant near Aiken, the Atomic Energy Commission announced Tuseday.

The site, which encompasses the entire plant outside the production area and borders the Savannah River for 22 miles, includes swampland, pine forests, an old town site, a large manmade lake, fields, streams and watersheds.

The site will be open to scientists from other government agencies, universities, and private foundations as a protected outdoor laboratory where long-term projects can be set up to answer questions about man's impact on the natural environment.

The decision to create the research park resulted from suggestions by conservationists and research scientists, and from President Nixon's interest in preserving representative land areas for ecological research and wildlife protection, the AEC said.

The Savannah River Plant offers controlled lands where instruments are undisturbed and study areas protected from vehicles and casual visitors, the AEC said, as well as 20 years of basic research information collected on the site by AEC research and monitoring teams. AEC environmental research and monitoring at the Savannah River Plant is now funded at about $1 million a year.

New environmental research park projects, which AEC expects to be funded by other government agencies and private institutions, will be coordinated with current AEC projects.

The type of research at the Savannah River Plant are expected to include responses of a swamp ecosystem to pollution; development of tests to measure the health of ecosystems, comparable protests used to assess a human's health; a pilot plan to test new techniques for handling organic waste; synergistic, or combined, effects of multiple pollutants; and expanded research on microecosystems.

AEC environmental research at the site currently is conducted by scientists from the DuPont Co. which operates the Savannah River Plant production facilities under contract to the AEC, and the Savannah River Ecology Laboratory, operated for the AEC by the University of Georgia.

Research proposed for the environmental park will be coordinated by the AEC's Savannah River Operations Office and by the Headquarters Division of Biomedical and Environmental Research to assure compatibility with other research under way at the site.

TO UNFOLD FUTURE

In an ever-more-congested America, where do you find the space and the environmental variety to research pollution problems, so as to come up with new and tested means for a better future?

The answer came yesterday when the Atomic Energy Commission in Washington announced the designation of nearly 200,000 acres at the Savannah River Plant as the Nation's first Environmental Research Park.

The role this area will play is not completely new. It is the scope and potential of expanded research by many scientific groups which provide significance. Central Savannah River Area people are aware, of course, of current wildlife protection programs on the huge SRP tract. They have been told through the columns of the Augusta and CSRA newspapers of the present environmental research and monitoring, now funded at about $1 million a year. The University of Georgia already conducts a portion of the present research.

Now, however, other projects may be expected, funded by other federal agencies and by private institutions. Universities and foundations have the opportunity to set up long-term projects designed to answer many questions about the impact of human activity on the natural environment. For example:

Possibly a pilot plant to test new techniques for handling organic wastes.

Experiments to learn the manner and degree to which a swamp area responds to pollutants.

Projects to develop tests by which the health of any unit of the natural environment may be tested.

The effects of multiple pollutants as compared with the impact of one type of pollutant.

Such activity should result in knowledge, to replace what are now estimates or educated guesses. And, with adequate knowledge, it should be possible not merely to plan solutions but to plan them wisely on the basis of sensible priorities—conserving anti-pollution funds for use where and how they are most needed.

It is important, in gauging the effects of human pollution on nature, to have available for experimentation a wide variety of types of terrain and vegetation. This variety is assured on the Savannah River Plant grounds, which border the Savannah River for 22 miles, and include swampland, pine forests, fields, streams, watersheds, a large manmade lake and an old town site.

President Nixon has expressed interest in preserving representative land areas for ecological research. Conservationists and research scientists have made urgent suggestions along the same line.

We are glad that the fulfillment of a national need now is provided in our own Central Savannah River Area.

McGOVERN'S LAST STAND?

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, in an article entitled "Where I Stand," which appears in the July issue of The Progressive, the leading candidate for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency discusses some of the current issues. I would like to comment on one of the points that GEORGE MCGOVERN brings up.

Under the heading "A Prudent National Defense," he writes—

In place of the madness of Vietnam thinking, I have proposed a rational reordering of our national priorities and redistribution of

our resources. I have shown that building a "zero base" defense budget, starting at zero and budgeting only what is realistically needed, would cost no more than $54.8 billion in fiscal 1975 instead of the $87.3 billion that the current level of military spending, allowing for inflation, would cost by then.

This would indicate that Senator McGOVERN would, if he becomes President, reduce defense expenditures by $32.5 billion in the first budget for which he would have sole responsibility.

A few paragraphs earlier, the candidate said—

Vietnam thinking means spending not only $14.2 billion on Vietnam in the last fiscal year, but another $44 billion to implement our military aid commitments to forty-five other nations. Vietnam thinking means voting to keep all of our present NATO forces of half a million men in Europe at a cost of $14 billion . . . on the assumption that the 250 million people of affluent Western Europe can't protect themselves against 200 million Russians (who meanwhile are worrying about 700 million Chinese at their back door).

While Senator McGOVERN's figures for Western Europe are accurate—assuming that he includes all members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization except the United States, Canada, Greece, and Turkey—his figure for the other side is by far too low. The population of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is 248,760,000, about a fourth more than the figure he uses.

In comparing the opposing forces, we must go beyond the statistics, however. The Soviet Union is a monolithic structure, while affluent Western Europe would find it rather difficult, if not impossible, to protect itself against the U.S.S.R. without an alliance such as NATO. Although Belgium, Denmark, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, and Portugal are all of strategic importance to the free world, they are nevertheless small countries that are absolutely dependent upon the help that stronger nations can provide.

The Senator overlooks the 105,044,000 population of the Iron Curtain countries, vassal states that are dominated by the Kremlin: Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, and Rumania. If we add Yugoslavia, which has for many years blown hot and cold, the total population of the satellite countries will be 126,074,000.

Some Western European countries that are neither members of NATO nor captive nations have an aggregate population of 64,872,000. Over half of these people live in Spain, which has 33,947,000 inhabitants. I am sure that Mr. McGOVERN does not relish the prospect of having to cultivate General Franco in the event of a hot war.

The only other nations of any size are Austria, Finland, Ireland, Sweden, and Switzerland. Finland is an immediate neighbor of the Soviet Union, Austria is all but hemmed in by its satellites, Sweden and Switzerland are traditionally neutral, and Ireland has troubles enough already.

Of the ministates, only Cyprus and Malta are of much strategic importance, leaving only Andorra, Liechtenstein, Monaco, San Marino, and Vatican City. Obviously Western Europe would be hard put to defend itself without whatever protection NATO affords.

Let me emphasize that we ought to help protect Western Europe, not for altrustic reasons, but because it is in our own selfish interest to keep it strong. Let me invite Senator McGOVERN's attention to the fact that the body of which he later became a member ratified the North Atlantic Treaty in 1949 by a vote of 82 to 13.

It is obvious from the paragraph which I quoted earlier in my remarks that the Senator is opposed to all of the alliances which the United States has entered into with numerous other nations. Let me make it clear that I have for some time favored a review of our farflung commitments. At the same time, realism compels me to recognize that we must maintain alliances, not only with the nations of Western Europe, but with Latin America and some of the Far Eastern countries.

Besides the North Atlantic Treaty, our agreements with other nations include the following:

The Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, which was agreed to in 1947, presently includes Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Columbia, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

A treaty with Australia and New Zealand, a treaty with Japan, and a treaty with the Philippines were agreed to in 1951. In 1953 the United States negotiated a treaty with Korea.

Signatories of the Southeast Asia Treaty, which the U.S. Senate ratified in 1955 by a vote of 82 to 1, include: Australia, France, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, Thailand, and the United Kingdom.

A treaty with Free China was agreed to in 1955.

During the years from 1947 to 1955, when the above-mentioned pacts were entered into, the Democratic Party, whose nomination the Senator from South Dakota is seeking, never had fewer than 45 of the 96 seats in the other body. Thity-three of them could have blocked the Inter-American and North Atlantic Treaties and the agreements with Japan and the Philippines that were entered into during the Truman administration, and the Southeast Asia Treaty and the treaty with Korea, negotiated during the Eisenhower administration. By proposing that we budget for defense only what is realistically needed, which, according to his figures is $32.5 billion under what would probably be proposed otherwise, the South Dakotan is repudiating the record that his own party has written in the Senate.

I have already demonstrated the difficulties that would confront Western Europe if we withdraw from NATO. Similiar and worse difficulties would arise in the Far East if we withdraw from SEATO and repudiate our solemn agreements with Japan, Korea, and the Philippines. Does Mr. McGOVERN seriously believe that the nations of Latin America could successfully defend themselves without putting up a united front? Admittedly, there are weak spots in an alliance that includes such nations as Cuba and Chile, but the Senator would in effect expel all the members.

If the United States were to withdraw from all of its alliances and cut defense spending in fiscal 1975—just 2 years away—by $32.5 billion, the President would obviously have a lot of money for diversion to health, education, welfare, housing, transportation, culture, and other programs. Even if we had the healthiest, the wisest, the richest, the best housed, the most mobile, and the most amused population of any nation on earth, what good would it do us if we let down our guard and left our land naked to its enemies?

It is not part of my responsibility, as a Member of this great body, to furnish brains to the party to which GEORGE McGOVERN belongs and to whose leadership he aspires. It is, however, part of my responsibility to demonstrate the dangerous situation in which the people of the United States would find themselves if he became President and successfully carried out the withdrawal of our Nation from all of the treaties it has signed.

Mr. Speaker, the leading candidate for the Democratic nomination has told us where he stands, but I am afraid that it is very shaky ground. I am reminded of the advice that the Apostle Paul gave to the Corinthians:

Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall.

Unfortunately, "he" might not be GEORGE McGOVERN but Uncle Sam.

MORE LOGOPHAGACITY

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the distinguished columnist for Newsweek defined a logophag as a "word eater" and the employment of it as logophagacity. Two columns in the June 28 issue of the Washington Post, one by his brother, Joseph Alsop, "The Jewish Voters" and the other by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, "McGOVERN's Comprises," are good examples of the practice of this art in current events. I know my colleagues will find both these articles quite revealing.

THE JEWISH VOTERS

(By Joseph Alsop)

Sen. McGovern is using Sen. Abraham Ribicoff, full time, to try to avert a major defection by Jewish-American voters from the Democratic Party. Sen. Ribicoff's job is to meet with Jewish leaders in key states. He explains that McGovern certainly "had a lot to learn about Israel," and he promises that McGovern is indeed "learning" from persons like himself.

Participants in the meetings report that Ribicoff has been having a rough time. And no wonder! On different occasions McGovern has come out for the internationalization of Jerusalem; he has equivocated on

the provision of Phantoms for Israel; and he has done other things along the same line.

In all this, Sen. McGovern has merely reflected the New Left, anti-Israeli views of a fair number of leaders of his organization. Richard Stearns, for example, is the McGovern manager for all the non-primary states. As such, Stearns has certainly earned his keep.

At the time of the Six-Day War, however, Stears was also the signer of a couple of the standard, oily anti-Israeli appeals that in those days united Arabs, professional Arabists, New Leftists and oil investors. Other such cases could be mentioned.

The concern about the Jewish vote in the McGovern high command centers on Israel, therefore. This is hardly surprising. Everything that Ambassador Yitzhak Rabin is rumored to have said about President Nixon and American politics, has in fact, been said with far more picturesque emphasis by Prime Minister Golda Meir.

Consequently, Sen. McGovern has been swallowing his former New Left-tending pronouncements on the Middle East with eager haste. The only thing he cannot do, in this line, is to show Prime Minister Meir, or any thinking Jewish-American, for that matter, how a totally disarmed United States is going to guarantee the security of Isreal, or any other U.S. ally, either.

All this, however, is merely the froth on the surface of the Democrats' new problem with the Jewish vote. The fact of the matter is that Jewish-American voters are showing strong signs of following the Irish, the Slavs, the Italians and other "ethnic" voters in their mass-march out of the Democratic Party.

Between 1960 and 1968, the Democrats lost from a quarter to a third of the non-Jewish vote that used to constitute one of their main strengths in the Northern states. There is good reason to expect, too, that with Sen. McGovern as the Democratic nominee, the defections by the Italians, Slavs and Irish will be far, far heavier this year. But in 1968, the Jewish voters were still the exception. They gave at least 90 per cent support to Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey against President Nixon.

Three things divide the Jewish voters from other ethnic voters. The others are Catholics. Their forebears also came to this country, not because they were actively oppressed, like so many Jews, but in simple search of economic betterment. Third, however, the Jewish-Americans are on average better off economically today than almost any other group.

The memory of past oppression explains the Jewish voters' long, strong loyalty to the Democratic Party, which Franklin D. Roosevelt consolidated. The economic factor explains why that loyalty is wearing thin. This reporter has yet to find a single Jewish leader who does not think that the economic factor is more powerful than Israel.

Quite aside from the importance of Jewish Democratic fat cats, the vote itself is about twice as important to the Democrats as the figures might seem to indicate. This is because Jewish citizens register and vote to the last man and woman, while others do not. In New York City, for instance, only a quarter of the population is Jewish, but 40 per cent of the vote is Jewish.

Thus heavy defections of formerly Democratic Jewish voters can be murderous to the Democrats in New York, where just under 14 per cent of the state's population is Jewish. Such defections can even be very damaging in the other industrial states, which characteristically have from just under 3 per cent to rather more than 5 per cent of Jewish population.

This reporter has consulted the dozen Jewish leaders, across the country, who have been the best prophets in the past. Their predictions of Jewish defection to President Nixon, in a race with McGovern, have ranged from 30 to 50 per cent, with 35 a good average.

With the south down the drain, and the ethnics, labor and the Jews all defecting heavily, Sen McGovern's organization could have an uphill task.

MCGOVERN'S COMPROMISES

McGovern and Wallace forces in secret negotiations last weekend attempted to unite the Democratic Party on the corrosive issue of racial school busing but barely failed—a dramatic episode showing how much Sen. George McGovern will compromise to be elected President but also indicating even that may not be enough.

In closed-door sessions of the 15-member platform drafting committee at Washington's Mayflower Hotel, agents of McGovern and Gov. George C. Wallace actually agreed on a busing plank that was later rejected by Wallace himself. Amazingly, McGovern then embraced the compromise unilaterally. But McGovern operatives the next day permitted the full platform committee to substitute a pro-busing plank, insuring a bitter challenge from Wallaceites on the convention floor in Miami Beach.

The episode fits the inconsistency of McGovern's platform policy.

When the drafting committee came to school busing last Saturday, its liberal majority proposed a pro-busing plank: forced busing is "another tool" to integrate schools. That plank would guarantee bitter opposition from Wallace delegates.

But state Sen. Pierre Pelham of Alabama, Wallace's skillful platform representative, interjected. Why not let him and former Gov. Grant Sawyer of Nevada, an uncommitted delegate and one of the few experienced politicians on the platform committee in New Politics 1972, try to work something out? Ted Van Dyk, a one-time aide to Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey now running McGovern's platform operation, agreed.

Surprisingly, Pelham and Sawyer returned with a busing compromise worthy of the Delphic oracle: "Quality education is the issue—busing is not." Moreover, "transportation of students"—his delightfully vague term—is endorsed only when it achieves "quality education." Whether that is anti-busing or pro-busing depends on the eyes of the beholder.

Van Dyk quickly relayed McGovern's approval. But it was too late Saturday night to contact the hospitalized Wallace. Overnight, McGovern's inner circle was jubilant, joyously envisioning reconciliation between the McGovern and Wallace wings of the party to insure victory over Richard M. Nixon.

Sunday brought the McGovernites down to earth. Pelham reported that Wallace had vetoed the compromise, inisisting on an overt prohibition against racial busing. "Right at that moment," one drafting committee member told us, "George McGovern lost his chance to be President."

Mrs. Abram Chayes, an ardently liberal McGovern delegate from Massachusetts, immediately started writing a more liberal busing plank. But Van Dyk stopped her; McGovern would accept the Pelham-Sawyer compromise anyway!

By the time the full platform committee took up the busing plank Monday, McGovern's militant supporters were restive over Van Dyk's tight control. The McGovern-dominated drafting committee Sunday rejected planks on homosexual freedom and free abortion and approved milk-and-water planks on welfare and taxation. On Monday in the full committee, Van Dyk engineered votes defeating radical taxation and welfare plans once espoused by McGovern himself.

But McGovern platform committee members, particularly blacks, wanted to return to the pro-busing "another tool" amendment. Since even the compromise would be opposed by Wallace at Miami Beach, Van Dyk made a spot decision not to impose discipliine. So, the committee voted, 70 to 27, to record the Democratic Party in favor of the massively unpopular integration device. McGovern's attempt at moderation on busing had failed.

But McGovern did not even attempt moderation on national defense. His lieutenants were frantic when the drafting committee with Mrs. Chayes momentarily absent, voted 7 to 6 for a non-committal national security plank. When Mrs. Chayes returned, the McGovernites got the drafters to send to the full committee both that plank and a rival McGovern version for defense spending cuts.

That insured both defense and busing would be battled out on the convention floor with McGovern seeming to oppose strong national defense and favor forced busing.

"HYPOALLERGENIC" COSMETICS MUST BE MORE STRINGENTLY REGULATED

HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the selling of cosmetics is now a $6.5 billion industry. This industry has been expanding enormously, growing at a rate of about 10 percent a year. Even male toiletries, the perennial step-child of the industry, has become a $700 million a year business.

Furthermore, because of the extreme competition in the industry, new and exotic products are constantly brought onto the market. In the last years cosmetics with such ingredients as female hormones, animal extracts, and ammoniated mercury have been widely marketed.

Drug and Cosmetic Industry magazine, commenting on the cosmetics industry's scramble for new ingredients, stated:

The function of many well publicized ingredients cannot be accurately documented, other than through subtle improvement in product feel, fragrance or color. But what possible justification can there be for grape seed, peach kernel or cucumber oil? Is skim milk really better than whole milk or no milk at all? Does putting in avocado, strawberry, guava, quince or gooseberry oil do anything for a woman's skin or hair? Will cinnamon, coriander, nutmeg and basil be next?

Yet despite the size and pervasiveness of the cosmetic industry it is basically unregulated. Even representatives of the cosmetics industry have admitted this fact.

J. Richard Edmonson, secretary of Bristol Myers, for example, writing in the Drug and Cosmetic Law Journal, has stated:

In this year of increasing government control, cosmetics are undoubtedly the least regulated of all household products. New cosmetics need not be pre-cleared. There are no required warnings, except possibly for hair dyes, and labels need not list ingredients.

This view is strongly confirmed when it is learned that the Food and Drug Administration in fiscal year 1972 spent only $1,130,000 to regulate the safety of this $6.5 billion industry. The Federal Trade Commission at the same time was spending only $25,000 to monitor the more than $600 million worth of cosmetics' advertising purchased by the industry. In other words, the FTC spent one-twenty-four-thousandths as much to monitor the advertising of cosmetics products as the cosmetics industry spent to promote them.

The FTC's lack of emphasis on cosmetic advertising becomes particularly startling when it is realized that the cosmetics industry is the largest single advertiser in magazines. While commercials for beauty products are the largest single category of advertising on television.

This lack of meaningful regulation has allowed extremely important problems to be ignored.

One of the most serious regulatory questions in the area of cosmetics is how to protect the potentially allergic user of cosmetic products. The National Commission on Product Safety, for example, has pointed out that approximately 60,000 people are injured by cosmetics annually, with injuries ranging from skin eruptions, to loss of hair, severe allergic reactions, burns, itching and lacerations. They further stated that a survey of American insurance companies found that cosmetics are the basis for the second largest group of household personal injury claims.

Many cosmetic companies have responded to this problem by coming out with so-called hypoallergenic cosmetics. These cosmetics lines clearly are attempting to attract the millions of Americans with allergic problems. Unfortunately, a number of allergists have written my office seriously questioning these claims. These doctors point out that "hypoallergenic" means less allergenic, but that this suggests a standard of measure which at present fails to exist. Commissioner Edwards of FDA substantially confirmed these charges when in House Appropriations hearings in response to my question: "What does 'hypoallergenic' mean?" responded "nothing really," and then elaborated by saying—

> It means a low instance of allergic reaction, but what is a low instance of allergic reaction? In other words, I do not know what their definition is.

Furthermore, Commissioner Edwards went on to question the validity of these claims for hypoallergenicity from another point of view when he stated:

> I suppose in most of these claims, they are not well substantiated with good clinical data.

Because of the serious health implications of a claim that a product is "hypoallergenic" the FDA should require companies to substantiate these claims when it appears on a cosmetic label or require the companies to cease to make these claims.

At the same time, FTC, in liaison with FDA, should require cosmetic companies, where these claims for hypoallergenicity appear in advertising rather than on the label, to substantiate these health claims made in their ads.

This action by FDA and FTC would protect those cosmetic companies who are making a legitimate effort in the area of hypoallergenic cosmetics while putting pressure on the unscrupulous or incompetent companies to reform or get out of this area. Only in this way can the consuming public be protected.

But even if FDA and FTC prove to be successful in these efforts, still more will have to be done. For it is an elementary fact that what is hypoallergenic for one may cause a rash for many others. In other words, even a legitimate hypoallergenic cosmetic may have ingredients within it that cause allergies to a great number of people. For this reason, I have introduced legislation that will require cosmetic manufacturers to put their ingredients on the label. In this way, consumers will be able to avoid ingredients to which they have become sensitized. At the present time, even when consumers learn that they are allergic to particular ingredients, because of the lack of labeling, neither they nor their doctors can advise them what products to use or avoid.

Recently growing support has been evidenced in favor of the notion that there should be increased ingredient information available to the consumer. Virginia Knauer, the President's Consumer Advisor, has strongly suggested that provisions of the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act should be utilized by FDA to require increased ingredient labeling of cosmetics in order to protect the consumer.

While Dr. Naomi Kanoff, chairman of the Committee on Cutaneous Health and Cosmetics of the American Medical Association, has written me that—

> (The AMA Committee) on Cutaneous Health and Cosmetics of the American Medical Association has on several occasions recommended that the information concerning the ingredients of a product should be placed either on the container of the product or in a package insert. It is not sufficient that a consumer who has developed a reaction to a cosmetic be informed that a particular ingredient is the cause of the reaction. Without identification of ingredients on all packages, the affected consumer is not only prevented from further use of the class of cosmetic embracing the one with the offending agent, but is also potentially exposed to cosmetic products of other classes which may also have the offending agent as an ingredient.

The CBS affiliate in New York in a television editorial also has come out for ingredient labelling stating:

> Most people take for granted that the cosmetics they buy are safe or the government wouldn't allow them to be sold. Unfortunately, the government has neither a list of all the products on the market nor of their components. Consumers are equally in the dark since cosmetic labels do not show the ingredients these products contain . . . While we congratulate those companies who are willingly filing a list of their products with the FDA, if some persist in refusing to do so, we think all cosmetic manufacturers should be required by law both to register their products with the government and to list the ingredients on the package.

FDA has stated that it has under consideration the requirement that cosmetics companies label sensitizing ingredients. But the time for consideration should by now be long past. As allergists and dermatologists have consistently pointed out, all ingredients are potentially seriously sensitizing. Thus, when consumers buy cosmetics to make themselves more beautiful they should have access to ingredient information so that they may avoid products that instead will make them sick or cause them to have a rash.

FDA should make this issue a high-priority matter and quickly bring forward a proposal to require the comprehensive labelling of cosmetics in order to protect the public.

Finally, FDA should set a deadline for the cosmetics companies to agree to open their complaint files to FDA inspection or see to it that legislation is brought forward to require this critical information be made available.

Commissioner Edwards of FDA has made clear that access to these files is critical stating that:

> At this time the FDA receives only a fraction of the total number of cases of adverse reactions. The feedback simply must be greater and the industry can help by opening their complaint files to us. I do not see any workable alternative if we are going to establish a valid base for preventive actions.

If the cosmetics companies have nothing to hide it would seem that they should be glad to support such a proposal.

HAP MORRIS: DISTINGUISHED HOUSE POSTMASTER

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it is only fitting and proper that we should pay tribute to one of our loyal and dedicated employees of the House who is about to reap the benefits of retirement after laboring for the Congress for more than 40 years.

Hap Morris has served in almost all capacities as an employee of the House including the Democratic cloakroom, secretary, administrative assistant, assistant clerk of the House, and for the past 17½ years, as postmaster of the House. His tenure in his latest capacity has established a record that will not be broken for many years.

Hap Morris has been a tireless servant to the Members of the House and has been quick in his responses to the demands levied upon him by the Members and our staffs.

Hap's friendship is not the type that lasts only while we are elected Members of Congress. He has maintained almost weekly contact with many former Members such as "Uncle" Carl Vinson, the beloved former chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the late Noble Gregory, until his untimely passing, and many of our other colleagues now retired for one reason or another.

Hap has been a fountain of knowledge on the Rules of the House and its past legislative history.

In the sports world, he is a sideline expert and a Monday morning quarterback second to none. His sage advice and counsel has led the Naval Academy to unsuccessful seasons for what seems like decades. Coach Forzano, I am sure, will sadly miss Hap's smiling face and willing advice for the seasons to come—and is looking forward to a winning season this year.

Hap is returning to the area that he loves, the bluegrass region of Kentucky, where he will be close enough to follow the fortunes or misfortunes of the athletic teams at the University of Kentucky. That great basketball coach over the years, Adolph Rupp, heard of Hap's plans to retire and return to Kentucky so he promptly went into retirement himself rather than have the advice and competition on the basketball court from Hap. However, I am sure that our postmaster will be happy to be of whatever assistance he can to the new coach at the university. With his many interests in sports, I am sure that Hap will be kept busy both as a participant and as an observer.

While Hap is a man of small build, his shoes will be hard to fill. His smiling face and friendly counsel will be missed by all. It is our fondest hope that Hap will enjoy his much-deserved retirement for many years to come and will not forget his friends on Capitol Hill. We wish him best of health, happiness, and Godspeed.

RAYMOND E. BALDWIN—FIRST CITIZEN OF CONNECTICUT

HON. ROBERT H. STEELE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, the State of Connecticut is honored to call Raymond E. Baldwin, former Governor of the State of Connecticut, former U.S. Senator, and former chief justice of Connecticut, its first citizen.

Judge Baldwin's contributions to his State and to his Nation over more than four decades of distinguished public service cannot be overstated. Following 17 years of apprenticeship as attorney, prosecutor, State legislator, and municipal court judge, Judge Baldwin went on to hold top public office in all three branches of government, a feat unparalleled in Connecticut's long history.

Judge Baldwin's life has finally been chronicled. Written by Curtiss S. Johnson, Raymond E. Baldwin is a fitting tribute to a dedicated and deserving statesman.

Wesleyan University, Judge Baldwin's alma mater, recently published the following review of his biography in its alumni magazine. The article follows:

FIRST CITIZEN OF CONNECTICUT

(By Curtiss S. Johnson)

Only one man in Connecticut's history has held the State's three highest offices: Governor, U.S. Senator, and Chief Justice. That man is Raymond E. Baldwin '16, the most popular nutmeg politician of the century, perhaps of all time.

What accounts for his remarkable success as a public figure? Why was—and is—his popularity so great?

Many of the answers are to be found in a biography published this summer by Pequod Press and written by a fellow alumnus and long-time admirer, Curtiss S. Johnson '21, who until his retirement in 1960 was a prize-winning weekly newspaper publisher. Without pretense of being a cold, objective appraisal of a complex and controversial man, this account of the life and times of Ray Baldwin is, as the author tells us, "largely a labor of love."

Curt Johnson had returned to Wesleyan in 1919 a freshly discharged Army lieutenant, and Navy Lt. Baldwin was home from sea waiting to return to Yale Law School. At their fraternity, Delta Tau Delta, they began a friendship that was to ripen over half a century. The result is a charming account of the satisfactions and disappointments, the victories and defeats, of the public life.

Though a descendant of Thomas Hooker, leader of the first immigrants into Connecticut from the Massachusetts Colony, Ray Baldwin was born in Rye, N.Y. When he was 10 his family moved to Middletown and he attended local schools and sang in the choir of Holy Trinity Church. Perhaps it was there that he developed the rich speaking and singing voice that served—and still serves—him so well.

When he entered Wesleyan in 1912 there were fewer than 500 men undergraduates. (The last of "the Quails," the women of Wesleyan's first co-ed period, had been graduated that June.) Without being a distinguished scholar, he was a sound student deeply involved in the full range of campus activities from football to the Senate to the glee club. He was a founding member of the jibers quartet.

From the beginning, Ray was pointed toward law and after graduation he entered Yale Law School. But before his first year was over Woodrow Wilson asked for and got a declaration of war against Germany. Along with many of his classmates, Ray joined the Naval Reserve and was called to duty almost immediately. After officer's training at Columbia and Annapolis, he served aboard destroyers until his separation in August, 1919 and his return to Yale that fall.

His progression as a lawyer-politician is a common enough one: practicing attorney, member of a solid legal firm, local prosecutor, member of the state legislature, judge of the municipal court, Republican town chairman, always available public speaker. But Ray was no common practitioner of either law or politics. During his 17-year apprenticeship, he became widely known throughout the state as an independent and idealistic comer. In 1938 when his party needed a fresh face to run against the popular Governor Wilbur Cross, Ray was nominated as "a new Republican." In a three-way race enlivened by the presence of Socialist Jasper McLevy, Ray won. James L. McConaughy, Wesleyan's president, became his Lt. Governor.

Talk of Ray as a dark horse candidate for president mounted during the next two years, but he himself was a strong supporter of Wendell Willkie. When Willkie went down to defeat in the Roosevelt sweep of 1940, Ray lost the governor's seat, despite the fact that he outpolled the leader of his ticket by 55,000 votes. So it was back to the law in Fairfield County for two more years. The next time up, however, he took the governorship again and established himself beyond dispute as one of the "new G.O.P. leaders" to be reckoned with nationally. By the end of that two-year term his popularity was so great that he won re-election despite F.D.R.'s heavy margin of victory in Connecticut. Ray was the only Republican elected; even his Lt. Governor was a Democrat.

Then in June, 1945 at the moment when his political career appeared to be at its peak, he astounded the state by announcing his intention to retire from politics to become vice president and general counsel of Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance Co. But no party willingly bids farewell to so proven a vote getter; he was persuaded to run for the U.S. Senate in 1946. He won handily. When Ray resigned to take his Senate seat two weeks early, another Wesleyan man, Lt. Gov. Wilbert Snow, poet and English professor, stepped up to the big blue gubernatorial chair.

With Republican majorities in both houses of the 80th Congress, the Old Guard held firm command of the upper chamber and Ray, along with such freshman Senators as John Sherman Cooper of Kentucky, Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts, and Alexander Smith of New Jersey, was restive. These Young Turks weren't satisfied to sit quietly and vote as they were told. They wanted to be for something as well as against the Democrats. Though they knew it was heresy, they also wanted a say in party policy formation. They had ideas about national priorities and party strategy. At his desk on the Senate floor, Ray wrote out a statement to this effect and 15 other junior G.O.P. Senators signed it with him. As if this declaration of independence weren't enough to make him anathema to some of the hard-line conservatives, the fledgling senator from Connecticut wrote an article, "Where the GOP has Failed," for American Magazine. He continued urging liberalization of the Republican stance on a wide range of national issues. A year before the election of 1948 he predicted defeat for his party if it continued to oppose rather than lead. Harry Truman's surprise victory—which denied the Republicans the White House and cost them nine seats and control of the Senate—confirmed Baldwin's forecast but did little for his popularity with the Taft forces.

Then the following April, in a surprise move about which speculation and controversy still linger almost a quarter of a century later, Republican Senator Raymond Baldwin and Democratic Governor Chester Bowles held a joint news conference in Hartford. The Senator was resigning as of the end of 1949 to accept appointment by Bowles as an Associate Justice of the Connecticut Supreme Court of Errors. Democrats were astonished, Republicans infuriated. But Ray's explanation was a simple one: "As a very young lawyer I had hopes that some day I might be a justice of the Supreme Court of Connecticut."

As Curt Johnson makes clear: ". . . there was an immediate, violent and mixed reaction." The storm continued throughout his last eight months in the Senate, a period when Senator Baldwin became the first victim of the virulence that came to be known as McCarthyism. He and the junior Senator from Wisconsin tangled over the Malmedy massacre. (Malmedy was the little Belgian village where Waffen S.S. troops machine-gunned 350 unarmed American soldiers captured in the Battle of the Bulge.) When the U.S. Army was accused of being over-zealous in its post-war prosecution of the Nazi perpetrators, Senator Baldwin chaired the Armed Services Committee's subcommittee that investigated, and cleared, the Army's handling of the case. So vitriolic was McCarthy's personal attack on Baldwin that the full Armed Services Committee passed a resolution ending, "We, his colleagues take this unusual step in issuing this statement because of the unusual, unfair and utterly undeserved comments which have been made about Senator Baldwin."

On his last day in the Senate the sting of controversy was soothed by public tributes

from both sides of the aisle for the gentleman from Connecticut's "high qualities of character, competence and courage which he has so often and so gallantly manifiested in the Senate."

Back home in Connecticut, he assumed the judicial robes as if his whole career had been mere preparation for the bench. For the next decade he was heavily involved in judicial review. Then in 1959 he received another key appointment, again by a Democratic governor, this time as Chief justice of the State. His son Lucian '47, himself a lawyer, had the pleasure of swearing his father in.

As chief legal officer of Connecticut, Justice Baldwin devoted the next four years to modernizing the administration of justice and making the courts more accessible to the people. In his fourteen years as Associate and Chief Justice prior to his mandatory retirement at 70 in 1963, he personally wrote 350 opinions. Several of them—such as the school bus law which permits local communities to provide public transportation for parochial school children—were landmark cases.

But even in retirement, Ray was called on again by the people of his state. He was elected chairman of the history-making Constitutional Convention of 1965 and opened its first session with these characteristic words: ". . . The only limitation upon this convention's powers is contained in the legislation which created it and the Federal Constitution. Yes, there are two others, the innate human sense of justice and natural common cause. . . ."

Now a widower and again living in Middletown, Governor-Senator-Justice Baldwin remains an active and involved alumnus and trustee-emeritus of his alma mater as well as a public figure of still astonishing popularity.

Curtiss Johnson could have found no more appealing subject for an admiring biography than this First Citizen of Connecticut.

AND THE (DEAD) BEAT GOES ON

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, after only a few years in operation, the prevailing melody heard from the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts is not "Rhapsody in Blue," but "Budget in the Red." This "IOU" orchestration is produced not by professional musicians, but by bungling bureaucrats; and their latest chord of fiscal disharmony has put the Center in debt to the tune of more than $5 million.

One example of sour note management at the Center was the recent revelation concerning the steel beams for this multimillion-dollar music box. Specifications called for 2,256 holes to be cut into the beams to allow for the passage of necessary ducting and electrical connections. The standing practice in such cases is to have the holes drilled at the foundry. However, due to a hasty change in design by Center officials, the beams arrived without holes and a special crew of ironworkers had to be brought in to remedy the situation at the site. This boondoggle cost nearly a half million dollars and delayed construction for almost 2 years.

Also plaguing the cultural palace with financial manipulations is the head music man himself, Roger S. Stevens, noted east coast entrepreneur. In order to temporarily satisfy creditors' claims, Stevens has taken it upon himself to issue nonnegotiable promissory notes in the name of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. Of course, there is no provision for this sort of financial wheeling and dealing in the congressional act which authorized this project. From $200,000 to $300,000 worth of these "funny money" certificates are being palmed off. An attorney for one of the major creditors said:

We have been acting all along as though we are dealing with the United States government and that they will eventually back up these notes.

This merely points up the effect of such fiscal capers on the American taxpayer. So far this "tuneful Taj Mahal" has cost the taxpayer over $60 million plus an annual appropriation of over $1.5 million for maintenance.

The cultural elite who defend the Center have promised repeatedly that every request for Federal support is their swan song. Yet each year brings additional financial problems. Despite repeated assertions that no more Federal money will be poured into the Center, there is every indication that the lilting lyrics of that old song, "Come Bail Us Out," will ring out at least one more time.

INDEPENDENCE DAY—1972

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the Nation's birthday on July 4, it is appropriate for all of us to think anew about our heritage and the circumstances from which it developed.

I have read a great many expressions of patriotism over the years, but one of the best came to my desk a few days ago. It is a mailing piece from Gaylord Industries of Lake Oswego, Oreg.

It should be read by every red-blooded American on this July 4. To help in its circulation, I insert it in the RECORD. This portion of the Gaylord Industries essay on Independence Day, July 4, 1972, is proudly presented:

INDEPENDENCE DAY: JULY 4, 1972

One Hundred and Ninety Six years as a nation. One Hundred and Ninety Six years of freedom to build a nation. Every citizen of these United States should be proud of what has been accomplished and, at the same time, be humble at what remains to be done. Pride in our nation is considered by many to be "old fashioned" . . . . . there are many today who would have us apologize for being free and American. There should be an overwhelming pride in our nation . . . . . no other people have accomplished what the citizens of this nation have accomplished, in so short a time. Mistakes have been made, are being made, and will be made—yet, even in our mistakes, there should be a pride that we have created a nation where mistakes can be recognized, criticized and corrected—By the people.

If pride in your country is "old fashioned", then we are "old fashioned" and so be it. It is time that those with pride in our nation stopped listening to those who would apologize for freedom. It is time that we stopped destroying this nation from within and started building again. With this in mind, it was felt that many of our friends might appreciate a little "old fashioned" commentary on the Fourth of July.

We hope our pride in being American shows through.

A PACKAGE OF FREEDOM

On the Fourth of July we celebrate that day in history when a people declared themselves to be free and independent.

Time blurs details. History becomes names, dates and places on a printed page. The pride, courage, fears and dreams of those first United States can only be seen as reflections from the document declaring their freedom—The Declaration of Independence.

On that day of declaring independence, each individual, for each succeeding generation, was gifted with a package the world calls freedom. That package of freedom is the birthright of every child born in these United States of America. It is a gift to do with as each sees fit and the gift carries only one condition—that the same package of freedom be the first gift of the parents to each of their children.

This package of freedom doesn't come wrapped in pretty paper of red, white and blue—tied with a bow of stars. The covering that protects the freedom is a stained, crumpled, blood-covered wrapping of years. Only the string with which the package is tied is always new—woven of the dreams and hopes of one generation for the next. History is written on the wrapping and there are stains of shame, as well as stains of courage.

There have always been, and will always be, those who take the gift of freedom for granted abusing it, not recognizing that with freedom goes responsibility for its safekeeping.

There have always been, and will always be, those who would trade the gift of freedom—not realizing that there is nothing of equal value.

Theer have always been, and will always be, those who do not instill in their children a faith in the future—not caring that without hopes and dreams as the foundation there can be no building for peace.

There have always been, and will always be, those who would sell their freedom to the highest bidder—being blinded to the fact that when another holds your freedom he is the master and you are the slave.

There have always been, and will always be, those who will recognize the value of their gift of freedom—those who will fight to preserve it, those who will see that it is the one gift that they can present to the future, those who have treasured freedom and pass it on to their children carefully tied with the dreams and hopes they have for the future. . . . Thank God that these are the majority of Americans.

The gift of freedom which you were given, which is also yours to give, is the most priceless possession you will ever have.

Freedom—more important than life itself . . . . for what is life without the freedom to live that life?

In celebrating the anniversary of this Day of Independence we are not celebrating what we are in this place at this time. We celebrate the strength and courage of those who have brought us to this day—in addition, and perhaps even more important, we celebrate in anticipation of what we can become . . . . because of our gift of freedom.

Read the Declaration of Independence for the reflections of those who dreamed their dreams, and hoped their hopes . . . . for the nation.

And you are the Nation.

OUR RETURNING VIETNAM VETERANS

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Richard L. Roudebush, the Veterans' Administration's Assistant Deputy Administrator, recently made a most perceptive speech concerning Vietnam veterans at the VFS State Convention in Nashville, Tenn. I would like to share these thoughts of the former Congressman from Indiana with my fellow Members. They make most clear the special situation which Vietnam veterans are confronted with upon their return to the United States.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars is to be commended for their desire to hear Mr. Roudebush so that they may effectively assist our Vietnam veterans during their transition period from military to civilian life.

The remarks follow:

REMARKS BY RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

It is a real pleasure to be with you here today. It is always a homecoming—when I am privileged to attend a VFW Convention—and associate with those who belong to the organization—that has been so big a part of my life.

It has been my good fortune to have been a VFW member since 1944 and to have served in a number of capacities including the highest offices that it was possible for my comrades to elect me to.

I will always be grateful to my comrades for placing their trust in me and thus honoring me. In personal satisfaction I equate these positions with the considerable gratification that goes with service in public office which it has also been my good fortune to experience.

Friendship, according to Shakespeare, does not require ceremony. So I will not linger further—with words of greeting or attempt to recognize all those here to whom I am indebted for past services or who deserve recognition for other reasons.

Shakespeare also said that brevity is the soul of wit. I will not try to be witty but I will be brief and I am sure knowing you as I do that this is probably the most appropriate remark I could make as I start my discussion with you.

Some one else, a great deal later than Shakespeare, said, tell it like it is. That is what I propose to do and, I think, telling it like it is, about Veterans Affairs, reflects a great deal of credit on our Nation and on the American people.

I know of no other society that has felt so deeply its obligation to its former fighting men or dealt so widely or so decisively to help meet this obligation. I think this is a situation in which we can take a great deal of satisfaction.

At this time some 3¼ million veterans are being paid compensation and pensions for disability that occurred in service or later in life.

At this time more than 1.6 million survivors of veterans are being paid compensation or are drawing pensions.

At this time, a million and a quarter veterans and servicemen are training under the GI bill.

At this time, 85,000 patients a day are being treated in Veterans' Administration Hospitals.

At this time, outpatient visits to VA clinics are running around 850,000 a month.

At this time, the number of veterans who have bought homes with GI loans, has exceeded 8 million since the program started. Loans guaranteed total more than $88.7 billion.

These are some of the dimensions of the vast programs of help the American people are conducting for our Nation's veterans.

Is there any other nation—east or west—that does as much? Is there any historical precedent, anywhere for the volume, the variety, the breadth, and depth of benefits Americans provide their veterans?

I think the debt we all feel to those who have worn their country's uniform and their dependents and survivors is a characteristic of an enlightened and benevolent society, one that is directed toward the needs of the people rather than toward the State.

While we expect young men to help defend their country, we do not as some other societies have, consider their sacrifices as something to be routinely and ungratefully expected, and their future well-being to be only their business or the business of family and friends.

The statistics I have listed for various categories of veterans programs do not begin to tell the full commitment of the American people to their veterans.

It is told in the compassion of those who serve veterans under these programs. It is told in the willingness of citizens everywhere, to give of themselves in such volunteer efforts as helping find jobs for veterans, carry on volunteer service in our hospitals. It is told in the dedication that public officials and public institutions show for helping to solve problems that beset veterans, and their consideration of veterans as special citizens with special needs.

And, of course, it is shown in the activities of the veterans' own organizations, the Veterans of Foreign Wars among the most eminent, activities that are not only designed and carried out to serve the community and Nation but to help other veterans.

While we can take great satisfaction in living in a Nation that appreciates its veterans and provides so well for them, we cannot be satisfied with what is being done.

We cannot be satisfied—as long as there is still so much to accomplish in the matter of providing training, job opportunity, health care, and a chance for better living for those who look to us—the Veterans of Foreign Wars—for help and guidance.

It seems to me that veterans organizations, working with the VA and others interested in problems of veterans, have a particular opportunity at this time in our Nation's history to be of service.

I think this is true because of the number of young men and women who are coming out of service and because of the special needs they have as they reenter civilian life.

Periods like the one we are going through occur at the end of every large conflict. Many veterans come home and must make decisions concerning the future. Jobs need to be found. Education needs to be provided. Housing needs to be arranged for. Adjustments to a new way of life have to be made.

But I think there are special conditions that exist today that we all recognize, conditions that call not only for a special effort on our part but that also call for special thinking—and perhaps call on us all to be something more than we have been before.

The tragic conflict—we are pulling out of in Vietnam—is not like past wars and I don't think I have to point out the many points of difference at this time because you have heard them all and you recognize them the same as I do.

The Veterans' Administration has attempted to accommodate to these differences and the way they affect veterans in a number of ways.

You are familiar, I'm sure, with our overseas operations and understand their novelty. You know about our efforts to reach veterans by letters, telephone calls, and personal visits. You know of our studies of the needs of Vietnam veterans and the changes that have been made in our offices and hospitals as a result.

It is urgent, I think, that any institution adapt itself to the requirements of those it serves, and change its character—and its operations where indicated in order to fulfill its mission.

We recognize that VA can do much to help heal some of the wounds and rifts of our society and help prevent disappointment and even alienation among many people by doing its job well. By doing our job properly we can demonstrate to doubters that the system does work and we can undercut the pessimism and ease the despondency of many young men who feel their fellow citizens do not appreciate their sacrifices.

I said a little while ago that the Veterans of Foreign Wars also have a special role to play today, a role that is much the same but somehow different from that of past periods of conflict. The same because our traditional interest in veterans and in the good of our country is needed as always; different because of the special circumstances and special needs I have alluded to.

It seems to me that the VFW and other organizations can be special repositories of understanding and special instruments of healing as we work our way out of a time that is fraught with misunderstanding, with suspicion, and with rancor.

I hope that you can continue to adapt to meet the needs of a different day and a different veteran clientele and frankly I know you will.

I hope also that you will not underestimate what you can do or the importance of the type of service that the VFW is in the business of rendering.

Every time you give good advice to a young man who is bewildered by what turn to take as he reenters civilian life, you help a deserving citizen to whom we are indebted and help preclude possible unhappiness or bitterness on his part.

Every time you are successful in getting an employer to give a veteran a chance at a job you create the possibility of economic independence for a young man and you combat the indignity that goes with unemployment.

Every time you give good counsel to a young veteran who wants training or education you lay the groundwork for a happier life, for a man and his family, and you raise the future leadership potential in your community.

Every time you provide service for a hospitalized veteran, you increase the possibility of happiness and productivity for him.

And every time you do any of these things you strengthen America, because you help another citizen participate in the good things America has to offer and you help mobilize him for civilian service.

Further, you help heal the wounds suffered by our national spirit as a result of disillusionment and disappointment among some of the valiant young men who have been serving in our Armed Forces and you prevent further estrangement and further wounds.

The past few years have, indeed, been a trying time for America.

We know that many of the things people say are wrong, are not wrong. We know that much of the restlessness, and much of the rhetoric, is not called for. We know that part of the trouble, and a great deal of the noise comes from malcontents, small in number, but noisy.

But knowing these things, we would still be dishonest with ourselves if we did not

admit to national problems that challenge the dedication and ingenuity of all of us.

We know that we will solve these problems in time and I have a deep personal feeling that organizations such as the VFW can play a large part in their solution.

I have this feeling first of all because I know first hand what the VFW stands for and what the fulfillment of its beliefs and goals could mean to America. I have this feeling also because I know of the character, the devotion, and the skill of individual VFW members and its Ladies Auxiliary.

And I also feel this way because many of the problems we face are the special problems of those in which you are interested—our returning veterans.

I am confident that the war that these young men have been called on to fight will soon be ended and I am confident that it will be ended in a manner that does not create future problems for us, but that will provide a fair and stable piece.

When the President returned from his trip to Moscow and addressed the congress, he said:

"I emphasize to you once again that this administration has no higher goal than bringing the Vietnam war to an early and honorable end. We are ending the war in Vietnam but we shall end it in a way which will not betray our friends, risk the lives of the courageous Americans still serving in Vietnam, break faith with those held prisoners or stain the honor of the United States."

I am sure we can all subscribe to those sentiments and applaud those words. I am certain that the membership of the VFW would have the President speak and perform in no other way and that he has your trust and your support.

As one official of the Government and as a past commander in chief and as one who happens to agree wholeheartedly with the course the President has charted, I express appreciation to you for your support of Vietnam policies and voice the hope that your support will continue.

And, when the strife and the sacrifices are ended and a just and lasting piece has been established, we will be proud that we have stood together and we will continue to work together—for the good of those who have carried the battle and made the sacrifice.

Thank you for your kind invitation to be with you today.

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE ROBINSON

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to join with my colleagues in saluting my friend George Robinson, who has compiled one of the longest records of faithful service on Capitol Hill.

George Robinson served the Congress for 26 years—first as a clerk in the document room and for the last two decades as Doorkeeper in this Chamber. In my estimation, he is one of the many fine individuals who makes serving in the House of Representatives a pleasure and an honor.

Altogether, George's service to government—at the local, State and Federal level—spans nearly a half century and as he and his lovely wife Ethel prepare to take leave for Colorado for their retirement years, I want to wish them the very best and say that the door to this House Chamber will always be open to him.

"GOLDEN ISLES" MAY FIGURE IN WORLD HERITAGE TRUST

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1972

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the "Golden Isles" off the coast of Georgia are famous in song and story. Perhaps in no place yet left in the world can one find such an equitable climate, natural and beautiful setting, and abundant native wildlife as on these islands. Unspoiled is an accurate description of perhaps 90 percent of these islands.

Jekyll Island is perhaps the best known of all along the Georgia coast. At one time it was said that about three-fourths of the wealth of America was represented on Jekyll by a club of well-known millionaires known as the Jekyll Island Club. They have long since departed and this island is now owned by the State of Georgia and available to all people as a recreation site.

Jekyll and St. Simons are the most developed of the string of islands, but even these are carefully restricted. Most of the dozen or more islands are still as nature made them.

It is no wonder that the World Heritage Trust which is expected to be established later this year by the United Nations, is looking toward these islands as a part of "the most valuable ecological resources in the world and should be preserved for future generations."

Further details of the plans for Georgia's islands are revealed in a news story carried by the Savannah Morning News of June 3, 1972, as follows:

PANEL IS NAMED FOR COASTAL AREA PRESERVATION

(By Mike Shane)

OSSABAW ISLAND.—A three-member task force was named here Friday to explore the possibility of having Georgia's undeveloped coastal area included in a World Heritage Trust expected to be established later this year by the United Nations.

Ecologists and state and federal officials who met here for three days agreed that Georgia's remaining undeveloped coastal islands, including Ossabaw, Cumberland, Little Cumberland and Sapelo, and the Okefenokee Park in Ware County are among "the most valuable ecological resources in the world and should be preserved for future generations."

Mrs. Eleanor West, one of the owners of Ossabaw; David Brower, president of Friends of the Earth; and Robert Hanie, former director of the Georgia Natural Areas Council, were chosen to explore the possibility of having Georgia's coastal islands and natural areas included in the trust.

SINGLE ENTITY

If the proposal succeeds, it would be the first time that the entire coastal area of Georgia would be considered as a single ecological entity, Brower said. He is the founder of a 20,000 member ecology organization which is headquartered on the West Coast.

Presently Cumberland Island and the Okefenokee Park are being separately considered by the Federal Government as national recreation areas.

Sapelo is owned and used for research by the State of Georgia, and Ossabaw and Little St. Simons islands are kept in a natural state by private interests.

"If we are successful, it means that coastal Georgia could obtain international recognition, and its wildlife and natural areas will remain intact into the future," Brower said.

The Georgia section of the World Heritage Trust would be controlled by Georgians and administered perhaps from an office in Savannah. There would be no legal loss of national sovereignty, Brower said.

STOCKHOLM MEETING

The committee of three will attend a conference on the environment sponsored by the United Nations this month in Stockholm, Sweden.

Later this year, the Trust is expected to be established in Paris and possibly could include such areas as the Grand Canyon, the Amazon River, and other natural and ecologically valuable portions of the earth, Brower said.

The Trust was first proposed by Russell Train, chairman of the President's Council on Environmental Quality.

In addition to those named on the committee, the meeting on Ossabaw was attended by Joe Tanner, commissioner of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources; Sam Candler, director of the Georgia Natural Areas Council; Robert Jenkins of the Nature Conservancy; J. Owens Smith, University of Georgia's Institute of Natural Resources; Dale Jenkins of the Smithsonian Institution, and several attorneys and businessmen from Georgia.

If a regional headquarters is established in Savannah, funds for staff will be sought from foundations, grants and private sources, Brower said.

Tanner said the State of Georgia is interested in participating, but will wait to see how the World Heritage Trust is established before endorsing the project for coastal Georgia.

Earlier, Tanner said the State of Georgia also is interested in helping the owners of islands along the coast to preserve them in a natural state—rather than having them sold to developers by owners now faced with the problem of rising local taxes.

VIEWS ON VIETNAM

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I feel it my duty, as a Member of Congress, elected by the citizens of my district, to assist them in registering their views with the administration and the Congress on issues of national concern. Pursuing this committment, I have delivered to the President two petitions, signed by more than 3,400 residents of eastern Massachusetts, expressing their opposition to the recent escalation of the war in Southeast Asia, and calling for the immediate and total withdrawal of American military forces from that area.

These petitions were given to me by two organizations, one at the Bridgewater, Mass., State College, and other

headed by the Natick Peace Action Committee.

I have asked the President to consider very carefully the views expressed in these petitions, as he progresses with foreign policy decisionmaking. I strongly urge U.S. disengagement from Vietnam.

THE PRESIDENT'S TELEVISED NEWS CONFERENCE

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, tonight, for the first time in over a year, President Nixon will have a televised news conference. The last such event was June 1, 1971. Since then there have been numerous issues which the administration has ducked because of a failure to hold a sufficient number of news conferences. As a matter of fact, there have only been two news conferences this year. With powerful and influential media such as television not being used in this manner, many questions remained unanswered. These issues include the war between India and Pakistan, the changes in the FBI, the problems with the environment, prisons, health care, or the crime rate, and particularly the escalation of the Vietnam war.

The following article by Max Frankel which appeared in the New York Times on June 19, 1972, indicates the importance of such a forum as a televised news conference. The questions which might be asked at such a conference appear toward the end of the article are definitely thought-provoking. The American people have the right to know the answers to such questions as: "What constitutional authority do you now possess, Mr. President, for bombing North Vietnam and mining its harbor?" "Why will the peace terms you could get this year be better than those you might have obtained 3 years ago?"

I am pleased the President has revised, at least for today, the use of the televised news conference. The people are owed information and the President will hopefully continue to give it to them.

The article follows:

PRESIDENTIAL NEWS CONFERENCES QUIETLY DYING OF NIXON DISUSE

(By Max Frankel)

WASHINGTON, June 18.—The Presidential news conference is dying, without ceremony or explanation, and reporters who moan about it are being put down by the Nixon staff as self-serving whiners who merely miss the chance to kick the President around or to bask in his glory in public. The reporters are not much more generous in speculating about Mr. Nixon's motives, so there is a lot of ugly talk about a subject that might just be worth some serious discussion, especially in an election year.

In all of 1971, President Nixon faced ad hoc questioning by the White House press on nine occasions, compared with an annual average of 24 to 36 by Presidents over the last 25 years. There have been two news conferences in 1972, the last one 12 weeks ago, compared with President Eisenhower's 13 and President Johnson's 15 in the years they sought re-election, 1956 and 1964. The last formally scheduled news conference, which allows the preparation of questions in advance and provides radio and television as well as press coverage, occurred on June 1, 1971.

But statistics alone reveal nothing about the flavor of news conferences. When held weekly, or even fortnightly, they invariably provide at least a question or two, and an answer or two if the President wishes on virtually every major topic of current public concern. When they occur every three months, great events and enormous issues are ignored. The reporter seeking to make up for lost time, or having lost the habit of direct and decisive interrogation, winds up lobbing puff balls or pomposities, or both in one pitch.

An impromptu quickie, with the available reporters summoned to the President's desk once every 90 days, and a duly scheduled gathering once a year is, indeed, often worse than nothing.

WORSE THAN NOTHING

There hasn't been a chance to question President Nixon about the long-forgotten war between India and Pakistan or about the release of Jimmy Hoffa from prison or about his budget deficits or taxes or welfare or the crime rate or the environment or population growth or the bombing and mining in Vietnam or the new F.B.I. or Taiwan or the sleeping accommodations in the Kremlin. There have been only negligible opportunities to ask about the new China policy or meat prices or the war or antitrust policy or the rotating Cabinet or campaign costs and contributors.

Mr. Nixon has not been shy about public appearances. He has had record-breaking hours of free television from Peking and Moscow and in between, with carefully timed and phrased public pronouncements. His staff contends that these appearances are more suitable and also more popular, although in candid moments it is conceded that the real motive is to avoid the allegedly "hostile" Washington reporters and to appeal "over their heads to the people."

The irony in all this is that, when Mr. Nixon began in 1969 on a policy of fortnightly or at least monthly television news conferences, he was judged by those reporters to be a deft fielder and effective performer. But that, of course, was before there was much of a Nixon record to be defended, or asked about.

EQUAL TIME PROBLEM

There is a problem now about televised sessions, because the Federal Communications Commission has reaffirmed its ruling that a Presidential news conference would require the granting of equal time to Republican candidates for President before the party's national convention in August and to a Democratic rival thereafter. And incumbents do not normally believe in sharing the limelight with their challengers.

But there are more profound problems raised by the absence of news conferences. Without them, a President avoids not only public examination on some difficult issues but even the private briefings by which he prepares himself for the worst. If he faces no risk of an embarrassing question, then his staff and the vast bureaucracy of the Federal Government need never really bring to him its most embarrassing dossiers of policy or performance. (Did that general bomb North Vietnam without authorization, or did he not?)

There is also no record of spontaneous Presidential reaction to the parade of issues, no chance to measure his changes of view or mood and no chance to remind him of what he said or did a year ago. It is not just the event that is lapsing, but a whole process of communication and, indeed, government.

Articles such as this often produce a quick news conference, but that is not the point. One of Mr. Nixon's close aides recently complained about the flabbiness of reporters' queries, so even if the Presidest demurs perhaps the reporters owe it to him and their readers to reveal the questions that are lingering in their notebooks.

SOME SAMPLE QUESTIONS

Here is a sample, culled from those of one newspaper's Washington staff.

Mr. President:

Are you still confident of ending the war in your first term and pulling the rug out from under the Democrats on this issue? Why will the peace terms you could get this year be better than those you might have obtained three years ago? What constitutional authority do you now possess for bombing North Vietnam and mining its harbors?

If the numbers of nuclear missiles does not matter too much in the new arms agreements, why did the Russians agree to a freeze only after they were assured a larger number in each category than the United States?

How much will it cost you to run for reelection and do you have a moral as well as legal obligation to reveal who is paying your costs?

Do you agree with a recent bipartisan study that tax increases are inevitable early in the next President's term? Could you pay for your proposed domestic programs and still reduce property taxes without raising other taxes considerably? Why are your political agents stressing the pledge of no taxes "this year?"

Will you sign what amounts to Congress' moratorium on public school busing without insisting on the other half of your proposal for compensatory financial aid to poor schools?

Why have you avoided a major public campaign to drum up support in Congress for your public assistance and welfare expansion program? Will you veto Social Security increases beyond that 5 per cent you recommended?

Is the economy having the very good year you promised for 1972 despite the high unemployment rate? Looking back on your first term, could you have done better in the fight against inflation?

Do you really think the press is hostile for harboring such questions?

THE LATE HONORABLE GORDON CANFIELD

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was truly saddened to learn of the passing of the Honorable Gordon Canfield who for 20 years was an outstanding Member of the House of Representatives. Gordon and I served together for many of those years on the House Committee on Appropriations and we became close friends. Although we sat on different sides of the aisle we worked together on many things and I had nothing but the utmost respect for him. He was a dedicated Member who served his congressional district in New Jersey, and the country, well. He was a hard worker, ever mindful of the problems of the country. He was also a warm and gentle man who was greatly admired and re-

spected by all who knew him. We shall all miss him. To his wife, sons and family I offer my deepest sympathy upon their great loss.

SIGNING THE DISCHARGE PETITION ON BUSING

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today signed the petition to discharge the Judiciary Committee from further consideration of House Joint Resolution 620 proposing an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit forced busing of schoolchildren to achieve racial balance.

This is the first and only discharge petition I have ever signed since I have served in the Congress. Only under the most extraordinary circumstances should legislation be taken from the properly designated committee for such action disrupts the orderly function of the legislative process. I firmly believe that the discharge petition is a procedure that should be adopted only as a last resort.

While I am convinced that our committee system, as a general rule, has served the Congress and the Nation well over the years, it has become apparent that the Judiciary Committee is not going to act on this issue.

Subcommittee No. 5 of the Judiciary Committee concluded hearings on the proposals on May 24. One of the proposals, a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 983) proposing an amendment to the Constitution to prevent pupils from being assigned or transported to public schools on the basis of their race, color, religion, or national origin, I introduced on November 30, 1971. Since no executive sessions have been held or scheduled, the likelihood that this committee will do something diminishes with each passing week.

Mr. Speaker, I feel the House should not be prevented from expressing its will on a constitutional question of such widespread concern. There is no question that there is strong support both in the Congress and across the land for effective action on this matter. The House repeatedly voted against busing in considering the higher education bill and by majorities that exceeded the two-thirds needed to pass an amendment to the Constitution. As we all know, the higher education bill, signed into law last week, is still subject to a court test for last year the Supreme Court in the Swann case chose to ignore similar congressional language contained in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 when it upheld court-ordered busing. President Nixon expressed his own reservations on the busing amendment to this bill.

The Judiciary Committee, I believe Mr. Speaker, has had ample time to take positive action. In view of this and despite the fact that I still have reservations about discharge petitions, I feel that the House should be permitted to work its will, and that is why I have signed this petition.

COMMENDATION FOR CONGRESSMAN HOGAN

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Washington Post carried an editorial regarding House passage of the Metro financing bill.

One of the most active and effective of the proponents of this legislation was our colleague from Maryland, LARRY HOGAN, and I take this opportunity to call attention to Congressman HOGAN'S excellent work and the deserved words of the Post editorial:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 29, 1972]

METRO MAKES IT

We don't mean to get ahead of events or lull anybody into a false sense of security but it actually begins to look as if one of Greater Washington's longest running, always-on-the-brink crises is over: There is honest-to-goodness light at the end of the Metro tunnel, thanks to a grand vote in the House this week. With nary a word about the Three Sisters Bridge and by a lopsided 280-to-75 vote, the House approved the granting of a federal guarantee for bonds to complete the entire 98-mile Metro system that has been so long in the making.

Action by the Senate is still needed, but Metro never has encountered opposition by this body; the real hurdle was always the House, where for years the fate of this delicate regional subway project had been unfairly entangled in a web of congressional pique and power. But this time, it should be noted, even Rep. William H. Natcher (D-Ky.) saw fit to join the majority—having lost a big round last December that could have killed the project if more responsible members had not prevailed.

That last vote, in fact, proved to have been the big one, for many other members who voted against Metro funding at that time turned up on the right side of this week's decision. Thus, it is worth recalling that the conclusion of Washington's incredible subway saga was due to vigorous, responsible efforts by sympathetic members of the House—and to strong and effective support from President Nixon.

Mr. Nixon deserves the region's thanks for acting to break the transportation impasse, and salutes are in order, too, for those who coordinated the campaign to round up the votes: Earle Cabell (D-Tex.), Robert N. Giaimo (D-Conn.) and Silvio Conte (R-Mass.), Reps. Joel T. Broyhill (R-Va.), Gilbert Gude (R-Md.) and Lawrence J. Hogan (R-Md.) and Del. Walter E. Fauntroy (D-D.C.).

The end of the Metro funding crisis does not mean, however, that Congress or the White House should consider their work complete in providing an efficient, attractive public transportation system for the Nation's Capital. On the contrary, there is yet another measure that deserves immediate attention if the rapid rail system is to achieve its full objectives; approval is needed for a bill that would ratify actions already taken by the Maryland and Virginia legislatures, to permit Metro's takeover of the area's bus lines.

For strategic reasons, members of the House District Committee separated this legislation from the bond bill, with a promise that it would receive prompt consideration on its own merits. Now that Metro is on its way to reality in time for the 1976 Bicentennial, no time should be lost in assuring that it becomes part of a cohesive transportation network that can be a source of pride for both the community and the nation.

A TRIBUTE TO T. GRAYDON UPTON

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the resignation of Mr. T. Graydon Upton, for 10 years the executive director of the Inter-American Development Bank. It has been my privilege to know and work with Mr. Upton. Under his capable guidance, the IADP has developed and blossomed into a full-fledged international banking institution, serving the whole of Latin America. Fortunately for the people of this hemisphere, the unique talents of Mr. Upton will be utilized through other avenues of public service. Along with presiding over the Pan American Development Foundation, he will be joining Porter International, a firm dealing with financing Latin American projects. We thank him for his 10 years with the Inter-American Development Bank and wish him continued success.

AFTER 10 YEARS OF SERVICE TO IADB—A SPECIAL CHEER OF THANKS FOR MR. UPTON

(By Virginia Prewett)

When a quarterback who has performed long and well leaves the field for the last time, grateful fans customarily give him a special cheer of approval and farewell. T. Graydon Upton, who has just left the Inter-American Development Bank after being its executive director from its founding, deserves such a hemisphere tribute for his 10 years of IADB service.

The IADB, a bank-type institution for international cooperation in Latin American development, is one of the New World's oldest dreams come true. In our country it has been a bi-partisan dream. The enlightened, imaginative policies that have made it "more than a bank" have been implemented under the quiet and unobtrusive guidance of Graydon Upton, working always with an overwhelmingly Latin American staff and led by a Latin American as bank president.

He came to the IADB from our Treasury Department and is succeeded by another Treasury "graduate," Henry J. Costanzo, who prepared for the responsibilities of the post by serving for over two years as the U.S. director of the bank.

CONTINUES INVOLVEMENT

Mr. Upton will continue in hemisphere activities in two capacities. He has become a director of Porter International, a Washington-based firm that specializes in arranging financing for Latin American projects, and also will be president of the Pan American Development Foundation.

The PADF, which operates under the wing of the OAS but is not a part of it, has the mission of transferring to Latin America a pattern of economic civic action that reflects one of the most admirable aspects of our national society.

North Americans are so used to banding together for good causes that we sometimes forget this is not the rule in other lands. Today when many of our own people make a point of slamming our social organization, it is good to be reminded of this unique, unselfish and socially useful device.

The PADF helps well-to-do Latin Americans band together in not-for-profit efforts to help their own poor.

CREDIT FOR THE POOR

A special concern of PADF offshoots in a dozen Latin American countries is credit for poor people. We often forget that easy credit is also an aspect of our society not common elsewhere. The PADF nurselings throughout the hemisphere have, in a very few years, helped hundreds of thousands of less advantaged Latin Americans thru this device alone.

The well-to-do Latins have discovered in their poor neighbors such integrity and reliability in a region where scarcity of capital is an economic plague has, in many instances, changed the entire face of poverty-stricken communities.

It is good to be reminded also that, even as U.S. official policy neglects Latin America, dedicated Latin Americanists still endeavor to hold the hemisphere together by holding out a helping hand to our neighbors.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFIT INCREASE CALLS FOR RAILROAD RETIREMENT COMPARABILITY

HON. RICHARD H. FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the action which we are to take today to provide a 20 percent across-the-board increase in social security payments is one of the major accomplishments of the 92d Congress.

While the cost of living has been continually rising since the last benefit increase in January of last year, the elderly and disabled have been forced to sit by while the purchasing power of their retirement and benefit dollar is slowly but irreversably eroded.

My only disappointment in this legislation today is that it does not meet the need to provide an adequate increase in the minimum social security benefit to $100. However, I am sponsoring legislation to provide this increase and intend to continue work in its behalf until it has become law. I am very hopeful this will be accomplished in the 93d Congress.

Traditionally, when we have increased social security benefits we have followed suit by voting a corresponding increase in railroad retirement benefits. Accordingly, I have introduced legislation today which will increase railroad retirement benefits by 20 percent effective.

It is my understanding that a special Presidential Commission is due to report this week on a study of the railroad retirement benefit system with recommendations for benefit increases. While the Commission's findings cannot be anticipated at this time it is my conviction that any benefit increase should be nothing less than fully comparable with the social security benefit increases we are voting today.

THE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY CORPS ACT OF 1972

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 15 I first introduced a bill designed to alleviate the crushing unemployment rate among today's young population, and at the same time provide the urgently needed manpower to attack the problems of cleaning up America's environmental disaster areas.

This bill, entitled the Environmental Quality Corps Act of 1972, would provide our country with a comprehensive national program representing a concerted effort on the part of the Federal Government to meet the degradation of our environment head-on. At present there is no such effort.

As I have envisaged it, the corps would put up to 100,000 of our Nation's youth and returning veterans to work cleaning streams, highways, parks, and forests, and constructing recreational facilities in both urban and rural areas. Volunteers to the Corps would be chosen from among those nonmarried Americans 18 to 26 years of age, without regard to any consideration of race, social class, economic status, or sex. Service would be for 1 full year, with an option to re-enlist for up to an additional year.

Corpsmen would receive room and board and a modest allowance. Those volunteers who choose not to live in the Government-provided facilities are eligible to receive a slightly higher allowance to cover their added expenses. Moreover, to further reduce costs to the Corps and to promote a higher number of volunteers, corpsmen will be assigned to projects as close to their permanent place of residence as feasible.

In trying to avoid monumental costs in this program, I have sought throughout the bill to make use of existing facilities and equipment to as full an extent as possible. Governmental units contracting for the services of corpsmen would be required to provide as much of the required equipment and facilities at their own expense as they are able. For those provisions which they could not provide, the corps would be authorized to utilize surplus Federal property made available by the General Services Administration and the various involved Federal agencies. Thus, it is anticipated that the corps will be able to escape a large portion of the cost of equipment and facilities.

Benefits derived from this bill would be manifold. Those agencies and levels of government which cannot now afford projects to better the physical environment for their constituents would suddenly find that they had the opportunity for an inexpensive source of labor. This in itself should encourage many localities to expand their programs.

However, at the same time careful precautions have been taken to insure that this new-found opportunity not be abused. No regularly employed worker may be fired as a result of this bill and the agency contracting for the services of the corpsmen are required to prove maintenance of effort to protect and improve the environment.

Although the initial lifetime of the Corps as specified in my bill is only 2 years, I feel that the structure is flexible enough to provide an ongoing means of absorbing our surplus manpower—wherever it may occur—and give the Nation something tangible in return. Too many of our present welfare and unemployment compensation programs simply do not do this. By creating this program, we would be taking people off of the government dole and giving them a chance to serve their country and better themselves.

I feel that the training received by the corpsmen could qualify many of them for careers in the field of environmental quality. As I have often said before, if we are truly serious about cleaning up our environment and keeping it clean, then vast new resources, trained and highly motivated, are going to be required.

Mr. Speaker, because of the favorable response I have received from my constituents and the press alike, I am today reintroducing this measure, with 20 cosponsors. I am also enclosing an editorial from the Scripps-Howard newspaper in Denver, the Rocky Mountain News, commenting favorably on the bill.

In conclusion, I cannot stress enough the urgency with which I introduce this bill today. Pollution and unemployment are social problems which our society must continuously seek to resolve. This bill, I feel, is a most responsible and responsive tool in dealing with these problems.

The editorial follows:

[From The Denver (Colo.) Rocky Mountain News, June 17, 1972]

WHY NOT AN ENVIRONMENTAL CORPS?

Colorado Congressman Donald G. Brotzman has resurrected a government employment and conservation scheme projected by the Roosevelt regime during the dark days of the Big Depression.

He would create an "Environmental Quality Corps" made up of young and single unemployed who would be put to work to help clean up the country's environment. The suggested 100,000 corps he envisions would be given employment, room and board and extra money while working at various jobs at recreation areas, in lakes and streams and construction in both urban and rural areas to help clean up the mess made by man in the past few decades.

The Brotzman plan has a strong resemblance to the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) that provided work, food and shelter, job training and side money for thousands of young men whose father's loaded the unemployment rolls of the Thirties.

The congressman says the new corps would be accomplishing "tangibles"—employment, job training and improving the environment. "Too many welfare and unemployment compensation programs simply don't accomplish this," he added. And with this we agree.

It's too bad that the idea wasn't implemented in time to aid the tide of high school graduates, vacationing collegians and returning Vietnam veterans this summer. We have no idea what his colleagues in Congress will think of the project, nor how they will work

out details and financing. But tapping this source of ready manpower for productivity seems a good investment in more ways than one.

MILITARY ORDER OF THE PURPLE HEART URGES INCREASED EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS FOR VETERANS

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the testimony of the Military Order of the Purple Heart before the Senate Veterans Affairs Committee last month, urging increased educational assistance benefits for our veterans.

As the sponsor of S. 2163, The Vietnam Veterans Act of 1971, which would provide an eligible veteran with up to $1,000 per academic year for tuition, books, fees, and supplies paid directly to the school where he is enrolled, as well as provide a monthly subsistence allowance, I heartily endorse the testimony and concepts which it supports. The testimony, presented to the committee by Mr. Kenneth Hubbs, National Service and Legislative Director, clearly sets forth, in documented form, the frustrations and needs of our veterans as they pursue their educational objectives. I am most impressed by the survey taken by the Military Order of the Purple Heart concerning veterans educational and financial needs. The sample shows that 83 percent of the veterans surveyed, wished increased benefits including a direct tuition payment of up to $1,000 per academic year. The text of the questionnaire is attached to the testimony.

I am pleased that the Military Order of the Purple Heart has taken such an enthusiastic interest in this most vital area and I am sure that Senators will be most interested in the testimony.

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

STATEMENT OF KENNETH R. HUBBS, NATIONAL SERVICE AND LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR, TO THE U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity for me to present the position of the Military Order of the Purple Heart: that our young veterans should have the unencumbered opportunity to pursue a well-rounded education.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to thank you and each member of this Committee for its thorough interest, concern and investigation of this vital subject.

Our Country has invested heavily in other parts of the world to preserve people's freedom and their opportunity to "build and grow".

This investment has been in the form of money, goods and the services of the youth of our Country.

This investment has cost the youth of our Country:

1. Two to four years from being timely in competing for an occupation or in pursuing an education;

2. Psychological and physical damage, and with many this includes loss of parts of their body; and

3. To over 50,000—death.

Mr. Chairman, our purpose for being before this Committee at this time is not to take issue with our Country's investment in other parts of the world but to take issue with our Country's investment in the youth of our Country.

We strongly feel that our Country is far more capable of an investment which will provide our youth with an adequate opportunity to "build and grow" than it is presently investing.

The present investment in our youth in education may prevent drop-out for those who are able to obtain additional financial assistance.

But this speaks of investing the barest minimum in only one-third of our youth. What about opportunities for the other two-thirds? Can we do better?

All of us will answer "Yes" to the question, "Should we provide our young veterans with a better opportunity to pursue a well-rounded education than we are now providing?"

But what is our answer to the following questions?

1. Should we permit the present situation where the majority are unable to afford an education?

2. Should we permit those who are fortunate to be in college to be encumbered with financial turmoil, burdens of loans, and loss of precious class attendance and study hours due to the necessity of a part-time job?

Mr. Chairman, we believe every Congressman will, like us, answer "NO" to both questions.

In order to adequately determine what the veterans attending college needs as improvements to the current benefits, we asked the veteran himself.

We mailed a simple financial form to the veteran which would supply his marital status, semester hour credit load, academic pursuit, institution, cost of education, cost of living and his income & indebtedness per semester.

On this finacial form, we asked him to complete the following statement: "If I were the author of the 'GI Educational Bill' I would provide the following benefits to assist a veteran in obtaining an education". (A copy of the form is attached.)

We received 307 of these forms from students attending 20 institutions. A summary of each veteran by name and address and the above information is attached and we ask permission to have it included in the record of this Committee.

The original forms are in the veterans' own handwriting and are in our files and will be made available to the Committee if you desire.

307 REPORTING

95% or 292 are full time (12 hrs. or more).

5% or 15 are part time (11 hrs. or more).

A veteran's entitlement is reduced at full time rate if he is carrying 12 semester credit hours or more.

A veteran must carry 15 semester credit hours per semester in order to accumulate 120 credits within a 36 month entitlement (4 nine-month periods).

27% or 83 are carrying 12, 13 or 14 credits which will take them 1, 2 or 3 semesters more than a 36-month entitlement in order to accumulate 120 credits.

51% or 157 are married.

37% or 58 have children.

50% or 153 must work part time.

53% or 83 veterans' wives are working.

32% or 99 have outstanding loans.

53% or 164 have a cash deficit.

83% or 256 completed the statement as to the benefits they would provide if they were the author of the GI Educational Bill—their remarks are in the attached summary.

83% or 256 would increase the present benefits. They asked for the equivalent rates of the current benefit for subsistence and up to $1000 for assistance to cover cost of tuition, fees, books, supplies, etc.

No specific emphasis could be drawn between whether the increase in benefits should be called "subsistence" and/or "costs".

Mr. Chairman, one might think that if you asked a veteran attending college what he needed, you might get an answer, "$100 a day for costs and a gold Cadillac for transportation".

Our faith in these young veterans is strengthened by the fact that not one asked for more than a bare existence.

Other suggested items are:

Increase entitlement to 48 months.

Pay subsistence twice a month.

Advance payments at start of semester.

Some tax exemption help.

More efficient VA service so checks arrive on time.

Medical & Dental help or low-cost insurance.

Lower living & housing costs.

Use graduate veterans as tutors.

Increase benefits retroactive so educational loans can be paid off.

Select college of veteran's choice.

No interest loans.

Eliminate interest or late charges charged by school.

Convert 9 months' subsistence payments into 12 equal payments.

Food stamps.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, we thank you and the members of this Committee for your serious consideration for an increase in the current benefits of upwards to $1,000 per year.

MILITARY ORDER OF THE PURPLE HEART

(Kenneth R. Hubbs, National Service & Legislative Director, VA Central Office: Room 117A–Laf., 810 Vermont Ave., NW., Washington, D.C. 20420 (202) 389–3089)

It is my desire to assist the Military Order of the Purple Heart to improve the educational opportunities for the veteran and I hereby give them permission to use the following information in their legislative activities with Congress.

Name of Veteran _____ M or S _____.

Address _____ Wife's Name _____.

City _____ State _____ Zip _____.

Children & Ages _____.

Name of College or University _____ at _____.

I am a: Freshman _____ Sophmore _____ Junior _____ Senior _____ Graduate Student _____.

I hold a Degree(s) in _____.

My educational objective is _____.

I am attending _____ hours/units per semester/quarter.

Education Cost per Semester/Quarter:

Tuition, $_____.

Books, $_____.

Supplies, $_____.

Fees, $_____.

Other Costs, $_____.

Total, $_____.

My Total Cost per Quarter/Semester for Education and Living is $_____.

Family Living Cost per Semester/Quarter:

Living Quarters, $_____.

Food, $_____.

Clothing, $_____.

Transportation, $_____.

Medical, $_____.

Other Costs, $_____.

Total, $_____.

Income (Including Family) per Quarter/Semester:

From VA, $_____.

My earnings, $_____.

Wife's earnings, $_____.
Loans from relatives, $_____.
Loans from others, $_____.
Other income, $_____.
Total, $_____.

If I were the author of the "GI educational bill" I would provide the following benefits to assist a veteran in obtaining an education:

U.N. DISCREDIT COMPOUNDED

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, it was with a combination of sadness, resignation and disgust that I noted still another condemnation of Israel by the U.N. Security Council. This time it was for last week's actions against Lebanon. The vote was 13 to 0, with the United States and Panama abstaining. As an afterthought, the Security Council "profoundly deplored all acts of violence in the area." Presumably, this was an illusion to guerrilla operations and acts of terror inflicted against Israel.

Mr. Speaker, the United Nations has very little credibility remaining these days, and such acts of condemnation drain off what little there is left.

Since the founding of Israel, her Arab neighbors have never accepted the reality of her existence, much less left her alone. Over the years, a steady stream of attacks of one sort or another have been mounted by those who believe terror will succeed where overt military action of a more formal kind fails.

In recent years, a series of terrorist organizations have come into being, dedicated to massacre, ambush, destruction and media headlines. Garbed in the illusion of romanticism fostered by professional propagandists, these groups, armed by the Russians and operating from a number of Arab states, have sought to sow destruction and terror in Israel.

Mortar attacks on sleeping villages. Mined roads. Murder of schoolchildren by bazooka attacks. Plane hijackings. The butchery recently at Lod Airport. Nothing has been too grisly or low for such groups to attempt. Unable and unwilling to confront the Israeli armed forces in any sort of open combat, they now resort to attacks upon unsuspecting noncombatants venturing into that area of the world.

So we see buses of dead children, mutilation of innocents, and the recent atrocity committed by three Japanese killers, done no doubt because Arab terrorists know they cannot get away with this themselves.

Through it all the entire world watches, deplores, and does nothing.

Here is a tiny little democracy, surrounded on three sides by Russia's heavily armed allies, thirsting for her blood. Her 3 million people live daily with death and destruction, yet brilliantly survive and keep their democracy vibrant.

And where has the United Nations been throughout all this? What has it done for this tiny outpost of human freedom? When Nasser thought he could annihilate Israel in 1967, he demanded that the U.N. buffer force step aside. This was done, expeditiously, as the world watched with bated breath. Many a sigh of disappointment was heard at the United Nations when the David of Israel brought the Arab Goliath low.

Since that time, as the terrorist onslaught has taken lives steadily, and Israel has raised her voice in indignation, seeking the aid of world opinion, the U.N. has largely remained silent. A barrel of oil and the threat of a Communist move has almost always outweighed conscience and justice at the United Nations.

For after all, are not they only a tiny little nation, with many enemies?

If the United Nations was as devoted to conscience, the dignity of man and ideals emblazoned on its walls, it would have noted the terrorist offensive mounted these many years, against Israel. It would have taken note of atrocities committed against her, against Jews of Arab lands and against international law by tactics of these butchers who call themselves guerrillas. Unfortunately for justice and the U.N., little has been done.

The ignoblest chapter in U.N. existence has been written on pages marked Israel. And the verdict of history against that so-called, "world organization" will be awful and irrefutable.

Where was the U.N. just a few weeks ago when the horror at Lod was committed? Where were its mighty voices and votes? It remained for the airline pilots to stand up where the U.N. wouldn't.

It is an old story. Anti-Semitism takes various forms. In one era it is an Inquisition. In another an accusation of ritual murder. In still another it takes the form of a Dreyfus, Mendel Bayliss or Leo Frank case. In yet another it will be a Hitler with his holocaust and genocide. Today, it is parlor and intellectual anti-Semitism masquerading as a concept of world order and government.

The United Nations forfeits confidence of every honest human being when it closes its eyes to persecution of Israel by terrorism while condemning her for refusing to sustain such attacks indefinitely. What is she to do? Take it until she bleeds to death? Would any member state of the Security Council allow such assaults across its frontiers without retaliation? Would any nation long survive by failing to protect its citizens, which is the first and most basic guarantee a state affords its nationals?

How hypocritical that in this day and age it is the tiny Jewish State receiving condemnation because it insists on its elementary right to live. How degrading to the idealism which founded the United Nations that its principles should be prostituted so low and often in such an ignoble cause.

Here in the United States it should be noted that much of the American Jewish community is increasingly turning its collective and individual back upon the United Nations. Many American Jews are withdrawing both financial and intellectual support from an organization now leading the fight for Arabs and Communists against their own coreligionists. Nor can I say that I blame them.

While many American Jewish leaders will still arise and argue on behalf of principles behind this organization, few can be found anywhere who dare to actually stand up for its actions.

This latest series of developments places yet another nail in the coffin labeled, "U.N. credibility." Some day, soon, that organization will turn to its former friends and find them as stony-hearted toward the organization as many of its hypocritical member governments are toward Israel.

On that day, justice will in fact be truly done.

GRANT FORMULAS FOR SCHOOL TAX EQUALIZATION ACT

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday on introduction of the School Tax Equalization Act (H.R. 15736) I supplied tables showing estimated grant entitlements for the States listed alphabetically and by rank.

Today I should like to insert an explanation of the entitlement formulas used for the basic grants and incentive grants that would be provided under the bill. The material follows:

OBEY SCHOOL TAX EQUALIZATION ACT: ENTITLEMENT FORMULAS FOR GRANTS

BASIC ASSISTANCE GRANT

State entitlement=adjusted basic assistance amount × school-age population.

"Adjusted basic assistance amount" equals the sum of:

One-third of basic assistance amount × per capita income, all states/per capita income, state.

One-third of basic assistance amount × tax collections as percent of personal income, state/tax collections as percent of personal income, all states.

One-third of basic assistance amount × income taxes as percent of total taxes, state/income taxes as percent of total taxes, all states.

"School-age populations" equals the number of children aged 5–17, inclusive, living in State.

Definitions:

1. "Basic assistance amount"=$75 in FY 1973, $100 in FY 1974, $125 in FY 1975, $150 in FY 1976, $175 in FY 1977, $200 in FY 1978.

2. "Tax collections" means total tax collections of all kinds in the State, including collections by political subdivisions.

3. "Income taxes" includes both individual and corporate income tax collections, in the State, including collections by political subdivisions.

INCENTIVE ASSISTANCE GRANT

State entitlement=adjusted incentive assistance amount × school-age population.

"Adjusted incentive assistance amount equals the sum of: Incentive assistance amount × State revenue made available to public schools as percent of total State and local revenue made available to public

schools/75% *but* not to exc ɔd the "incentive assistance amount."

Definitions:

1. "Incentive assistance amount"=$25 in FY 1975, $50 in FY 1976, $75 in FY 1977, $100 in FY 1978.

2. "Revenue made available to public schools" includes all revenue receipts derived from State or local sources made available for public, elementary and secondary education.

BENNO SCHMIDT GIVES COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS TO NEW YORK MEDICAL COLLEGE

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of attending the 113th commencement of the New York Medical College at which Benno Schmidt delivered the main address.

Mr. Schmidt, the chairman of the President's Cancer Panel and one of the most knowledgeable and dedicated men involved in this Nation's program to fight cancer, touched on the development of the National Cancer Act which was passed into law last year.

I think Mr. Schmidt's words will be of interest to my colleagues and would like to place it in the RECORD at this time, Mr. Schmidt's contributions to the fight against cancer were recognized by the New York Medical College when they bestowed upon him an honorary doctor of humane letters.

The address follows:

Dr. Slobody, Members of the Graduating Class, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is a pleasure to join you for your Commencement this morning. The high standing which your students have achieved in nationwide examinations attests to both the calibre of your graduates and the success of your educational program. And as a partner in the Metropolitan Hospital Center, the Bird S. Coler Hospital, and the developing Westchester Medical Center, your rank as a leader in the New York medical community is clearly established.

I congratulate you of the graduating class not only on your accomplishments, but on your timing. No graduating class has ever faced a more interesting and more challenging world than that faced by the Class of 1972. And never at any time in our history have those with training in medicine and biomedical science had so important a role to play or such good tools to work with in helping to solve the problems that beset our society. When we look at the great problems that face our nation and our world, almost every one of them presents a crucial role for the physician and the biomedical scientist.

It seems clear to me that one of the overriding problems in our civilization today is population control. The solution of every other major problem in our society depends in some measure upon our ability to keep our population within reasonable bounds. In the few short years that have passed since I was sitting where you are sitting today, the world's population has grown from slightly over 2 billion to 3 billion, 750 million, and by the time you are delivering a commencement address at my age, the same rate of growth would give us a world population of over 7 billion. I doubt that we can find any solution to the problems of the environment, the problems of war and peace, the problems of effective distribution of our resources among all portions of our population, the ability of the races to live together in peace and harmony, and the provision of proper health care and nutrition to all peoples unless we can find a way to plan and accomplish effective population control.

Who can contribute more to such planning and to the implementation of those plans than our physicians and biomedical scientists?

To those who would leave the population problem in the hands of the Almighty, I would recall the words of President John Kennedy that "here on earth God's work must truly be our own."

I have often been reminded by events of the wise philosophy embodied in a story which the Catholic priest told me as a high school boy in Abilene, Texas. A fighter crossed himself in a gesture of silent prayer as he came out for the first round of his fight. "Father, will that help him?" a young spectator inquired of a priest sitting next to him. The father replied: "If he can fight it will." In dealing with the poulation problem, as with most others, we must truly make God's work our own.

As we look at the other major problems that confront us today, the role of those trained in medical science is critical.

How can we maintain an acceptable standard of living and not at the same time pollute our air, defile our oceans, our rivers, and our lakes, and degrade the soil that sustains us?

How can we distribute the bounties of our society so that adequate nutrition and medical care reaches all levels, and so that the disparities between the rich and the poor are greatly moderated?

How do we eliminate the racial bias that threatens to destroy us on both a national and international level?

How do we reorient our priorities so as to minimize the devotion of our resources to the wasteful purposes of the armaments race and devote them to a better life for all people?

How do we avoid the catastrophic confrontations that could lead us to the ultimate disaster—a war that would prove, by ending our civilization, what we already know and that is that in the present state of our technology war is totally and hopelessly obsolete as a means of settling our international differences?

Think of the enormous role that those trained in medicine and biomedical science must play in the resolution of these great problems. You are truly blessed with opportunity and you are most fortunate in the relevance of your training. In short, your work is cut out for you.

We live in an age of polarization and oversimplification. I urge you not to fall for it. Do not allow rhetoric to take the place of specifics when you are seeking solutions. Know the other side of every issue at least as well as you know your own, and attempt to bring to every question a balanced understanding. There is an old Russian proverb that "no pancake is so thin, but that it has two sides." Know both sides, and be able to state the other man's case better than he himself can state it. And above all, make yourself and others think through the specific implementation of a proposed solution before you accept the solution as real.

Do not settle for simplistic answers. Nearly all of us know where we want to come out; the man to follow is the man who makes sense when he deals with the specifics of how to get there. And do not ever buy the idea that one man cannot make a difference, because every last one of you can.

I would like to say just a few words about the Cancer Act of 1971, because that Act represents a story of progress in times when it seems that real progress has been very difficult to come by.

In the spring of 1970, cancer research like all biomedical research was on the back burner. This was true in spite of the fact that cancer was, as it is today, the number one health concern of the American people.

A poll conducted in 1966 showed that 62% of the public feared cancer more than any other disease. Yet, of the more than 200 million Americans alive today, 50 million will develop cancer at present rates of incidence and 34 million will die of this painful and often ugly disease if better methods of prevention and treatment are not discovered. About one-half of those deaths will occur before the age of 65, and cancer causes more deaths among children than any other disease. Cancer often strikes as harshly at human dignity as at human life, and more often than not it represents financial catastrophe for the family in which it strikes.

Notwithstanding the seriousness of these figures and the depth of public concern, the amount we were spending on cancer research in 1969 was grossly inadequate. For every man, woman and child in the United States we spent in 1969: $410 on national defense; $125 on the war in Vietnam; $19 on the space program; $19 of foreign aid; and only $0.89 on cancer research.

It was in this climate that in the spring of 1970 Senator Ralph Yarborough and the members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare named a National Panel of Consultants on Cancer made up of 13 distinguished scientists and doctors in the field of cancer and 13 laymen. I had the pleasure of serving as chairman of this Panel, and I have never seen any group work with greater dedication and effectiveness than the professional members of our group.

The Panel was charged with reporting to the Senate as promptly as possible on:

1) Where we stand today in the field of cancer;

2) What are the areas of greatest promise for significant advance; and

3) What steps should be taken to make the conquest of cancer a major national goal.

On December 4, 1970, we made our report to the Senate, setting forth the answers to these questions, and recommending specific legislation for a new and accelerated cancer initiative. A bill was promptly introduced in the Congress embodying the Panel recommendations.

In January of 1971, President Nixon, in his State of the Union address, supported the initiative recommended by the Panel in these words:

"The time has come in America when the same kind of concentrated effort that split the atom and took man to the moon should be turned toward conquering this dread disease. Let us make a total national commitment to achieve this goal."

The initial legislation implementing the Panel's recommendations was introduced in the Senate by Senator Ralph Yarborough, Chairman of the Health Subcommittee in the Senate. However, Senator Yarborough did not have the opportunity of continuing his support in the Senate because he was defeated for re-election in the 1970 campaign. Senator Edward Kennedy succeeded Senator Yarborough as Chairman of the Senate Health Subcommittee and he reintroduced the legislation in the new Congress in January of 1971.

The proposed legislation, which had represented the unanimous recommendation of the Panel, soon became the focal point of great controversy within the scientific and medical community. It was argued that an enlarged cancer program would be at the expense of other biomedical research and medical education. None of us wanted that, but it always seemed to me that this argument was invalid because it has always been

true, even from a purely selfish standpoint, that the next best thing to getting a raise yourself is for the man next door to get one. I had no doubt that increased support for cancer would promptly lead to increased support for other areas of biomedical science, and that is proving to be the case as evidenced by the recent bill, largely patterned on the cancer bill, giving substantially increased support for work in heart disease, stroke, and related arterial diseases.

Other arguments against the special cancer initiative as recommended by the Panel were that it would fragment biomedical research, reduce the independence of the basic researcher, attempt to program that which was not susceptible to programming, and jeopardize the system of peer review which has become widely accepted and respected in the biomedical community.

All of these matters had been most seriously considered by the Panel and it was our opinion none of them was in fact threatened by the proposed legislation. The real basis of the conflict was a simple but important organizational issue: to what extent was the cancer effort to be independent and to what extent was it to be controlled by the Director of the N.I.H.? This is the kind of issue on which the bureaucrats fight hard, and supporters on both sides were rallied to the cause.

This conflict for a time seemed to threaten the entire program, but the statesmanship of the politicians resulted in the resolution of the conflict, and this was the most impressive aspect of the entire experience so far as I was concerned. President Nixon supported the Panel, and his leadership was invaluable. Senator Kennedy made it clear that his only interest was in getting the best possible cancer bill and that he would do anything helpful to that end, including the withdrawal of his bill in favor of the Administration bill, thus foregoing what might have been thought to be his personal political advantage. In the House of Representatives, the dynamic leadership, the industry and the dedication of the Health Subcommittee Chairman, Congressman Paul Rogers, and the ingenuity and wisdom of the ranking minority member, Ancher Nelsen, also greatly facilitated the ultimate legislation.

Thus, we had a situation where President Nixon, Senator Edward Kennedy, Senator Javits, Senator Dominick, Congressman Rogers, Congressman Nelsen, and many, many others of all shades of political persuasion worked together in harmony to produce the Cancer Act of 1971. This was a very impressive display of unity in subordinating partisan and personal interest to the public good. I believe that this Act gives us the foundation we need on which to build the best cancer research program of which American medicine and American science is capable.

No one is under any illusion that simply spending more money will solve the cancer problem. There was much more behind the timing of the new cancer initiative than that. There is no question in my mind that we have today more opportunities in cancer research and more promising areas for accelerated exploration than have ever heretofore existed. In the fields of cell biology, cell surface phenomena, molecular biology, immunology, virology, etiology and early diagnosis, as well as chemotherapy, radiation therapy and surgery, we have new insights which in my judgment can lead to far better methods of prevention, detection and control of cancer than have heretofore been available. It was for these reasons that an enhanced and accelerated program was advocated at this time.

Cancer is an implacable foe. It is many diseases, not one, and it will probably not lend itself to a single form of immunization or a single cure. However, I am convinced that we can make far more rapid progress against cancer under the new program, and we owe it to the people of our nation and of the world to do so. Without raising false hopes and without creating false optimism, we must give to the American people the best program in cancer research and cancer control of which American medicine and American science is capable.

I know that many of you will be involved in this effort and for that too I salute you.

Thank you again for your generosity and for the opportunity to join you in your graduating ceremonies this morning.

TRANS-ALASKA PIPELINE RESOLUTION OF THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST CONFERENCE OF SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, the Pacific Northwest Conference of Savings and Loan Associations met for the first time in Alaska on June 11–14, 1972. This is the first meeting this organization ever held in Alaska, and over 500 persons came representing the entire Pacific Northwest. Representation came from Utah, Montana, Wyoming, Idaho, Oregon, Washington, Hawaii, Alaska, and Guam.

During the business session, a resolution was discussed and unanimously adopted in supporting the issuance of a pipeline permit by the U.S. Department of Interior for the Trans-Alaska Pipeline. I believe these ladies and gentlemen, who represented a large and important segment of the financial community of the Pacific coast, knew what they were doing in passing this resolution. I call it to the attention of my colleagues by inserting the resolution and the list of delegates in attendance at the conference in the RECORD at this point:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the delegates at the 1972 Pacific Northwest Conference of Savings and Loan Associations have met for the first time in Alaska at Fairbanks; and in this connection were afforded an opportunity to travel in this vast State; mingle and talk with its citizens and business and government leaders; and study and analyze its economy, its resources and its future potential and development.

Whereas, said Pacific Northwest Conference covers the eight Pacific Northwest states of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, Utah, Wyoming, Hawaii, Alaska, and the island of Guam; and their economic interests, development, and growth are closely related, including energy requirements.

Whereas, the development of new sources of oil and gas and other energy and minerals are vital resources, not only to said Pacific Northwest region, but also to the nation, its defense and in the public interest. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved. That said delegates at said conference do hereby endorse, and deem it of the highest importance to the national welfare and defense, for the immediate issuance of a permit by the U.S. Department of Interior for the right of way for the proposed oil pipeline from Prudhoe Bay to Valdez, Alaska, and its construction, as well as the expeditious development of the Alaskan oil and gas resources in the public interest, its welfare and defense, all within reasonable and proper ecological controls of the State of Alaska and the Federal government. Be it further

Resolved, That such issuance of said permit, and undertaking of such construction and oil development be expedited and hastened, as soon as existing injunctions in the Federal court are dissolved.

Duly Passed this 14 day of June, 1972. Fairbanks, Alaska.

WALTER SCZUDLO, *President*.

1972 PACIFIC NORTHWEST CONFERENCE—DELEGATE LIST (AS OF JUNE 2, 1972)

ALASKA

Anchorage

Mr. Gordon Hartlieb, Mr. Raymond Hartlieb, Mr. and Mrs. Guy Kasnick—First Federal Savings.

Fairbanks

Mr. and Mrs. Randy Acord, Mr. and Mrs. Roger Burggraf, Mr. and Mrs. Wally Cathcart, Mr. Le Roy Chisholm, Mr. Jack Fricke, Mr. and Mrs. Bob Haverfield, Mr. and Mrs. Cliff Mortensen, Mrs. La Dessa Nordale, Mr. and Mrs. Walter Sczudlo—First Federal Savings.

Juneau

Mr. and Mrs. Richard Clark, Mrs. and Mrs. Lee Coffman, Mr. and Mrs. Tom Morgan, Mr. and Mrs. Larry Nelson, Mr. and Mrs. Richard Rountree—Alaska Federal Savings.

Mr. Joseph C. McMurray—Director of Banking Securities State of Alaska.

HAWAII

Honolulu

Mr. and Mrs. Ray Hammett—American Savings & Loan.

Mr. and Mrs. Gordon Ito—Hawaiian Savings.

Mr. Terence Kimura, Mr. Uytaka Nakahata—Honolulu Savings & Loan.

Mr. and Mrs. Jerry Merrick—Pacific Savings & Loan.

Mr. and Mrs. Charles Fletcher, Mr. and Mrs. Don Imig—Pioneer Federal Savings.

Kahului, Maui

Mr. and Mrs. Sam Hironaka—Maui Savings & Loan.

IDAHO

Boise

Mr. and Mrs. Jock Hewitt, Mr. and Mrs. John Hweitt—Provident Federal Savings. Provident Federal Savings.

Mr. Tom McEldowney—Commissioner of Finance.

Burley

Mr. and Mrs. Norval Wildman—First Federal Savings.

Coeur D'Alene

Mr. and Mrs. Norris Benson—First Federal Savings.

Idaho Falls

Mr. and Mrs. Robert Brewer—First Federal Savings.

Lewiston

Mr. and Mrs. Harry Graser, Mr. and Mrs. Jim Hamm, Mr. and Mrs. Ken McIntosh, Mr. and Mrs. Don Modie, Mr. and Mrs. Weldon Wasem—First Federal Savings.

Pocatello

Mr. and Mrs. Ray Henscheid—First Security Savings.

Twin Falls

Mr. and Mrs. James Sinclair, Mr. and Mrs. James W. Sinclair—First Federal Savings.

MONTANA

Billings

Mr. and Mrs. Jack Ryan, Mr. and Mrs. Ward Langstroth—Security Federal Savings.

Great Falls

Mrs. Pauline Barsotti, Mr. and Mrs. Paul Johnson, Mr. and Mrs. Frank Shanley, Mr. and Mrs. Roger Walsh—First Federal Savings.

Havre

Mr. and Mrs. Einar A. Lund, Jr.—Havre Federal Savings.

Livingston

Mr. and Mrs. Sam Kaisler, Mr. and Mrs. Ernest Sandberg, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Swindlehurst—Empire Federal Savings.

OREGON

Albany

Mr. and Mrs. Art Lewis—First Federal Savings.

Astoria

Mr. and Mrs. M. F. Eward, Mr. and Mrs. Howard Wright—First Federal Savings.

Baker

Mr. Thad Beatty, Mr. and Mrs. Carl Davis, Mr. and Mrs. Albert Durgan, Mr. and Mrs. Bruce Kirkpatrick, Mr. and Mrs. Ivan Patrick, Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd Rea, Mr. and Mrs. Bill Thomas—Pioneer Federal Savings.

Beaverton

Mr. and Mrs. Larry Brecht, Mr. and Mrs. Bob Hemphill, Mr. and Mrs. Donald Hirschberger—Lincoln Savings.

Dalles

Mr. and Mrs. J. Paul Bollman, Mr. and Mrs. William Dalton, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Newton—Polk County Federal.

Eugene

Mr. and Mrs. Leslie Johnston—Eugene Federal Savings.

Grants Pass

Mr. and Mrs. J. Robert Thompson—First Federal Savings.

Gresham

Mr. and Mrs. Jim Cartier—Oregon Trail Savings.

Hillsboro

Mr. and Mrs. Howard Hughes—Washington Federal.

Klamath Falls

Mr. and Mrs. Van Mollison—First Federal Savings.

Lake Oswego

Mr. Einar Nordahl—Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co.

McMinnville

Mr. and Mrs. Reid Cottrell, Mr. and Mrs. John Herring, Jr., Mr. and Mrs. Gale Vinton, Mr. and Mrs. Rudy Windishar, Mr. and Mrs. Larry Worrell—First Federal Savings.

Portland

Mr. and Mrs. Donald Lewis—American Savings.

Mr. and Mrs. Robert Downie, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Hazen—Benj. Franklin Federal.

Mr. and Mrs. Lowell Nutting, Mr. and Mrs. Bruce Thomas—CMI Investment Corp.

Mr. and Mrs. Howard Hubbard, Mr. and Mrs. Chris Kraig—Equitable Savings.

Mr. and Mrs. Tom Hemphiss, Mr. and Mrs. Dick Pahl, Mr. and Mrs. Jack Todd—Excel Mortgage Insurance.

Mr. Robert Young—Franklin Savings & Loan.

Mr. George Coffin, III, Mr. Arthur Wilkinson—Investors Mortgage Insurance.

Mr. and Mrs. Dave Barrows—Oregon S&L League.

Mr. and Mrs. Guy Jaques, Jr., Mr. and Mrs. Robert le Tourneux—Portland Federal Savings.

Salem

Mr. Cecil Johnson—First Federal Savings.

Mr. and Mrs. Richard Hendrie—Salem Federal Savings.

UTAH

Logan

Mr. and Mrs. Russell Anderson, Mr. and Mrs. J. H. Milligan, Mr. and Mrs. Dean Rogers—Logan Savings.

Ogden

Mr. and Mrs. Richard Mercer—Ogden First Federal S&L.

Salt Lake City

Mr. Howard Bradshaw, Mr. and Mrs. Estel Wright—American Savings.

Mr. and Mrs. Emerson Hardy—Deseret Federal Savings.

Mr. and Mrs. Tom Judd—MGIC.

Mr. Gene Donovan—Prudential Federal S&L.

Mr. and Mrs. Walter Kelly, Mr. and Mrs. Scharf Sumner—Western Savings.

WASHINGTON

Aberdeen

Mr. and Mrs. Harold Johnson—Aberdeen Federal Savings.

Bremerton

Mr. and Mrs. De Loss Seeley, Mr. and Mrs. August von Boecklin—Great Northwest Federal.

Burien

Mr. and Mrs. Harry Kittleman, Mr. and Mrs. Bob McEachern, Mr. and Mrs. Rod Newton—Highline Savings.

Centralia

Mr. and Mrs. Roy Alexander—Centralia Federal Savings.

Everett

Mr. and Mrs. John Schilaty—Cascade Savings.

Mr. and Mrs. Bob Humphrey—First Federal Savings.

Longview

Mr. and Mrs. Joe Hill, Mr. and Mrs. Elmer Sylvester—First Federal Savings.

Mount Vernon

Mr. and Mrs. A. S. Polson—First Federal Savings.

Olympia

Mr. and Mrs. Tom Allen, Mr. and Mrs. Les Armstrong, Mr. and Mrs. Dave Jenkins—Capital Savings.

Mr. and Mrs. Albert Newman—Olympia Federal S&L.

Opportunity

Mr. and Mrs. Carlos Landa, Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Smith—Spokane Valley Savings.

Pasco

Mr. and Mrs. James Taylor—Yakima Federal Savings.

Seattle

Mr. and Mrs. David Thompson—Citizens Federal S&L.

Mr. and Mrs. Dean Gray, Mr. and Mrs. Tom La Follette—Family Life Insurance.

Mr. and Mrs. John Kleeb—Federal Home Loan Bank.

Mr. and Mrs. Ron Cline, Mr. and Mrs. Mike Materia—Federal Home Loan Mtge. Corp.

Mr. and Mrs. Richard Shorett, Jr., Mr. and Mrs. Richard Shorett—Metropolitan Federal.

Mr. Michael Nuebel—Minnesota Mutual Life Ins.

Mr. and Mrs. Olin Loomis, Mr. and Mrs. Tracy Owen—Queen City Savings.

Mr. and Mrs. E. F. Bryant—Shoreline Savings.

Mr. and Mrs. Bruce Harris, Mr. and Mrs. Harold Kean—Washington Federal S&L.

Spokane

Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd Baker—Fidelity Mutual Svgs. Bank.

Mr. and Mrs. Vern Buntrock—Great Western Savings.

Mr. and Mrs. John Ehrhardt, Mr. and Mrs. Donald Lindsay—Lincoln First Federal.

Tacoma

Mr. and Mrs. John Davis, Mr. and Mrs. John Ward—American Mortgage Ins.

Mr. and Mrs. Dutton Hayward—Tacoma Savings.

Mr. and Mrs. William Brice, Mr. and Mrs. Donald Jones, Mr. and Mrs. Robert McComas, Mr. Donald McPhail—Pacific First Federal.

Vancouver

Mr. and Mrs. John Priel—First Federal Savings.

Mr. Thomas Carver—Vancouver Federal Savings.

Wenatchee

Mr. and Mrs. J. F. Evans—Wenatchee Federal Savings.

Yakima

Mr. and Mrs. Herb Watkins—Home Federal Savings.

Mr. and Mrs. Roy Tufts, Mr. and Mrs. H. H. Weeber—Yakima Federal Savings.

WYOMING

Cheyenne

Mr. and Mrs. Randolph Anselmi, Mr. and Mrs. Willits Brewster, Mr. and Mrs. Martin Peterson, Mr. and Mrs. Raymond Wilson—Cheyenne Federal Savings.

Greybull

Mr. and Mrs. Al Cook, Mr. and Mrs. Bob Moore, Mr. and Mrs. W. R. Shelledy—Big Horn Basin Federal.

Laramie

Mr. and Mrs. George Surline—First Laramie Savings.

Rawlins

Mr. and Mrs. A. Kay Anderson—Rawlins Federal Savings.

Rock Springs

Mr. Robert Bath, Mr. and Mr. Raymond Venta—Sweetwater Federal S&L.

Sheridan

Mr. and Mrs. J. Ralph Hylton—First Federal Savings.

OTHER STATES

Los Angeles, Calif.

Mr. and Mrs. Ross Blakely—Coast & Southern Federal.

Mr. Brent Baillie, Mr. and Mrs. Earle Daniels—Los Angeles Federal S&L.

Lynwood, Calif.

Mr. and Mrs. Harold Galitz, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Souter—World Savings.

Pasadena, Calif.

Mr. and Mrs. Frank Hardinge—California S&L League.

San Diego, Calif.

Mr. Bernard Dillon, Mr. Ted Mannheimer—U. S. F. Mortgage.

San Francisco, Calif.

Mr. and Mrs. F. Marion Donahoe—Citizens Savings.

Mr. Charles Davidson—Advertising Division, Inc.

Mr. and Mrs. Jack Bruce—U.S. S&L League.

Hartford, Conn.

Mr. and Mrs. Ray Miller—First Federal Savings.

Washington, D.C.

Mr. Carl O. Kamp, Mr. Frederic Spidell—FHLB Board.

Mr. and Mrs. John Horne—Investors Mtge. Insurance.

Mr. and Mrs. E. F. Bryant—Shoreline Permanent Federal.

Mr. and Mrs. William K. Divers, Mr. and Mrs. Howard Duff, Mr. and Mrs. Michael Stevenson—S & L Foundation, Inc.

Ft. Lauderdale, Fla.

Mr. and Mrs. Tom Wilburn—First Federal Savings.

Winter Park, Fla.

Mr. and Mrs. Carl Distelhorst.

Atlanta, Ga.

Mr. and Mrs. W. O. DuVall—Atlanta Federal Savings.

Chicago, Ill.

Mr. and Mrs. Robert Perrin, Advertising Division, Inc.

Mr. Gene Barry, Mr. Harry Pierson, Mr. William Prather—U.S. S&L League.

E. Chicago, Ind.

Mr. and Mr. Chester Wiekinski—First Federal Savings.

Wabash, Ind.

Mr. and Mrs. Miles Wilson—First Federal Savings.

Wichita, Kan.

Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Brasted—Mid Kansas Federal S&L.

Boston, Mass.

Mr. Jack Goss—Investors Mortgage Inc.

Albert Lea, Minn.

Mr. and Mrs. John P. Farry—First Federal Savings.

Jackson, Miss.

Mr. Tom B. Scott, Jr.—First Federal Savings.

St. Louis, Mo.

Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Fassel—Home Federal Savings.

New Rochelle, N.Y.

Mr. and Mrs. Joseph McMurray.

New York, N.Y.

Mr. John Edwards, Mr. Beverly Smith—McCann Erickson, Inc.

Cincinnati, Ohio

Mr. and Mrs. Andy Neidert—Standard Federal S&L.

Altoona, Pa.

Mr. Paul Gieg, Investment Savings & Loan.

Brownsville, Tex.

Mr. & Mrs. Herschel Rogers—Brownsville Savings.

San Antonio, Tex.

Mr. and Mrs. Walter W. McAlister, Jr.—San Antonio Savings.

Fayetteville, W. Va.

Mr and Mrs. J. Duval Shultz—Fayetteville Federal.

Milwaukee, Wis.

Mr. and Mrs. Harold Last, Mr. and Mrs. Sylvester Wood—Badger Federal Savings.

Mr. and Mrs. B. R. Doyle—Milwaukee Federal S&L.

Mr. and Mrs. David Engelman—MGIC.

LOCAL RADIO STATION RISES TO THE OCCASION

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, a grateful Brunswick, Md., certainly owes its sincere thanks to Country Frank Manthos and his hardworking and unselfish staff at WTRI Radio. During the height of the recent devastating flood that hit our area—and for the days that followed—WTRI operated around the clock on an emergency basis serving as a clearing center for the homeless and confused citizenry.

Rising to the occasion they created a flood fund which provided immediate help to families in the surrounding area effected by the storm. Pleas for clothing, food, furniture, tools and transportation were broadcast on a continual basis and efforts were coordinated with city and area officials, fire companies, fraternal organizations, police, and many, many more civic-minded groups.

It is said that in times of great emergency, dedicated public service—regardless of personal exhaustion—is brought into sharp focus. And certainly this was never more proven than by Country Frank and his tireless staff of workers. I join with all western Marylanders in this wholly inadequate but sincere tribute to their dedicated civic efforts which were far beyond their normal obligations.

Thank you one and all.

SACB: AN ALIEN CREATURE

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 23, 1972, the New York Times published an excellent article by Senators ERVIN and PROXMIRE with respect to the wasteful and dangerous Subversive Activities Control Board. I commend this excellent analysis to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

AN ALIEN CREATURE

(By Sam J. Ervin and William Proxmire)

WASHINGTON.—Once again the Administration has come before the Congress with a request—this year for almost three-fourths of a million dollars—and the plea that the moribund Subversive Activities Control Board be allowed to survive yet another year. Again there is a flurry of activity before June 30 to distract the Congress from the board's 22-year history of inactivity, at a price thus far of almost $7 million.

We believe the time has finally come to end this perennial exercise in futility and waste. The board is an anonmaly and an unnecessary appendage to our Government. It is a distasteful relic of the McCarthy era, incapable of performing any significant constitutional function.

The Constitution expressly provides two ways to protect our country against domestic danger by civil means. First, Congress may punish dangerous acts and, subject to strict First Amendment limitations, dangerous words. Second, those of us who esteem our system, the best yet devised by man, may use our First Amendment freedoms to instruct the ignorant, convert the doubting and combat the efforts of those who undertake to destroy or injure it.

Before the Internal Security Act of 1950 was adopted, our country steadfastly adhered to the principle that government ought not to punish anybody for anything except for a crime of which he has been convicted in a constitutionally conducted trial in a court of justice.

The Internal Security Act injected a novel concept into our system: that to protect society, our country should maintain a governmental agency to stigmatize publicly organizations the Government considers intellectually or politically dangerous, and visit upon such organizations and their members severe penalties. The Internal Security Act of 1950 created the Subversive Activities Control Board. By an amendment in 1954, the board was given jurisdiction to act on petitions of the Attorney General to identify and require the public registration of "Communist-action," "Communist front," and "Communist-infiltrated" organizations, and members of "Communist-action" organizations.

The act automatically imposed severe penalties upon the members of the organizations stigmatized by the board. The S.A.C.B. has been moribund since its existence in part because the courts have struck down its major approach—disclosure of individual members through compulsory registration. These rulings left the Subversive Activities Control Board with virtually nothing it could constitutionally do.

Apart from the constitutional questions, the board has proven to be a gross waste of taxpayers' funds. Congress has appropriated nearly $7 million to fund the board over the last 21 years. The Attorney General has brought only 26 petitions alleging organizations to be "Communist-action," "Communist front," or "Communist-infiltrated." Of these 26 petitions the board has issued only eight final orders determining that the organizations fell within the definitions of the act—one organization, the Communist party of the United States, was designated a "Communist-action organization * * * seven groups "Communist front" organizations. In spite of these eight final orders, the board has never registered a single organization or individual. The majority of the remaining cases have been dropped either because the board has found that the organization did not fall within the provisions of the act, or because the board's orders were vacated pursuant to a Federal court decision.

On July 2, 1971, President Nixon issued Executive Order No. 11605, which attempts to confer on the Subversive Activities Control Board vast powers to harass and stigmatize Americans.

In the last year—a year of "great activity" under the new Executive Order—the board did no more than hold four days of hearings. Aside from the absurdity of expending almost one-half million dollars in such a futile exercise, we submit that the Nixon order, which purports to confer new powers on the board, has no legal force. Its promulgation was beyond the constitutional power of the President; it is a direct violation of the doctrine of separation of powers for the President to rewrite statutes enacted by Congress. It is void for overbreadth and vagueness under the Fifth Amendment right to due process. It violates the First Amendment and due process rights of all the members of the organizations or groups designated except those who share the illegal aims of the organizations or groups.

The board will have even less to do next year than it had last year. Inasmuch as the courts have rendered it incapable of performing its basic functions under the Internal Security Act, Congress will again be asked to appropriate almost one-half million dollars for practically no purpose whatsoever. It is for this reason that the Senate struck the entire appropriation for the board. The issue is now before a conference committee.

The S.A.C.B. has no rightful place in our land. It is not the function of government in a free society to protect its citizens against the thoughts or associations it thinks hazardous. The time has come to remove this alien creature from our Government.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 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 sadisti-

cally practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

THE SALT AGREEMENTS

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the strategic arms limitation agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union which will probably be followed by SALT II—further talks in arriving at some mutual relationship on disarmament between our two nations. Chalmbers M. Roberts, a special columnist for the Washington Post, has written an excellent article, "Judging the Merits of the SALT Agreement." It is a hardheaded well analyzed article and one of the few I have seen that shows the in-depth research which was done in preparation of it.

The article follows:

JUDGING THE MERITS OF THE SALT AGREEMENT

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

In judging the merits of the strategic arms limitation (SALT) agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union it is necessary to do two things: first, to appraise the meaning of the anti-ballistic missile (ABM) treaty and the details, including the numbers, of the interim agreement on offensive weapons; second, to judge the twin pacts in the larger context of the changing Washington-Moscow relationship. The two seem to me to be inseparable.

The ABM treaty has the great virtue of so limiting such defensive measures as to remove fears on either side that the other could indulge in a first strike attack. If such an attack could ever be conceivable to any rational leader, it would become so only when he felt that his own weapons and the bulk of his population would be so protected by an elaborate nationwide ABM system as to make a second or retaliatory strike by the other nation a risk worth taking.

Given the undoubted ability of the offensive to overwhelm the defensive and given the grave doubts by many experts as to the efficacy of any ABM system, such fears doubtless have been gravely exaggerated in both Washington and Moscow. But that does not detract from the fact that such fears have existed, that they impelled vast expenditures regardless of their validity and that under terms of the SALT treaty on ABMs this should come to a halt if not an end. "Zero ABMs," which means a complete abolition by both sides of any ABMs, would have been better than the two site option agreed upon. But two, at least, is far, far better than unlimited ABMs.

So at least one factor that threatened to destabilize the balance of terror has been cut back to manageable proportions. It seems to me it would make sense for Congress to refuse funds for the building of an ABM around Washington despite the asymmetry that would involve, given the existence of a site now in existence around Moscow. Likewise, it would make sense for the Soviets not to build their second site around an offensive missile field. Should Congress so decide, the Moscow decision is most likely to be affected by the Soviet perception of a changing Moscow-Washington relationship.

Now turn to the offensive weapons agreement. It is evident enough that the Nixon Administration paid a stiff price, negotiated at the finale in Moscow, to win Soviet assent to inclusion of a limitation on submarine launched missiles (SLBMs). I think, however, it was a price worth paying.

The United States long has had a triad of strategic weapons system: ICBMs, SLBMs and long-range bombers. According to the figures presented to the Senate Armed Services Committee by Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, the sum total of the rival triads (one bomber being equated with one missile) will be 2,499 for the Soviets to 2,167 for the United States. Even these figures are not the whole story, however. The total megatonnage in the Soviet arsenal under the agreements is much the larger but the total number of American warheads, due to the American multiples (MIRVs), is far larger than that of the Russians.

In sum, the apples and oranges of nuclear weaponry have been added up to what can fairly be termed rough parity for weapons of one nation that can reach the soil of the other. Even here, it should be noted, some of the American apples have been excluded from the basket: the fighter-bombers based in Western Europe and on carriers, known as forward based systems (FBS). It seems to me the net of all these figures and factors is that the offensive agreement is a good deal for both superpowers.

In reading over all the official American explanations, by the President, Secretaries Laird and Rogers, Adm. Moorer and above all by Henry Kissinger, one is struck by a single theme: it would have been much worse if there had been no agreements reached. It is an uncontroverted fact that, as Sec. Laird kept saying so loudly and so long, the Soviets did have a great momentum going on offensive arms, from the giant SS–9 missiles to submarines. So, as the admiral put it, "we have forestalled a 1977 ratio of about three to two in their favor." I have no doubt he is right because I have no doubt that Moscow would have gone on building, lacking an agreement, to something like that amount of superiority. At some point the United States would have responded with a new program of its own.

The action-reaction phenomenon in strategic arms has been evident for years, for decades in fact. The current Soviet momentum clearly dates from the humiliation Moscow suffered in the 1963 Cuban missile crisis. The American preponderance at that time, in turn, was the result of early Kennedy Administration decisions to build a vastly superior force, rather than to accept some form of parity.

President Nixon was the first chief executive to accept parity as a principle though he sought to soften the blow to American pride by using instead the word "sufficiency." Whether he did so as an intellectual exercise, or whether he did so because he knew the Congress and the country simply would not put up the money for superiority in such costly weapons, is not material. That can be left to the historians. The fact is he did so. And only because he did so is there the agreement now before Congress for approval. Perhaps the best clue to Mr. Nixon's submarine decision was Dr. Kissinger's remark at a Moscow press briefing. Discussing the high price paid for the submarine section of the agreements, Dr. Kissinger remarked that "the United States was in a rather complex position to recommend a submarine deal since we were not building any and the Soviets were building eight or nine a year, which isn't the most brilliant bargaining position I would recommended people find themselves in."

In discussing the agreement, Secretary Laird has said he accepted them only on the premise that the United States will go forward with the multi-billion dollar Trident submarine and the equally costly B–1 bomber and some other programs as well. In essence, this is the old bargaining chip idea now being applied to the SALT II round due to begin this fall. The hope is to reach a permanent treaty covering offensive weapons systems to replace the five-year interim agreement now before Congress.

A good many in and out of Congress deride the bargaining chip argument. I do not. History teaches that Moscow respects muscle, not weakness. I thought there was validity in years past to the contention that keeping the American ABM program going was a bargaining chip; I think it proved so. The same argument now has validity. But that is not to say that everything that Sec. Laird and the Joint Chiefs would like is necessary, or even desirable at the speed they request. It sees to me further funding of the Trident project makes sense, in part because it will tend to move the core of the strategic power more to sea where it is least vulnerable. The B–1 is of lesser value, in my view, and should receive only limited funding at this point.

In his remarks at the Moscow dinner for Mr. Nixon, Soviet President Nikolai Podgorny remarked that despite "differences of social systems," there are "objective factors that determine similarity of interests" that influence Soviet-American relations. It was of course such a Kremlin view that permitted the Soviet leaders to let the President come to Moscow at a time he had challenged Soviet interests by mining the harbors of North Vietnam. It was simply one more demonstration of practicality over principle. One could say the same thing about Mr. Nixon's climb down from "superiority" to "sufficiency."

This sort of thing was codified in the declaration of basic principles signed in Moscow by President Nixon and Soviet Communist Party chief Leonid Brezhnev. They said, among other things, that the two nations "will proceed from the common determination that in the nuclear age there is no alternative to conducting their mutual relations on the basis of peaceful coexistence." Or as Dr. Kissinger put it to members of Congress at the White House: "We are compelled to coexist."

This theme, of course, is not new. Back in 1954 President Eisenhower declared that "since the advent of nuclear weapons, it seems clear that there is no longer any alternative to peace, if there is to be a happy and well world."

Just as many Americans have difficulty accepting parity instead of superiority, so the Russians have difficulty abandoning the secrecy on which they have so long counted, from Stalin through Khrushchev. This is evident in their refusal to give the numbers of their own ICBMs or to agree to a definition of "heavy" missiles and other pertinent terms. In short, the old suspicions of the Cold War are far from gone. It took a long time, on our side, for officials to abandon such terms as "international Communism." It would be useful for Secretaries Rogers and Laird to abandon the phrase "negotiating from a position of strength," which they both used in their testimony to Congress. And it would be useful for the Soviets to abandon some of the jargon of their own ideology such as "the imperialists."

The SALT agreements seem to me to be very important in themselves. But they are far more important if they form part of what Dr. Kissinger has called "vested interests in a continuation of a more formal relationship" between the two nations. We should, as Dr. Kissinger went on to say, "have no illusion" that such will occur or that, if it does, it will be quick and simple. The ideological differences, and the national rivalries too, remain. But there are, as Podgorny said, "objective factors" as well which tend to force each nation to move in the direction of a more stable and rational relationship.

Each side interacts on the other. In the

past when the Soviets were weak the Americans sought to exploit that weakness. If America becomes weak I have no doubt the Soviets will exploit that weakness. The changes therefore must be gradual, not precipitate. To me, the Nixon demand—as specified by Sec. Laird—for massive new arms goes too far. But so, in the other direction, does the budget cutting program of Sen. George McGovern. It is up to Congress, as it approves the SALT agreements, to find the mean between the extremes. If it does, then 1972 could well become a date to remember when hope superseded fear without allowing illusion to supplant rationality.

A TRIBUTE TO THE LITHUANIAN SPIRIT

HON. ROBERT H. STEELE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, within recent months the international community has become more and more aware of dissent within the Soviet Union. In the past, we in the Congress have viewed with grave concern and spoken out in behalf of Soviet Jews, Ukrainians, and other oppressed minorities within the Soviet Union who suffer cultural-religious and political injustices. It is indeed appropriate that we now focus our attention and concern on Lithuania and her courageous people.

Soviet domination of Lithuania since 1940 has neither extinguished the desire for freedom nor has it been successful in erasing the Lithuanian ethnic spirit. In fact, there has been a rebirth of Lithuanian determination to reassert ethnic identity. Petitions, riots, and self-immolation by young Lithuanians within recent months have challenged the regime, which insists on forced russification and assimilation. Furthermore, despite official harassment by the Communist regime, traditional religious beliefs persist.

On March 28, 1972, the Washington Post reported that petitions from 17,000 Lithuanian Roman Catholics were sent to U.N. Secretary General Kurt Waldheim in February. In their petition the Lithuanians complained that local officials curb freedom of religion by limiting the number of new priests trained and by controllng the assignment of priests to parishes. In addition, Catholics have not been allowed to rebuild churches destroyed during World War II and have difficulty in getting permission to hold services in private homes. These petitions were sent to the U.N. following unsuccessful attempts to induce the government to implement religious freedoms guaranteed by the Soviet constitution.

The Soviet leader's insensitivity to human spiritual needs is made clear by their preference for violent repression, arrests, and threats. On May 14 a young Lithuanian Catholic, Roman Talanta, burned himself to death for "political reasons" in the city of Kaunas. The incident triggered 2 days of rioting by nationalists. The incident was the most striking in a week that saw concentrated efforts by the authorities to prevent demonstrations during President Nixon's visit to the Soviet Union. Political dissidents and Jewish activists had been warned and threatened with prison and labor camps. Jews were told that demonstrating would foreclose their chances of emigrating to Israel.

Talanta's suicide and burial were almost immediately followed by thousands of young Lithuanians swarming into the streets shouting "freedom, freedom, freedom for Lithuania." Local police, reinforced by "internal forces" clashed with thousands of demonstrators which eventually led to 800 arrests and two deaths. The Soviet press, as expected, conveniently denounced Talanta as "mentally disturbed" and a "drug addict."

Although the rioting was not reported in the Soviet central press, the Lithuanian Communist party leader held a special political meeting with local leaders in early June. Western diplomats interpreted the meeting as evidence of high-level concern over unrest in Lithuania, yet the low level representation from Moscow tended to indicate that the Kremlin felt local authorities could handle the situation.

However, the spurt of protest and the fires of Lithuanian patriotism which have been building up were not easily extinguished. In early June another youth in the city of Varena burned himself to death.

The tragedy of these events are overwhelming, yet the Kremlin remains insensitive to demands for justice, religious freedom, and human dignity. I believe it is fitting that we pay tribute to these two young men who gave their lives in protest. Let us hope and pray that these tragic incidents are not repeated and that justice, religious freedom, and human dignity will be a reality for Lithuania and her people.

MOONWARD BOUND

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has undertaken a long and difficult road on space cooperation with the Soviet Union. There may be progress and setbacks in our attempts to establish both programs in space exploration and possibly later in space utilization. A New York Times editorial of Monday, April 17, 1972, is enthusiastic about the prospects and opportunities of joint United States-Soviet space cooperation. I offer this editorial for consideration of my colleagues and information to the general public.

MOONWARD BOUND

By this time most Americans are so blase about successful Apollo flights that it was left to a foreigner to pay adequate tribute to the smooth launch of Apollo 16 toward the moon. Yevgeny Yevtushenko, a Soviet guest at Cape Kennedy yesterday, said Apollo 16 ranked with the Grand Canyon as the most impressive sight he had seen in this country. In this mood of admiration, Mr. Yevtushenko expressed the hope that American and Soviet astronauts will some day cross the Milky Way together in the same spirit in which their fathers met at the Elbe in 1945.

Implicit in Mr. Yevtushenko's tribute was the understanding that astronauts Young, Duke and Mattingly are moonward bound as envoys for all mankind. Their mission will be performed on a stage to which all nations have access. If they land on the moon, it will not be as imperialists to seize territory but as explorers seeking knowledge to be made available to all. Soviet scientists have already been given lunar material brought back by earlier Apollo flights. American scientists have received lunar material obtained by Soviet unmanned probes.

The Apollo effort began in 1961 in an aura of cold war Soviet-American rivalry. But yesterday the Moscow television news gave the Apollo 16 launch equal time with events in Vietnam. Soviet-American space cooperation—perhaps a prelude to truly international teamwork—could help greatly in easing world tensions. It would be an unexpected but welcome by-product of the Apollo program.

TRANSPORTATION ACT

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Motor Transportation Association of South Carolina adopted a resolution endorsing the Surface Transportation Act of 1971 at its recent convention in Myrtle Beach. President Angus D. Senn of the association is an accomplished and dedicated leader in the field of transportation. Likewise, the Honorable Samuel L. Boylston, general manager of the association, is rendering splendid service and is devoted to improving our great American transportation system.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this resolution to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and to the attention of the people of our country.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, high quality surface transportation is essential to the efficiency and economic welfare of this nation;

Whereas, freight transportation accounts for one dollar of every ten we spend and it keeps nearly ten million workers employed;

Whereas, the railroads have outlined their mounting problems in their Astro Program, and other modes have made proposals to solve their problems;

Whereas, the railroads, water carriers, and Trucking Industry have endorsed The Hartke-Adams Bills known as the Surface Transportation Act of 1971;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Motor Transportation Association of South Carolina, in meeting assembled at Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, do hereby endorse the Surface Transportation Act of 1971 and do hereby recommend that the Congress adopt this legislation. It will improve surface transportation for a growing economy and all our citizens will benefit.

Adopted this 17th day of June 1972.

AWARD FOR BETTY

HON. DONALD D. CLANCY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Marine Corps League has selected a very good friend of mine, Betty Donovan, for a well-deserved honor. For many years, she has been the best friend in the Cincinnati area of men in the military services. Betty is a topflight writer, reporting on the assignments and activities of area servicemen. In 1970 she went to Vietnam and wrote a series of articles about hometown boys that was widely proclaimed and thoroughly read.

I commend to your attention the following story about Betty and the award she is to receive as published in the Cincinnati Post and Times-Star:

Betty Donovan, who has written about servicemen and their families for the Cincinnati Post since 1944, has been chosen by the Marine Corps League of the U.S. to receive the Dicky Chapelle Award.

The presentation will take place Aug. 11 at the annual Marine Corps League Convention at Anaheim, Cal.

The award is given annually to a woman who has contributed "in an outstanding and meritorious way" to the welfare of the U.S., the Marine Corps and the Marine Corps League.

Mrs. Chapelle, a free lance journalist, was killed Nov. 4, 1965, while on patrol with a group of Marines near Chu Lai in Vietnam. Marines on active duty and members of the Marine Corps League established the award program in her honor.

Betty, in private life Mrs. Charles Rentrop, widow of the long-time City Hall reporter for The Post and Times-Star, will be presented the award by entertainer Martha Raye, who received the award last year.

The Marine Corps League of Greater Cincinnati and several individuals nominated Betty for the award.

They cited her contributions through articles about Vietnam and Southeast Asia, written for the Post and Times-Star when she went there in 1970 and her articles about servicemen and their families and the plight of returning servicemen.

Betty was notified of the award in a letter from H. Lynn Cavin, national commandant of the Marine Corps League.

"It was not just a professional, but a personal, matter where my Charlie and I and servicemen were concerned. I guess we were proudest of the fact that we had more than 200 'courtesy grandchildren' who were named Betty or Charlie after us by our servicemen and their families." Betty said.

In addition to Miss Raye, past recipients have been Esther Clark of the Arizona Republic Phoenix Gazette, Verona Devney of Project HOPE, Lucy Caldwell of the USO and Marjorie Merriweather Post.

Gen. Lou Walt, retired former assistant commandant of the Marine Corps, also will be present at the award ceremony.

Betty has two daughters and 10 grandchildren, William E. Daily, one of her sons-in-law, is on the faculty of Xavier University. Her other son-in-law, Willis H. Martin, is warrant officer at Fort Eustis, Va., following his third tour in Vietnam.

BRUCE HERSCHENSHON

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bruce Herschenshon, former Director of Motion Pictures and Television, U.S. Information Agency, made the commencement address at McLean High School in my congressional district, on June 10. Several persons who attended believed that Mr. Herschenshon's remarks would be of interest to our congressional colleagues, and have asked that I insert the text of this address in the RECORD. I include it at this point in the RECORD:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY BRUCE HERSCHENSHON

Throughout all of your lives, the month of September has served as an usher. Each year, September has escorted out a vacation and brought in the dreaded advertisements of back-to-school clothes and it has brought in the first day of the new semester with squeaky chalk, varnished desks and the slowest clocks in the world. Also it has brought back old friends and the sight of some almost forgotten faces that would once again be passed in locker-lined hallways. It would come with the last heat wave of the season, the world series, Jewish holidays and football try-outs. There was very little element of surprise.

But today, September is losing its job and it will no longer be the arrogant usher. Some of you will go on to universities, some into marriage, some into a career—but all of you, today, are done with what is called compulsory education.

And that's good.

Now, for the first time, free choice is yours. Other than the gift of birth and the gift of love, today, June the 10th, is the greatest gift you will ever receive. From this day forward, September will no longer be arrogant and demanding. From this day forward, it's your choice. You can choose now to live in Arizona or Alaska, be a bricklayer or a banker, quote Confucius or quote Christ. You can become a hero or a hobo. It's your choice.

Many have died for the gift you are receiving free-of-charge, today. The gift is perishable, breakable and non-returnable and only the brave really appreciate it. It is true that many who are not brave prefer to live without it. There are those who want the security of regimentation where each person is cut from the same cloth. They do not want the responsibility that goes with free choice, where each person sews his own cloth and guides the needle in and out from this moment until the moment he dies.

Because it is both an ending and a beginning, this day will be remembered by you throughout the rest of your lives. But it is really only one in a series of forthcoming graduations through which most of you will pass. The forthcoming graduations will be without Pomp and Circumstance, without ceremony, without cap and grown. But they will come with a diploma—a diploma less tangible than the one you hold today, but just as real.

They will come with each success and each failure, each victory and each defeat, each high and each low—and you are bound to have all of them.

But with perception even the failures and defeats and lows will bring their diplomas and give to you a continuing scale of values—a scale of values which is based on being able to separate the important things from trifles. I have known, as I'm sure you must know, some who have no scale of values, who have stopped the learning process some past June in a ceremony very much like this one. When compulsory education was over, their learning process was over. They go through life existing rather than living and they go through life in a world of trifles. Moments make them. They never make the moment.

You can recognize them in an instant. They are the negativists who greet without a smile, who talk of the things they dislike rather than the things they admire, who prefer to condemn rather than commend. Afraid of their inferiority, it makes them feel superior. They are people of accusation and prejudice.

When I graduated from high school, we had a speaker at our commencement exercises who was a positivist and who spoke with optimism and pride in the young, and with optimism and pride in the country. He used words such as "duty" and "honor" and "law" and "prayer". In those days, they were not words of controversy.

But this isn't June of 1950. It is June of 1972. A little over two decades have passed. Today if someone chooses the word "duty" does it mean he disapproves of dissent? If he chooses the word "honor" does it mean he thinks of nothing else? If he chooses the word "law" does it mean he ignores justice? If he chooses the word "prayer" does it mean he's a religious fanatic? Of course not—but it's a time when old values and beliefs and ideals are put under microscopes and, if a germ is suspected, the germ is no longer searched for, isolated and removed. Instead, unfortunately, too often the entire idea is destroyed.

Sometimes, to be sure we don't over-simplify anything, we are in danger of over-complicating everything. We not only question values, we throw them out before the questions are answered.

I would like to briefly discuss a few important words which have been used and mis-used recently. The words are "young" and "old" and "prejudice" and "love" and "youth" and "Utopia".

The words, "young" and "old" have recently been opened to more examination than perhaps any other words. They have, in fact, polarized many into camps that each day seem to find a new reason for disrespect and distrust. I consider myself ideal to talk about them, since, by my age, I am completely unacceptable to both. I am too old to be young and too young to be old.

Since the mid-sixties, the young have been attacked and applauded, blamed and blessed, condemned and congratulated for every vice and every virtue of our time. We single out one youth from a crowd and say he speaks for all young people. We single out one from a crowd and say he is representative of the new generation. We single out one from a crowd and say he is typical. But I have yet to meet a typical Italian or a typical Catholic or a typical black person or a typical old person. It seems to me that the young generation has its share of fools and geniuses. For anyone to want to deal with young people as a group, and for any of the young people to want to be dealt with as a group, is a new way of writing an old word called "prejudice".

Because he is young, should he be denied the right to express an opinion?

Because he is young, should he assume his opinion must be obeyed?

Because he is young, must he be wrong?

Because he is young, is he automatically right?

Perhaps we have forgotten what "young" means. To some, it is one end of a chronologi-

cal scale of age. It was just that to Webster who said, "Being in the first or early period of life. Not having existed long. The period preceding maturity."

In recent years both the old and the young have become guilty of prejudicing themselves against age-groups, often times listening to the loudest and then generalizing. All of us, during these past two decades have taken some satisfaction in feeling prejudice is finally removing itself from our ways of life. It isn't.

Under the disguise of removing prejudice, which any sane man would be for, we have too often allowed prejudices not to be removed, but to be traded one for another.

As soon as the word "nigger" finally became unacceptable, the word "wasp" became acceptable.

When drinking finally became frowned upon, dope became accented.

When criminals finally became subjects for cure rather than only condemnation, the police became the condemned.

When new ideas were finally examined with favor, old and proven ideals were often discarded.

In total, the prejudices we would all like to see disappear have lessened, but have not disappeared. Some prejudice that existed two decades ago still exists. Some prejudices are the same as they were. Some prejudices have simply been traded for others. It has been a game of trade in the disguise of complete morality.

It has come about in my view, because we have redefined words to suit our own incapabilities. The word "love" itself has gone through a metamorphosis within the last two decades. Once it meant the highest honor, the greatest degree of compassion and sensitivity, the truest loyalty—worth living for, and even worth dying for. But today we have made it a cause rather than an emotion.

Some of you have already known love. Some of you have yet to feel it. Some, perhaps, may never know it.

If it has come, or if and when it comes, you will hear your mate or perhaps others, tell you there are compromises to make in an acceptance of love and in a joining together of two people. There are. Compromise a weakness for a strength but never a strength for a weakness. Compromise a liability for an asset but never an asset for a liability. Compromise selfishness for selflessness but never selflessness for selfishness. Compromise destruction for creativity but never creativity for destruction. Real love will never ask you to be worse—only to be worthy. Those who don't understand the word will find, as the years progress, that they hold a mirror rather than another hand. And through that mirror they will see wrinkles get deeper, characteristics get harder and the ends of their lips get lower. If they misinterpret love when they are young, they will frown at life when they are old.

The word "old" has also come under misinterpretation as of late. I have heard it said that those who live in your parents' time and your grandparents' time have left a horrible world for all of us. And we have shaken our heads at prior follies. But despite the evils that still exist in the world, most of the fatal diseases of a century ago are now controlled. Traveling to a foreign country is faster than it used to be traveling to another town. The best of music and art and literature is available in cartridges, prints and books which are plentiful and accessible. The news of half a globe away is known in seconds within most homes. The dangers of storms can be correctly prophesized and disaster averted. Life expectancy has significantly risen. Man has mastered the technology to walk on the moon and those on earth have the means to watch him. The arts have flourished with some of the greatest names of all time. Science and medicine have progressed more in this century than in all the time before it. This country is the most open and decent society known throughout the history of man.

But there is still poverty and there is still disease and there is still war and there is still slavery in the world. The older generation has not left a clean slate. But it is cleaner than the one *it* was left, and the next should be cleaner yet.

In talking about the young and the old, the word "youth" is something separate because that, of course, is not a matter of chronology. Youth, we all know, is possessed by many of the most aged people and unknown to some of the youngest.

Youth belongs to every man whose dreams outweigh his memories—Youth is the ability to substitute one dream for another when the first dream is accomplished. Those I know who have that eternal youth have achieved it for themselves from talent and virtue and maturity and work. They treat happiness like a career that has to be earned rather than expected. They know that money can only buy what someone else is willing to sell. They have principles higher than their ambitions. They know everything they own that can be touched is a supplement to their life. And that everything they own that cannot be touched is a supplement to their soul.

I have known men like that. They hold the youth of the wise. That's eternal youth. Many of those men have lived and continue to live in the city across the river—in Washington. You can see those men there on any day both in marble and in flesh—in memorials and breath.

There is an obelisk for Washington, a dome for Jefferson, pillars for Lincoln, and a flame for Kennedy.

And there are others who work today in the White House and the Capitol and the Courts and some who are scattered throughout more unpretentious buildings that stand between the Potomac and the Hill. Those in marble can expect a wreath. Those in the flesh can expect a demonstration.

But that's the way it always was and that's the way it will always be. Those who work in the cold climate of today do not have the luxury of having their work seen in retrospect. Memories take on a dreamlike quantity of the "good old days" while the present always seems unconnected, disorganized and unsure.

But some day the leaders of today, along with all of us, will be neatly organized between pages 240 and 247 in a school history book. The names we all know so well like Nixon, Mansfield and Burger will be left to be spelled right and spelled wrong on three-holed bluelined paper, by yet another generation. And these days will take on a look we cannot yet imagine.

In the meantime we continue to write those pages ourselves. In our writing and actions, we, of course, should continue to be discontented with the world the way it is, and we must try to make it better. As we do it, we should also appreciate what generations before us have already gained, lest we *lose* for all mankind, all that has been *won* for all mankind.

The last word I would like to discuss is the word, "Utopia". We are a nation impatient for Utopia—but impatience breeds errors. With loud voices of self-condemnation rather than self-confidence, with pessimism rather than optimism, we have become perversely interested in flagellating ourselves for not reaching Utopia, and congratulating others though they are even further from it. The advocates of that perversity have stood ready to flail the United States and its leaders for idealism and hard decisions. Simultaneously, they have eagerly justified and defended the actions of closed societies, shrouded in their curtained-off "mystique", with the belief that what we don't know can only be better. Those messages were often applauded by the young.

But lately more and more young people have caught on. They have started to travel. They have started to compare this society and this way of life—not with a non-existent Utopia as they did in the late 1960's, but with other nations of the world as they really exist in 1972. And knowing that this nation has a great past and a greater potential for the future, they are working for its success. All of this is true, not because of the voices of masochism, but in spite of them.

Having traveled the world extensively, I know that travel is one of the richest experiences of life. If you travel to learn, you succeed in that venture. But if you travel to find Utopia, you will waste your life.

Search for it in the South Seas and the Himalayas and the West Indies—and you'll find it isn't there. You *create* Utopia. You don't *find* it. If it isn't *in* you—it isn't anywhere. And once created, the only way to make it permanent is to give it away unselfishly to the ones you love and the ones who love you.

Thank you, and the very best of everything in the future.

DR. GONZALO E. APONTE

HON. JORGE L. CÓRDOVA

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. CÓRDOVA. Mr. Speaker, last year's commencement season brought signal honors to an outstanding Puerto Rican, Dr. Gonzalo E. Aponte, a member of the faculty of Jefferson Medical College and head of the department of pathology at that outstanding medical school. I did not then know of this distinction, but I am proud now to bring to the attention of my colleagues the remarks of the president of Jefferson Medical College, Dr. Peter A. Herbut, and Dr. Aponte's acknowledgement, on the occasion of the presentation to him, by the Jefferson Class of 1971, of his portrait as a symbol of their selection of Dr. Aponte as the teacher who most contributed to their enlightenment and education.

Said Dr. Herbut:

Dr. Aponte, members of the Aponte family, Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, for myself, and for our board of trustees I wish to congratulate the Class of 1971 for selecting Dr. Aponte as the subject of their class presentation this year. I also wish to congratulate Dr. Aponte for being the recipient of this—the absolute highest honor that can be bestowed on anyone at Jefferson. It is the absolute highest honor because it comes from the students, because the students select only the person who, in their judgment, is the teacher who contributed most to their enlightenment and education, and because, in the final analysis, it is the students who are Jefferson.

I have known Dr. Aponte casually, as a medical student between 1949 and 1952; well, as an intern in 1952 and 1953; and intimately, as a Resident in Pathology from 1953 to 1957; and as a colleague from 1957 to the present.

You have already heard of his educational, scientific, and academic accomplishments. From this, you must conclude that success, to Dr. Aponte, is an old refrain. He has many firsts to his credit. He was first in his class in primary and secondary school, first in his class at Georgetown University, first in his class at Jefferson, first Markle Scholar at Jefferson, first resident in pathology to become Chairman of Jefferson's Department of Pathology, first Jeffersonian to be on the Educational Council on Foreign Graduates,

and first member of the faculty to have his portrait painted at the tender age of 42 years.

Above all, today, Dr. Aponte is first in the hearts of all of us.

That Dr. Aponte is brilliant—must be apparent to everyone here. That he is a Jefferson product and a loyal Jeffersonian—cannot be disputed. That he is beloved by students and colleagues alike—is amply demonstrated today. That he is a prodigious worker—cannot be challenged. And that he is a diplomat—must be accepted, for otherwise, especially at Jefferson, he would never have been the spontaneous choice as Chairman of the Department of Pathology in 1967 or the subject of this portrait this afternoon.

Aside from his prowess as a pathologist, teacher and academician Dr. Aponte is sensitive yet sensible, idealistic yet pragmatic, demanding yet tolerant, impatient yet understanding, firm yet sympathetic, willful yet cooperative, trusting yet cautious. Lest you get the wrong impression, however, all this is not to say that he is always virtuous in everything he says or does, that he does not evoke discussion or controversy by some of his pronouncements and some of his actions, that he does not experience the vicissitudes that engulf all of us in our daily lives, or that he can walk on water when none of the rest of us can.

For example, his working habits are atrocious. He works when others sleep and he sleeps when others work. He is never punctual for his appointments or his meetings. Sometimes he ignores them completely. Time means nothing to him. He forgets to eat and he forgets to sleep, and, deadline? What is that? He never heard of the word.

To sum up, one can never have everything in any one person. In Dr. Aponte, we almost do. He is first among top graduates of Jefferson. We are delighted to have him with us. We are thrilled to have him honored today, and we are pleased to accept this excellent portrait as a token of your esteem for him.

Dr. Aponte's acknowledgment of the honor follows:

Thank you, Class of 1971. My family and I are overwhelmed by this incomparable experience. I feel this happy event far beyond what you could imagine. Computers could not analyze it; nor could I describe it if I tried with all might—here, there and everywhere; now, then, or evermore.

For this unique joy of May the fifth 1971 will never come again for me—here, there and everywhere; now, then, or evermore.

But since we know each other well at least I feel that you have a general idea of what this means to me, and realize that when I say "many thanks" they are thanks from heart and yet some more.

Unforgettable, that's what you will be! Be assured that the memory of you will be that long within me—with rare tenderness and increasing pride, for I am also sure that your lives soon will begin to add uninterrupted honor to the past, present, and future glory of the profession of Medicine and of Jefferson Medical College.

All of us in Puerto Rico take pride in the distinguished career of Dr. Aponte, one of the great sons of Puerto Rico.

PHILIP J. PHILBIN, OUR DEPARTED FORMER COLLEAGUE

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to hear of the passing of the former Member of Congress from Massachusetts, our colleague, the Honorable Philip J. Philbin.

I had known Philip Philbin since I came to Congress in 1967 and admired his dedication and leadership as member of the House Armed Services Committee, and at one time its chairman. His genial disposition and sincere concern for the welfare of our men and women in the armed services have won admiration from his colleagues in the Congress, our military as well as his constituents. His expertise in the area of national security was well marked in the Congress.

Phil learned his politics well, first as aide to State Senator of Massachusetts David I. Walsh, following his graduation from Harvard University and Columbia University Law School and then in the Congress for almost three decades.

His devotion to our men and women in the military services for better housing and retirement benefits, better working conditions and pay, and fairness in seeing that military justice is dispensed equally has been well recognized.

Phil Philbin was a learned and cultured man with a wealth of knowledge on a number of subjects. In his early years, he was a star football player and even played in the Rose Bowl in 1919.

Mrs. Burke joins with me in mourning his passing and we both extend our deepest sympathies to his family.

PHILIP J. PHILBIN

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the other Members of the House in extending sympathy to the daughters and family of our late colleague, Philip J. Philbin.

I first met Phil when I was appointed to the House Armed Services Committee following my election to the House in 1966. However, it was not until my second term, when I was assigned to the Post Exchange and Commissaries Subcommittee of which he was chairman, that I had the opportunity to know him well. As chairman, he was always very courteous and fair to Members on both sides of the aisle. He also was an extremely enjoyable companion during our travels on subcommittee business. A conversation with Phil covered many diverse subjects. We shared an interest in sports, his stemming from the days when he played for Harvard in the Rose Bowl. The tales of that era which he related never failed to fascinate his listeners. Yet he also was very knowledgeable in music and art. It did not take much encouragement to entice him to sit down at the piano to display his repertoire of classical and popular pieces.

Mr. Speaker, Philip Philbin contributed a great deal to the Nation through his service in the House. His colleagues, and I am sure his constituents also, are grateful not only for his efforts but also for the kind way in which he served.

May he rest in peace.

AN INCENTIVE PROGRAM FOR THE NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVES

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, currently our Reserve forces face a shortage of more than 50,000 men in paid drill status. This shortfall can be overcome with the proper combination of incentives, the cooperation of civilian employers, and a more vigorous recruiting effort by the Reserve forces.

Yesterday, in a speech before the National Convention of the Reserve Officers Association, Assistant Secretary of Defense Roger T. Kelley outlined the needs of our Reserves, and underscored the Defense Department's commitment to create an all-volunteer force. I commend this item to your attention.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY HON. ROGER T. KELLEY, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (MANPOWER AND RESERVE AFFAIRS), NATIONAL CONVENTION OF RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION, BAL HARBOUR, FLA., JUNE 28, 1972

Three years and two days ago, I was privileged to keynote your 42nd Annual Convention in Las Vegas.

Then the big problem of Guard and Reserve units was the shortage of equipment and the absence of a clear cut Reserve mission. Those were days of lively debate about the All-Volunteer Force, whether the concept was a good one and whether the draft could be ended.

Three years later the equipment shortage among Guard and Reserve units is nearly a thing of the past. The mission of the Guard and Reserve, once obscure, has since been defined, publicly and on many occasions, by the Secretary of Defense.

The All-Volunteer Force is beyond the stage of debate. It is an idea whose time has come, and a goal whose final attainment is in close range and within sight.

Today's problem is people—how to attract them to service in the Guard and Reserve and how to retain them in sufficient numbers without the pressure of a Selective Service draft. This is the subject I wish to discuss with you today. But before doing so, let me comment briefly on the improved state of equipment, on Reserve readiness and on your defined mission.

Our objective in the equipment area is identical with that repeatedly voiced by the ROA—to provide first line equipment for every Guard and Reserve unit, in quantities required to meet realistic mobilization requirements. Although much remains to be done in reaching that objective, there has been great progress to date and we have established a degree of momentum which is carrying over into planning for future years.

If the projected flow of equipment is maintained, the Army will have met the essential equipment requirements for Guard and Reserve early deployment units by the end of Fiscal Year 1973 and, by the end of Fiscal Year 1976, all units of the Army National Guard and Army Reserve will be substantially equipped for their missions.

In the Reserve Components of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, the push has been on modernization, rather than fill, of equipment. Naval Reserve ships have been replaced and modernized. Naval Air Reserve units have been completely reequipped with combat serviceable aircraft. The Marine Corps Reserve continues to get modern replacements for aging hardware. The Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve are in the midst of the most extensive modernization program in their history.

This equipping and reequipping momentum is being reflected in improved training—hands-on mission training as opposed to armory drills and lectures. Where it is necessary to transition to new types of equipment, the temporary lag in readiness is more than offset by the potential gains in combat capability.

When Secretary Laird announced that the Guard and Reserve, rather than the draft, will be the initial and primary source of augmentation for the Active Forces in any future emergency, he set the pattern for the improvement of equipping and readiness.

But while designating the Selected Reserve as our primary augmentation force has given the Guard and Reserve a real mission, it has also created a manpower challenge that must be met.

In the years preceding this Administration, when the draft was a major source of military manpower and the equipment and training status of the Reserve Forces were at pitifully low levels, it was easy to see that the Guard and Reserve were not likely to be mobilized in anything short of all-out war. Accordingly, many young people were attracted to the Guard and Reserve as a means of escaping from the draft and *active* military service. Their interest in Guard and Reserve activities, never very positive, has declined markedly in the face of this Administration's total force policy which relies heavily upon a strong and deployable Guard and Reserve.

The long lists of applicants for Guard and Reserve membership, so characteristic of the years of heavy draft, have disappeared. And disappearing also are many of the draft-motivated young Guardsmen and Reservists as their obligated terms of service expire.

Now we are left with what I would describe as a welcomed challenge: to return to a Guard and Reserve force whose members reflect the true volunteer tradition of the "Minuteman", and live up to your proud heritage.

I know this great Minuteman tradition is reflected in the spirit of those in this audience. But unfortunately, it is a spirit not readily understood or accepted by enough Americans, including many of our young people. Some have been turned off by the war in Vietnam; others by confusion over our Nation's place in international affairs; and still others because they do not understand the key role of the Guard and Reserve in this Nation's national defense system.

For the re-spiriting of the Minuteman tradition, there must be a vastly improved public understanding of the role of your Guard and Reserve in our Nation's security. And there must also be a much higher level of encouragement by American employers for their employees to participate in Guard and Reserve activities.

Last week the President announced the creation of the National Committee for Support of the Guard and Reserve, and named Mr. J. M. Roche as its Chairman. Mr. Roche, the former Chairman of the Board of General Motors Corporation, is a distinguished citizen and business leader. He brings to this challenging assignment his vast experience as chief executive officer of our Nation's largest corporation.

The broad and critical charter of this national effort is to improve public understanding of the Guard and Reserve role in our national security system, and to enlist the cooperation of those who employ present and prospective members of Guard and Reserve components.

The full-time staff of the national committee, a carefully selected group of professionals from the Services and their Reserve components, is already at work. The Air Force has loaned us Colonel Milt Mitler from General Lewis' office to get things started, and he has been making the initial contacts and laying the groundwork for liaison with national organizations and associations like ROA.

The program will be in full swing as soon as we can round out the membership of the key committees and councils. These will include business and labor leaders from both the private and public sector, together with representatives of professional and reserve organizations. All of you will be asked to serve in this important work—whether at the national, state, or local level.

What needs to be done? I won't burden this informed audience with the reasons for better public understanding of your role in national security. Clearly, public understanding is deficient. The taxpayer must realize that a well equipped, fully manned, and readily deployable Guard and Reserve is potentially the most economical part of our na his and his Nation's security is in peril.

How about American employers? As you know, some employers are opposed to the idea of having their employees participate in Guard and Reserve activities. Others are indifferent about it. In either case, young men will not join and remain in the Guard and Reserve in sufficient numbers if advancement opportunities or security on their principal job is impaired.

Many Guardsmen and Reservists must use their summer vaction for a two-week training encampment, often with a financial loss along with the denial of a family vacation. Other Guardsman and Reservists, while given time off their principal job for training, are victims of subtle discrimination which makes it clear that being in the Guard and Reserve is a poor way to feather their promotional nest. These are forms of indifference and discrimination that must be eliminated, and they will be as the consciousness of the American public and employers is drawn to you key role in our society.

But even with improved public understanding and cooperative employers, there is another major ingredient critically needed to solve your manpower supply problems without draft pressure. The Selected Reserve needs the same kinds of financial and other incentives which have been made available for use in the active forces.

That is why we have proposed to Congress a number of new incentives to retain experienced Guardsmen and Reservists, and to attract new people to their ranks.

The key provision of the Uniformed Services Special Pay Act of 1972, introduced in Congress a month ago, is the authority to use reenlistment and enlistment bonuses for the Selected Reserve. Long-time experience with variable reenlistment bonuses in the active forces, and recent favorable experience with an enlistment bonus for ground combat arms in the active Army and Marine Corps, convince us that these authorities for the Guard and Reserve are not just desirable—they are absolutely essential.

Other proposals now before the Congress include:

Full time Servicemen's Group Life Insurance coverage for members of the Selected Reserve.

The authority to enlist 20-year active force retirees to meet critical skill shortages in the Selected Reserve.

Better protection for a Reservist and his family in case of injury, illness, or death incurred while in training.

While these proposals now before Congress await action, we are continuing to pursue the matter of reforms in the Reserve retirement system. These will be tied closely to the ongoing study of the Reserve Officer Personnel Act so that your retirement system will be compatible with overall personnel and career management plans.

The legislation I have just outlined is needed now. How Congress reacts to it, and when, will be influenced by the Reserve community's enthusiasm for it, and the strength of your organizational endorsements of it. We have proposed these incentives, and we will testify in their behalf when hearings are scheduled.

One final point. In the Guard and Reserve, as in the active forces, recruiting has been done poorly in the years of heavy draft. Your main recruiting tool was the draft, and applicants came to the armories without being sought. Now we must help our recruiters unlearn those bad habits of the draft era, and recruit people in the same aggressive and creative ways that you recruit people for your civilian offices and factories.

Every Reservist must be a Minuteman recruiter. You senior members of ROA particularly, who have recruited so successfully in years past, must teach young officers and NCOs the challenging art of competing for all good people in the open market—minority members, high school graduates, and prior service veterans among others—and attracting them to the service of their country through the Guard and Reserve.

In closing, I want to congratulate the Reserve Officers Association for 50 years of conspicuous achievements. Your consistent concern with the key issues of national security and your support of efforts to improve the effectiveness of national security have earned you my respect, and the respect of all elements of the Defense establishment.

It is appropriate for you to begin your second half-century at a time that the National Guard and Reserve are being challenged to their full potential under the Total Force concept. The enthusiasm, leadership, and influence of ROA was never needed more than it is today.

We enlist your continued guidance and support, and thank you for your great contribution to our Nation's security. May this National Convention be a productive and successful one.

CONSUMERISM'S OTHER HALF

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, the issue of consumerism has received a great deal of comment and attention lately, and it is indeed an issue which deserves thorough consideration not only by Members of Congress but also by the general public as well.

What is often overlooked in the discussion is the fact that most of us are producers as well as consumers. What we produce, others will ultimately consume. I would like to share with my colleagues the following article which further explains this important point. The article is entitled, "Consumerism's Other Half," and is from a recent issue of the New York Times:

CONSUMERISM'S OTHER HALF

"Consumerism" has implanted itself in the American consciousness. But can it endure as a force for enhancing our lives? It can if the movement adopts the equally important concept of *producerism*—the attitude of consumers toward the quality and cost of goods and services that *they themselves* help put in the marketplace.

There is news value in blaming a corporation for lack of product quality, and little in the story of the man on the assembly line who turns out a defective product. Yet the dissatisfied customer may himself be a less-than-satisfactory producer whose work elicits protests from other consumers. The focus on decision-makers falls short of building an

effective consumer movement, for it presents the consumer as helpless (except through negative protest) to control the quality of his life.

Each of us, in our role as producer, must act to increase our economy's productivity in order to slow down the upward spiral of prices. Between 1963 and 1971 labor productivity in the United States increased only 24 percent. At the same time it increased 55 percent in France, 48 percent in West Germany, 35 percent in Italy, 114 percent in Japan.

How do we solve the problem? Perhaps through a joint management-labor program aimed at worker involvement not only in units per hour, but in *well*-made units. Producerism, I believe, can inject the necessary element of positivism into the consumer movement.

MRS. ETTA M. DORN—OUTSTANDING FEMALE STATE EMPLOYEE OF 1972

HON. TOM S. GETTYS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. GETTYS. Mr. Speaker, the General Assembly of South Carolina recently took notice of the selection of Mrs. Etta M. Dorn by the South Carolina State Employee's Association as the Outstanding Female State Employee of 1972. Mrs. Dorn exemplifies all the qualities a dedicated public servant should have. She is a valued and dear friend of our colleague, the distinguished and able Representative of the Fourth District of South Carolina, WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN.

I take pleasure in joining with the members of the General Assembly of South Carolina in congratulating Mrs. Dorn on her selection as the Outstanding Female State Employee of 1972 and in recognizing her splendid record of public service.

Following is a concurrent resolution recently adopted unanimously by both the Senate and the House of Representatives of South Carolina:

Whereas, Mrs. Etta M. Dorn has recently been selected by the South Carolina State Employees' Association as the Outstanding Female State Employee of 1972; and

Whereas, this much merited award to the State Supervisor of Distributive Education reflects a continued record of excellence and service to the business-education field throughout South Carolina; and

Whereas, Mrs. Dorn has made extensive contributions to business and civic organizations, youth groups and many fields of public education and has been a primary force in the rapid growth and success of distributive education in South Carolina; and

Whereas, the effective and dedicated public service of this most charming and talented lady merits the recognition and praise of all South Carolinians. Now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate, the House of Representatives concurring:

That the General Assembly by this resolution congratulates Mrs. Etta M. Dorn upon her selection as the Outstanding Female State Employee for the year 1972 and extends to her the thanks of all South Carolinians for her remarkable and most productive record of public service to the State.

STRANGE INEQUITY IN SOCIAL SECURITY LAW

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to eliminate a strange inequity in the social security payment regulations. Under present law a social security recipient is entitled to no payment for the month in which he dies. In other words, if a social security recipient died in June, the check for June which would arrive at the beginning of July would have to be returned. This policy deprives social security recipients of their regular monthly payment for the month in which they die.

Legislation is needed to correct what is either a slip-up in the social security regulations or a case of unbelievable bureaucratic hardheartedness. I have received numerous letters from widows who have been told they must return a full month's social security check even though their husbands may have died on the 28th day of the month. This practice only adds to the burden of paying funeral expenses and doctor bills.

The Federal Government is cast in the role of the worst kind of Scrooge—recalling a social security check from a family grieving over the death of a loved one. To rectify this situation I am introducing a bill providing that an individual's entitlement to benefits would continue through the month of his death.

At this point I would like to insert in the RECORD the text of two letters I have received from constituents which document the real and urgent need for this legislation:

FEBRUARY 20, 1970.

DEAR MR. ST GERMAIN: Recently I have had to assist an elderly aunt in filling out various papers in connection with the death of her sister. Here were two elderly ladies who had been dependent upon Social Security pensions for support. The older sister died on the 27th of the month. When on the 3rd of the month following, her check arrived, the entire amount had to be returned to the government.

This seems quite unfair. Had she lived four more days, her sister could have retained that much needed check. There should be a change in Social Security regulations to allow a beneficiary in such a case to receive—if not the whole amount—at least a percentage of the monthly allowance for the month in which the death occurred. Does our government need money so badly that it must take from the elderly poor some substantial amount of the pension which they have earned? This—while 200 of our wealthiest pay no income tax at all—is particularly difficult to accept!

There must be many people on Social Security pensions who would appreciate any action you could take to improve this situation.

Sincerely yours,

_____.

JANUARY 26, 1972.

DEAR SIR: If you could help me in a matter of a Social Security check. As my husband died on November 28, 1971, Social Security refused to honor his Social Security check for the month of November. He had not only regular expenses for the month of November but the added expense of hiring a hospital bed for a month and buying a mattress for that bed, which he used only 5 hours, with no refund costing almost $100.

It does not seem fair to refuse to honor that check for November for the sum of $127.70.

Any assistance you could give me on this matter would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

_____.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment would be well worth the minor cost involved. It would eliminate an unexpected hardship inflicted on the families of social security recipients which they regard as a real injustice.

DIRTY DOZEN

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago another faceless group or organization called Environmental Action reared back and threw a curve under the respectable guise of antipollution and environmental control, naming their handpicked "Dirty Dozen" for defeat in the Congress.

In the June 21 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD our colleague, the Honorable EARL F. LANDGREBE, placed in the RECORD an article by Ed Zuckerman referring to this nebulous group as "bratty, radic-lib kids" and I think he effectively destroyed their credibility, et cetera.

Meanwhile, I think our colleagues should have the benefit of an editorial that appeared in Scripps-Howard publications across the Nation, including Columbus, Ohio and Washington, D.C. Further, an article appeared in the Columbus Dispatch giving further background of this outfit under the bylines of Laura Genero.

These are printed hereafter for the information of those who are truly interested in ratings by all types of organizations and they can draw up their own conclusions:

THE "DIRTY DOZEN"

An outfit calling itself "Environmental Action" has issued a list of 12 congressmen it scornfully calls the "dirty dozen."

The House members earned this epithet, according to Environmental Action, because each has a "bad environmental voting record" and a "bad record on general domestic issues."

They also were chosen because they represent "marginal" districts, meaning they may be more vulnerable to defeat than others in this year's election.

Politics is notorious for name-calling and defamatory labels. But such behavior isn't usually expected from an organization which ostensibly is dedicated to such a lofty purpose as cleaning up the environment. It is possible to disagree with a congressman without casting aspersions on his laundering habits.

For instance, the reasons cited by "Environmental Action" for placing Rep. Samuel

Devine of Columbus on this year's list, seem in most cases to have no link with the environment. EA picked Devine for voting, among other things, against food stamps for strikers, against an end-the-war amendment and for the SST. What connection is there between cleaning up the environment and food stamps for strikers or ending the war?

By appointing itself a know-all, judge-all, decide-all authority, Environmental Action not only has strayed from its avowed purpose and stooped to bad taste. It probably has reduced its own effectiveness and damaged its cause; and itself could use a little soap.

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch, June 18, 1972]

"DIRTY DOZEN" REBUT ENVIRONMENTALISTS

(By Laura Genero)

WASHINGTON.—Members of the "Dirty Dozen"—Congressmen singled out for defeat this year by a Washington based ecology group—say they were targeted because of their conservative political philosophies.

The congressmen, selected last week by Environmental Action, Inc., all face tough, marginal re-election battles.

They say their voting records have been deliberately distorted by the group to boost the chances of their ultraliberal opponents.

Rep. Roger M. Zion, R-Ind., called the Environmental Action, Inc., "irrational, irresponsible" and the "off-shoot of radical dissenters."

Zion's office investigated the lobby group two years ago when it issued its first "Dirty Dozen" purge list.

Zion said that, when his aides caught up with the organization, "they had moved and hadn't paid their rent or phone bills," and that "they weren't very responsible people."

Zion has made the organization's purge list twice in a row.

Among the criteria the group used to evaluate his "environmental voting record" was his vote on the Equal Rights Amendment for women, the Nedzi-Whalen amendment to end the war in Vietnam and his opposition to changing certain House Rules Committees procedures.

The group also charges that Zion voted for three "pork barrel" watershed projects in his district which are detrimental to the environment. The three projects, however, were not even in Zion's district, and he told The Dispatch that he did not vote on them.

New York congressmen John J. Rooney and Peter A. Peyser, who have been given good ecology marks by other environmental groups, also made the "Dirty Dozen" list. Both face primary and general election challenges this year from liberal Democrats.

On an environmental rating put out recently by the League of Conservation Voters, Rooney's environmental voting record over the past 10 years was given a high score. On a scale which rated the worst record a minus 25 and the best a plus 25, Rooney received a plus 18.

Rooney's opponent in this Tuesday's New York Democratic primary is liberal Allard K. Lowenstein. Lowenstein is national chairman of the Americans for Democratic Action, and is credited with originating the "Dump Johnson" movement in 1967.

Environmental Action charged Peyser had voted against Black Lung legislation and the Family Planning and Population Research Act of 1970.

Peyser's aid, Ted Barry, told The Dispatch that the population bill was voted on before Peyser was even elected.

He also said that Peyser voted against the first Black Lung Bill because he felt it wasn't adequate. After it had been reworked in committee, Peyser voted for the bill and several measures to strengthen it.

Barry said that whoever did the research on Peyser's record must have "only looked at the first vote and forgotten the rest."

Barry also noted that the League of Conservation Voters rated Peyser in the upper best half of Congress on ecology.

Barry said he is sure that Peyser—the only liberal on the purge list—was singled out because his opponent in 1972 will be Richard Ottinger. He said "Ottinger has been twisting arms" to get Peyser on the list.

Ottinger is the liberal Democrat who gave up the Westchester, N.Y. congressional seat Peyser now holds to run for the Senate in 1972. He was defeated by Sen. James L. Buckley, a Conservative.

Charles Piper, who researched and chose the "Dirty Dozen" for 1972, told The Dispatch that he had singled out Peyser because "some people in New York had told him" that "Peyser was the standard bearer for the Nixon Administration." He would not name the "people."

Peyser's 1971 voting record rates him as supporting the President 77 percent as compared with 68 percent for the average eastern Republican. There are five other congressmen in New York, however, with an equal or better ratings than Peyser for supporting President Nixon.

Piper also said that Ottinger was an "outstanding environmentalist" who would represent an improvement over Peyser.

He said Peyser "took" Ottinger's congressional seat. When informed that Peyser had run for the seat after it had been vacated, Piper said, "Well, he (Ottinger) wants it back."

In his analysis Piper included a survey taken in Peyser's district which indicated that 44 percent of his constituents still thought that Ottinger was their representative.

Piper, 24, a student from the University of Michigan, was placed in Environmental Action, Inc. through an intern program at the university to do field work for graduation.

As a political science major, Piper chose environment for his field paper and will submit his work at Environmental Action, Inc. for credit.

Piper returned to Michigan Wednesday to begin working for the defeat of U.S. Rep. Charles E. Chamberlain, R-Mich., one of the "Dirty Dozen."

Piper is one of the full-time staff of eight that works at Environmental Action, Inc. The current spokesman for the group is Peter Harnick, a 1970 humanities graduate of Johns Hopkins University in Maryland.

Harnick told The Dispatch that the group tries to be as "constructured" as possible. Everyone receives the same salary, regardless of duties, and there is no hierarchy. He said that they choose a spokesman by "drawing titles out of a hat" and that this year he drew "president."

When asked why such issues as women's rights, the War in Vietnam and House Rules Committee procedures were considered "environmental issues," Harnick said that they had a "very, very broad definition of the environment."

He said, "the war in Vietnam is probably the greatest ecological catastrophe to befall the world in all times."

Barnick said that Environmental Action, Inc. grew as an offshoot of the Environmental Teach-In, which sponsored Earth Week in 1970.

The "activists" stayed on after it was over, to plan further projects. They decided that merely calling attention to the environment in a few short days was not enough, Harnick said.

Environmental Action's political purge list, however, caused a minor Washington scandal in 1970. Former Ohio Congressman William Ayras discovered that it was partially financed with federal funds.

Another ecology group, Environmental Resources, Inc., had been picking up 70 percent of the rent and sharing telephone expenses for Environmental Action, Inc. Environmental Resources, however, was financed with a $250,000 federal education grant from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

As a result, the grant was canceled, Environmental Resources, Inc. changed its name, and Environmental Action, Inc. does not have tax-exempt status.

Other organizations which support Environmental Action, Inc. were named as the League of Conservation Voters, the Committee for an Effective Congress, the Environmental Policy Center and the Wilderness Society.

Piper told The Dispatch that there were more organizations working with Environmental Action, Inc., but he could not disclose their names.

When asked to explain this secrecy, Piper told The Dispatch that some of these organizations would lose funds if their contributors found out they were "engaged in purge activities."

The other congressmen named in the 1972 "Dirty Dozen" list are: Reps. Samuel L. Devine, R-Columbus; Wayne R. Aspinall, D-Colo.; Walter S. Baring, D-Nev.; Earle Cabell, D-Tex.; James J. Delaney, D-N.Y.; Earl F. Landgrebe, R-Ind.; Sherman P. Lloyd, R-Utah; and Vernon Thomson, R-Wisc.

JOINT PLATFORM PROPOSAL OF NATIONAL CHAMBER AND AFL–CIO

HON. DAVID N. HENDERSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, a very unusual thing happened at the Democratic Platform Committee meeting on June 23.

On that occasion, Arch Booth, executive vice president of the chamber of commerce, appeared to present his organization's recommendations. Although the chamber's recommendations were numerous and extensive, Mr. Booth chose to comment on only one—to emphasize its overriding importance.

He noted, too, that this recommendation has the support of George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO. He told the committee that he had visited Mr. Meany to discuss the recommendation—that Mr. Meany concurred with it and agreed that it could be presented as a joint recommendation of the two organizations.

I am sure my colleagues appreciate that it is most unusual for our largest business and labor organizations to agree on anything. When they do, it most certainly deserves our attention.

In my view, this joint statement is indeed a critical one—and most timely. It should be implemented by both parties—not merely in the interest of their candidates, but in the national interest.

I include the statement at this point in the RECORD, with the hope that my colleagues will agree with the need for putting this recommendation in effect.

The statement follows:

THE CAMPAIGN

The tragic events of recent years have created great concern among all Americans for the safety of candidates for high political office. We therefore appeal to both political parties to establish stringent security

rules for the campaigns of their candidates for the offices of President and Vice President.

The assassinations of John Kennedy, Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King—and the attempted assassination of George Wallace—are conclusive proof of the vulnerability of national leaders to the lone, isolated act of violence.

Although the vast majority of Americans are politically mature and dedicated to seeking their goals through the traditional political system, we must now face the fact that political campaigning as we have known it offers no real safeguard against that individual who, for whatever reason, would resort to violence.

Unless there is a tightening of security—with the full cooperation of the major candidates of both parties—we may see a repetition of previous tragedies that could have serious repercussions throughout the nation and threaten the survival of our election processes.

We recognize that the candidates are not likely to initiate on their own any new security guidelines. There is too great an appeal in grass roots appearances. Further, which of two opposing candiates would make the first approach—with a risk of being accused of having lost confidence in the electorate?

Accordingly, we urge the two political parties to devise their own compact—one which publicly spells out stringent new campaign security rules. We ask that such rules be made conditions for party leadership, and that they in no way be left optional to the candidate.

Only if the parties demand it can we expect the candidates to campaign in a manner that will alleviate risks to their personal safety.

We ask that both parties make this demand, not only in the interest of the candidates, themselves, but also in the national interest.

FUSION POWER—HOW SOON?

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as was so forcefully pointed out by many of our distinguished collegues on Monday, June 26, 1972, it will take some time before we can expect to have energy on line from controlled thermonuclear reactions. Those who continually state that fusion power is just around the corner speak without knowledge of the problems and the research program needed to prove the principle and then develop the systems needed to produce useful energy.

On June 28, Dr. T. Kenneth Fowler, associate director for controlled thermonuclear research at the Lawrence Livermore Laboratory in California, is presenting a paper entitled, "Fusion Power—How Soon?" I would like to quote one of his concluding paragraphs.

A prediction about the time scale for the reactor development phase probably goes beyond the credible. Based on fission experience and feasibility by 1980, it is popular to estimate commercial fusion power by the year 2000. Any number of technical and socio-economic variables can either accelerate or slow this development.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has supported the outstanding work of such dedicated scientists as Dr. Fowler. We wish them every success in this promising field of energy research.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefits of so many of our colleagues who have indicated an interest in fusion research, Dr. Fowler's excellent paper is included herein as a part of my remarks:

FUSION POWER—HOW SOON?*

(By T. K. Fowler, Associate Director for Controlled Thermonuclear Research, Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, University of California, Livermore, Calif., June 19, 1972)

I would like to begin by expressing my appreciation for this opportunity to discuss fusion power with representatives of the utilities industry. I am sure that most of you are aware of the potential of nuclear fusion as a lasting solution to our energy needs with a minimal impact on the environment. If you have followed the course of research in this field, you will recall that some early disappointments made it clear that further progress required the development of a whole new science, the physics of high temperature plasmas. Physicists the world over responded to this challenge, notably in the U.S., Russia, and Western Europe. By the late 1960's, this cooperative scientific effort had paid off with greatly improved results in the laboratory. Today, we look forward to completing the task of determining the scientific feasibility of fusion power in the late 70's and early 80's. Anticipating success, we are already thinking ahead to how engineering development might proceed beyond that. In this status report, I will try try to convey the basis for this renewed optimism, where we are, and where we think we're headed.

First let me remind you what fusion is all about. Nuclear fusion is nuclear combustion, the same kind of nuclear burning that produces energy in the sun and the stars. Our oceans are filled with deuterium, which is a form of hydrogen that burns by nuclear fusion. However, burning deuterium in a controlled way poses problems outside the realm of previous experience. The reason is that the kindling point for nuclear fusion in deuterium, as well as in other nuclear combustibles, is very, very high. It is at least 100 million degrees centigrade. Consequently, the burning fuel exerts a tremendous pressure outward.

At solid or liquid densities, this pressure is millions of atmospheres. Burning would last only briefly as the fuel explodes. Indeed, one possibility for harnessing nuclear fusion is to explode very small solid pellets of a deuterium-tritium mixture inside a large cavity capable of containing the exploding gases. Repetitive tiny explosions, perhaps a few times a second, would produce heat energy which could, for example, be converted to steam and hence to electricity in the conventional manner.

This is the idea of a new area of fusion research in which the objective is to use laser beams to ignite D–T pellets. When this was first considered some years ago, it appeared that the laser pulse required was impractical, some 100 million joules in a very short time. According to more recent theories, this requirement might be cut a thousand-fold. Even so, only now are we on the threshold of building lasers with beam qualities and power sufficient to begin experiments to test the scientific validity of this theory. To date, with lasers in the present 100 to 200 joule range, it has been possible to generate only weak fusion reactions that cannot yet be described as explosions. Therefore, exciting as this concept is scientifically, we must expect that a period of extensive experimentation will be required before we can assess its practical potential with the degree of confidence that now applies to the fusion approaches which I shall discuss here. These approaches, about which we know a great deal after two decades of research, employ strong magnetic fields to manipulate the burning fuel.

Fusion reactor concepts using magnetic fields have the objective of producing slow, relatively continuous nuclear burning. In that case, in order that the walls of the reactor vessel be able to withstand the pressure at the very high temperatures required, the fuel must be in the form of a gas at a very low density. This tenuous gas would be instantly cooled below the fusion kindling temperature if it should contact air or the walls of the vessel. It will therefore be necessary to evacuate a fusion reactor vessel and to somehow isolate the hot fuel gas away from the walls of the vessel. In some fusion experiments the vacuum requirements are formidable and have required new techniques that pushed back the frontiers of vacuum technology.

By far the most challenging problem, however, has been that of isolating the hot fuel away from the walls. To accomplish this, we have taken advantage of the fact that a gas at fusion temperatures is fully ionized. That is, the hot gas atoms smash into each other hard enough to dissociate into free electrons and atomic ions (actually fully stripped nuclei). A gas in this ionized state is called a plasma. Because the free electrons and ions carry electric currents, a plasma responds to magnetic forces. Thus for two decades fusion research has concentrated on the use of magnetic fields to confine a blob of hot plasma suspended in space and isolated from its surroundings.

This has proved to be a tough problem requiring a subtle understanding of the properties of high temperature plasmas. While the magnetic confinement of the plasma need not be perfect, the allowed leakage must satisfy stiff requirements. In order to obtain a net yield of energy in a fusion reactor, a given quantity of hot plasma fuel would have to be confined in its "magnetic bottle" long enough so that the total fusion energy produced by nuclear reactions is greater than the energy required to heat that much plasma to its kindling point. The actual confinement time needed depends on the fusion reaction rate. Nuclear reactions occur only if atomic fuel ions collide with each other. The probability of collisions, and hence the fusion reaction rate, increases as the square of the plasma density, whereas the energy required to heat the plasma to its kindling temperature is simply proportional to the density. It follows that the required plasma confinement time is less the higher the plasma density. That is, it is the product of the density and the confinement time that matters. At fusion temperatures and at the limit of plasma pressures that the walls and the magnetic field can withstand, the maximum allowable density is some 10 thousand times less than the density of air in this room. By ordinary standards, the chamber would be virtually empty. Despite the large energy release per nuclear event, at these rarefied densities the fusion reaction rate is so low that the plasma confinement time must be about a tenth of a second (or a little more or less depending on the design). This is a long time. In a tenth of a second, an individual hot ion in the plasma would travel across the reactor vessel many thousands of times. The atomic collisions themselves lead to some leakage by diffusion. Leakage by collisional diffusion represents the best that can be achieved by magnetic confinement. This is the theoretical ideal. Collisional leakage can be calculated and is known to be tolerable for several magnetic designs.

From the beginning the problem was that magnetically confined plasmas were found to leak faster than this ideal rate. Finding out

---

*Work performed under the auspices of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. Prepared for presentation at the American Public Power Association's 29th Annual Conference, June 26–28, 1972, San Francisco, Calif.

the reasons why and devising solutions and building ever more technically challenging experiments to test these ideas has been the stuff of fusion research ever since.

Today, research along three different paths has produced magnetic configurations in which plasma confinement has approached the theoretical ideal within the technical limitations of the facilities. These are sketched in Slide 1 (Slides are not reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD), along with a conceptual laser-fusion device. The Tokamak, in the left hand corner, was developed by the Russians. It has achieved the largest product of plasma density and confinement time of any of the magnetic confinement approaches to date, though the ion temperature is as yet an order of magnitude too low and increasing it will call for new methods of heating the plasma. Following the Russian success, several Tokamak experiments are in progress or are being built in this country. The largest, called PLT, is being built at Princeton University, to be completed around 1975. The Mirror Machine, in the upper right corner, has largely been developed at Livermore, and the Theta Pinch at Los Alamos. Each of these has produced hotter plasmas than the Tokamak, but not as good confinement as yet, though in each case confinement approached the theoretical ideal within the limitation of the respective experiments.

Each of these three magnetic designs has shown sufficient promise to warrant active pursuit now and, barring failures along the way, continuation to a complete determination of its scientific feasibility as a fusion reactor concept. Apropos of the general theme of this session, I might digress to comment on why it is vitally important to pursue many exploratory, long-term approaches in the energy field, both within and outside of fusion research. The point, of course, is simply that the risk is high and we cannot afford to fail. It is our experience, and yours no doubt, that when we approach any new technology at the frontier of current knowledge and technical capability, we cannot be sure of success. We often follow several promising alternative routes in the hope that one will succeed, or if more than one succeeds, some will be superior. When one limits himself to too few alternatives, he may fail, and in so doing lose time and waste money. Moreover, just as we presently generate electricity from diverse resources, there may be no single ultimate solution to the energy problem. There may well be a continuing role for all of the alternatives we are considering, each with its special attributes.

Let me turn now to the question of the time scale to determine scientific feasibility. In order to help you assess this for yourselves, I would like to discuss in more detail the progress and expectations for one of the magnetic confinement approaches. For this purpose I have chosen the one I know best, the Magnetic Mirror approach at Livermore.

(Slide 2.) What is plotted here is the history of improvement in our 2X Magnetic Mirror experiment as a series of problems was successively encountered and solved. In this experiment a hot deuterium plasma is created and then one measures the density as a function of time as the plasma leaks out. The vertical scale is density and the horizontal scale is time. A steep curve means the plasma is leaking rapidly. A less steep curve means that some unwanted cause of leakage has been eliminated. The top curve is the theoretical ideal for this machine.

In the simplest form of the mirror machine, a ball of plasma is confined between two regions of strong magnetic field at the ends. The field strength falls off sideways. Perfectly placed, the plasma would stay put, but this is not a stable configuration; any tiny disturbance makes the plasma fall sideways toward the weaker field. It is this behavior that accounts for the rapid leakage shown by the lower, steepest curve on the slide corresponding to operation of 2X as a simple magnetic mirror.

The next higher curve shows the improvement in leakage when additional magnetic windings are energized to create what we call a magnetic well configuration. As the name implies, in a magnetic well the magnetic field strength increases outward in every direction away from a central region where the plasma is confined. Because the plasma would encounter a stronger field whichever way it moves, this configuration eliminates the grossly unstable behavior characteristic of the simple magnetic mirror. This discovery in the early 1960's was one of the milestones of fusion research.

Nonetheless, when the magnetic well principle was first applied to high density plasmas in the 2X experiment through the confinement of the plasma greatly improved, still confinement fell short of the theoretical ideal, as you can see from the curve labeled 1968. The difficulty was traced to a milder form of plasma instability in which the plasma as a whole stays put but spontaneously generated turbulence in the plasma enhances its leakage by diffusion over the theoretical rate. The principal source of this turbulence was traced to cold impurity gases associated with the vacuum gear and certain aspects of the particular way in which the hot plasma was generated in the 2X experiment. By 1970, these defects had largely been remedied with a further improvement in the confinement as indicated in the slide. But still the confinement was somewhat short of the theoretical ideal given by the uppermost curve.

Thats the way things stood when it was decided to rebuild the 2X magnet coil to incorporate further improvements. That was finished over a year ago and much of the time since has been spent in adapting the various measuring instruments to the new facility. At this time, a discrepancy from the ideal still remains, but with the help of important theoretical advances in the meantime we think that at last we may know enough to come close to the theoretical ideal in 2X.

Meanwhile a quite different question is being addressed in another mirror experiment at Livermore. In a working mirror reactor operating continuously, the plasma must be created in a quite different way. The experiment that we actually propose to scale up to a Mirror Reactor is called Baseball II.

(Slide 3.) The name refers to the magnet winding that is shaped like the seam of a baseball. This experiment has been operating only a few months. Like the new version of 2X, Baseball II is also a second experiment in a series. The Baseball II magnet winding is a superconductor and represents advanced technology in the superconducting field. Weighing 13 tons and being 6 feet in diameter, it has a unique combination of high field strength (15 kilogauss or more at the center) and large size. In Baseball II, the plasma is created and maintained by continuous injection of beams of energetic neutral atoms. These energetic neutral beams are generated by first accelerating ions and then passing them through a gas cell where the ions capture electrons. This has been a difficult development job, but the payoff will be great, not only for Mirror Machines but also for Tokamaks and any other continuously operating magnetic fusion device. These energetic neutral atoms can freely penetrate the magnetic field. When they collide with the plasma they become ionized again, whereupon the field traps them.

The main objective of the Baseball II experiment is to demonstrate the use of neutral beams to build up a high density plasma to achieve a steady state operation. In the past this buildup process, too, was fraught with instability problems. Based on what we'd learned in the earlier Baseball I, the Baseball II experiment was expected to overcome all that and, though results are preliminary, so far it has validated its design principles. When a second neutral beam is added Baseball II should be capable of reaching plasma densities somewhat short of those in 2X but adequate to determine whether the plasma leakage from a mirror machine does or does not exceed the theoretical ideal, in this case in steady state operation.

In a sense, if all that comes to pass, the most pressing scientific questions about the magnetic mirror approach now known to us will have been answered, conceivably in a year or two. However, we could not yet be satisfied that the scientific feasibility of the mirror approach had been proved. Though the plasma density and temperature in 2X and Baseball II would be high enough so that the results would be relevant to the fusion problem, at best they would fall substantially short of those required for nuclear burning. For that, an experiment of larger and stronger magnetic field would be required. A survey of the other leading lines of magnetic confinement research would disclose a similar situation. In the Theta Pinch line, the Los Alamos Scyllac experiment to be completed next year is potentially a precursor to a large scientific feasibility experiment. Similarly the Orkmak experiment at Oak Ridge, which is now in operation, and the PLT about to be built at Princeton could be the precursors to a Tokamak feasibility experiment. Taking into account the development necessary before embarking on construction of a larger superconducting magnet, the next larger Mirror experiment probably could not be completed before the late 70's. The next Theta Pinch and Tokamak would require similar construction times.

It is on this basis that we estimate that scientific feasibility might be demonstrated by the late 1970's or early 1980's. However, achieving that level of scientific confidence which a judgment about feasibility implies is actually a continuous process. As I have indicated, a great deal more will be known about magnetic mirror feasibility after another year or so of experimentation on Baseball II and 2X, and the same is true of the other fusion approaches. Moreover, what we call the scientific feasibility experiments—that next generation of larger facilities I mentioned—will themselves mark a profound transition. As my description of mirror research illustrates, up to now fusion experiments were built either to explore the unknown or, more recently, to test some new design feature in which there is theoretical confidence. By contrast the large feasibility experiments will mainly be based on demonstrated successes in the present generation of experiments. Otherwise they would not be built.

Beyond scientific feasibility is the reactor development phase. Present thinking is based on D–T fuel, that is, a mixture of deuterium and tritium. This fuel mixture has the highest reaction rate and the lowests kindling temperature. However, it requires breeding of tritium, which is radioactive and does not occur in nature. Tritium can be bred by neutron bombardment of lithium, which is naturally abundant. A schematic diagram of the arrangement is shown in Slide 4. As you see the lithium is introduced as a "blanket" surrounding the plasma. Most of the energy from D-T reactions appears in the neutrons. This energy is dumped into the blanket as heat which in turn produces steam and hence electricity.

At a later stage of fusion development, or possibly concurrently, D-D reactors burning pure deuterium will be developed. These will require no external tritium breeding, which removes an important constraint on the blanket. The D-D reaction products are

T and ^{3}He. These are also fuel and will partially react before escaping from the plasma. Unburned T and ^{3}He can be reinjected to improve the fractional burnup. By increasing the operating temperature and reinjecting only the ^{3}He, the D-D cycle can operate such that D^{3}He reactions contribute most of the output power with as little as 10% of the output being from D-D neutrons (and tritium as a byproduct). With efficient direct conversion of the energy of the charged D^{3}He reaction products to electricity, overall system efficiencies as high as 75% appear to be possible.

A prediction about the time scale for the reactor development phase probably goes beyond the credible. Based on fission experience and feasibility by 1980, it is popular to estimate commercial fusion power by the year 2000. Any number of technical and socio-economic variables can either accelerate or slow this development.

Personally, I very much hope that the country will want to accelerate the advent of fusion power because I think we cannot afford to deny ourselves the possibilities that fusion offers. Let me conclude, then, by reminding you of some of the characteristics to be expected of a fusion power reactor.

(Slide 5.) Perhaps these items speak for themselves. The third item refers to neutron activation of the walls. In a fusion reactor the resulting afterheat is so low that it is virtually unaffected by a loss of coolant accident. Item 3 also refers to the inventory of volatile radioactive material, which is probably the most important factor in engineering safeguards. For a fusion reactor this is the tritium inventory which represents a biological hazard six orders of magnitude lower than that of the iodine-131 in a fission reactor at the same power. In short, a fusion reactor should be a safe system offering the utilities industry new options in facing environmental challenges of tomorrow.

REVENUE SHARING

HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, on June 22 the House passed the gentleman from Arkansas, WILBUR MILLS' revenue sharing bill. It was a different proposal than the President had asked Congress to enact, but the administration supported it. The bill now lies in the Senate. If enacted into law as it passed the House, the Revenue Sharing Act will distribute $29.5 billion among the States, counties, townships, cities, and villages in the next 5 years. This will be in addition to Federal assistance already flowing to State and local governments which presently total about $37 billion annually.

The State governments would share $1.8 billion in 1972 and the first half of 1973. Thereafter the amount to the States would increase from year to year until in 1976 they would receive $3 billion.

What each State will receive would be controlled by a two-factor formula, one-half according to the State's tax effort to increase its own revenues and one-half according to the State's receipts from State individual income taxes. In other words, the Federal Treasury will reward those States which increase their State income taxes and other tax revenues. The more they raise the more they receive from the Government.

The money flowing to county areas within a State will be distributed on the same basis as the funds going to the State government, that is, one-half according to the State's tax effort and one-half according to the State income tax receipts. Once there, however, it will be divided between the county government and the local units on a different formula. This formula will be three-factored: Population, urbanization and poverty. After the first 18 months, a State may substitute local tax effort for the population formula, and it may weigh the three factors other than equally so as to further favor its urban areas over its rural areas, or its poor areas over the well-to-do.

Funds flowing to State governments go with no strings attached and can be used by the State as its legislature directs. Funds to counties and other local units, however, are restricted as to their use. They can be used only for public safety, environmental protection and public transportation. They cannot be used for education or welfare, two of the most financially burdensome functions of local government.

Public safety would include law enforcement, fire protection, and building code enforcement. Street lights and traffic control certainly would fall within this category. Environmental protection would include sewage disposal, sanitation, air pollution abatement, trash and garbage collection, solid waste disposal, and the like. Public transportation would include transit systems, which no municipality in the Fourth Congressional District operates, and it would also include street maintenance.

Local units could also use shared revenue for capital expenditures for sewage collection and treatment, refuse disposal systems and street construction.

County governments could use the money only for the categories allowed townships and municipalities.

The distribution formula favors metropolitan areas over smaller cities, and greatly favors cities and villages over townships.

We who live in small cities and in rural America are strikingly short-changed. On a population basis, the county government and local government and local governments in Wayne County, Mich., would receive $20.29 per capita. But the counties and local governments of our fourth district would receive little more than half as much. Berrien would receive $12.61; Branch, $12.15; Cass, $11.93; Hillsdale, $12.17; Lenawee, $11.52; St. Joseph, $11.39; Van Buren, $12.09. Because two townships of Calhoun County are now in the congressional district, I include the comparable per capita figure for that county: $10.85.

Allegan County, which has been in the fourth district but now is the ninth, will receive $12.17.

The State government in Michigan will receive only $10.05 per capita of State population, while 12 other States will receive more. New York State will receive $17.23 and Hawaii, Wisconsin, the District of Columbia, Delaware, Minnesota, Massachusetts, Maryland, Vermont, California, Alaska, and Oregon each will receive more per capita than Michigan.

In looking at the purposes for which counties, cities, villages, and townships may use the money, I was immediately struck by the fact that Federal programs already in existence provide subsidies for many of the same functions. The Law Enforcement Assistance Act materially aids county and local law enforcement. We already have several Federal programs assisting the construction of sewage collection and treatment works and an increasing list of environmental programs to assist both the States and local communities. And the proceeds of the Federal gasoline tax have been aiding counties in their county road construction for many years. So it is argued that revenue sharing is only more of the same with fewer strings attached. Instead of the Federal assistance being $37 billion a year it will be $42 billion.

All of this might seem reasonable enough if we had any revenue to share. But the Federal Government has spent in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, alone $32.2 billion more than it took in. Next year the comparable deficit is estimated to be $37.8 billion. The Government debt now stands close to $450 billion and it will have to be increased in October. So when we add new governmental programs or increase those already in existence we have to borrow every penny required to carry them out. We have no revenue to share. We have only a deficit.

There was a time in history when the Government actually had surpluses on hand and no national debt to retire. That happy day occurred back in 1836, and Congress distributed the surplus among the States on certificates of deposit. The certificates never had been called. Michigan's determination to enter the Union as a State was strengthened by the fact that if the State were admitted in time it could share in that revenue distribution. A second time when there appeared to be revenue to share was in the 1880's, when the only Government debt outstanding was some bonds not callable, revenue from customs, and excises on liquor and tobacco coming in so fast that Congress could find no need for it. So another distribution was planned; but, alas, along came a depression and the surplus soon evaporated. Our plight today is that we have a Government debt larger than the debts of all the other governments in the world combined.

The first objection to the revenue sharing bill, therefore, is that we do not have any revenues to share, and in spite of all the arguments for priorities and the like, this fact still remains.

A second objection, in my opinion, is the bill's bold attempt to dictate State tax structures. Its purpose is to induce every State to lean primarily on a State income tax upon individuals. The Internal Revenue Service will even collect a State's income tax for it, at Federal expense, and remit the proceeds to the

State. I recall how strongly most States opposed this concept of Federal collection of their taxes when I sat as a member of an interstate tax subcommittee in 1967. The revenue sharing bill contains incentives to persuade a State not only to enact a State income tax system but to increase its reliance on that form of taxation. One purpose, of course, is to move States away from property taxation. In Michigan, though, we have no State property tax. Our property taxes are levied only by local units, municipalities and school districts—most of it for school purposes. The Revenue Sharing Act precludes any property tax relief for school districts since it does not include them among the recipients of its bounty. And if my computations are correct it will afford little relief to municipal property taxation, less than 3 mills in our part of Michigan. There is nothing in the bill to assure any reduction in property tax by local units. In fact its revenues are so meager that in many cases the likelihood will be no reduction of property tax by local units. All of the shared revenue will be consumed in increased costs.

A third objection to the revenue sharing bill lies in the violence it does to the federal system. If the concept is extended and grows, the States will truly become mere administrative subdivisions of a central government, for they may become utterly dependent upon the Government for their revenues. As the share of Federal revenue increases, there will be increasing resistance to State and local generation of revenues. A strong argument for revenue sharing is that in turning revenue back to the States and cities with few if any strings attached, we can dismantle the Federal bureaucracy. And I am all for that. But I favor strong and healthy State and local governments, not helpless and dependent ones. The way to assure that is to return to the States adequate sources of taxation. It is the exact opposite of what we do here—take all tax sources into the Federal Government and dole back money to States and local units.

Fourth, one of the soundest principles of political accountability is that a level of government should have the responsibility of raising what it spends. The separation of the taxing and spending power will wreak havoc. The Congress will be called upon to tax, the States and cities will spend, under the revenue sharing concept.

It will be much different under existing Federal assistance programs because, under them, Congress retains control of how the money may be spent. The great risk in revenue sharing will be that after the States and cities succeed in transferring their revenue burdens to the Congress and become mostly or totally dependent on Federal tax sources, Congress will, in political self-defense, again seize control over how the revenue it raises for the States shall be expended. Then the States will truly be reduced to administrative subdivisions.

For these reasons I thought it better public policy to vote against the revenue sharing bill.

FDA NOT ACTING IN CONSUMERS' INTEREST

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, the Food and Drug Administration has repeatedly ignored or subverted laws designed to protect the consuming public. Because of this, many rightly question the need to continue this agency as it is presently organized.

FDA's most recent announcement to indefinitely delay withdrawal from animal feed a known cancer-causing agent, diethylstilbestrol—DES, is another in a series of incidents which endanger the public and undermine our food and drug laws.

Previously, this agency has been reluctant to move against the hazards of cyclamates, saccharin, mercury, DDT, and other toxic chemicals.

Over two decades ago, eminent medical authorities warned the former Select Committee To Investigate the Use of Chemicals in Foods and Cosmetics, which I had the honor to chair, that even a single dose of a carcinogenic material can result in the development of cancer in an individual years later. This unique delayed effect of these chemical substances sets them entirely apart from the usual toxic agents.

Based on this testimony, and other supporting evidence, the Congress in 1958 passed the so-called Delaney anticancer amendment. This legislation prohibits the use in food of any additive known to cause cancer in man or animal.

Scientific experts continue to testify in support of this legislation. No one at this time can tell how much or how little of a carcinogen would be required to produce cancer in any human being, or how long it would take the cancer to develop.

DES is widely used to increase the body weight and lower feed requirements for animals slaughtered for human consumption. It is also a highly toxic chemical. This drug has been shown to cause cancer in numerous species of animals, and recent evidence strongly indicates it is a possible cause of cancer in second generation humans.

For some time, residues of this substance have been found in edible animal tissue, despite repeated assurances from the FDA that their controls would prevent this from happening.

Last year more stringent regulations were issued by this agency, yet DES residues have increased nearly fourfold.

Rather than placing an immediate ban on this extremely hazardous drug, the FDA says more time is needed to study all the facts. In the meantime, the consuming public will continue to be exposed to this toxic chemical.

This is unconscionable. The protection of the consuming public is paramount. If the FDA will not concern itself with protecting the public from hazardous substances, Congress must give immediate attention to setting up an agency that will.

"O CONGRESS"

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, this is the gentleman from Illinois, ABNER MIKVA's superb review of the gentleman from Michigan, DONALD RIEGLE's book, "O Congress":

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 28, 1972]

UNDERWATER PART OF THE CONGRESSIONAL ICEBERG

("O Congress," By Donald Riegle with Trevor Armbrister—Reviewed by ABNER J. MIKVA, *Democratic congressman from Illinois*).

It takes one to know one, and that's what gives Rep. Don Riegle's book, "O Congress," its validity as an intensely personal anatomy of a congressman.

The book is not a primer for what makes the institution tick, but if you want to know how it feels to be a congressman, "O Congress" provides some first-rate clues in a highly readable context.

The format is a diary of one year in Don Riegle's congressional and personal life, from April 1971 until this March. For much of that time, Rep. McCloskey of California was trying to challenge President Nixon for the Republican presidential nomination. Don Riegle was McCloskey's closest ally, and much of the book is about "the insurgency." But it also describes another, more personal insurgency and explains just how difficult it is to be a congressman who does not like the direction in which his party or his country is headed. That difficulty begins at the beginning of the diary when Riegle finds that he could not get the cystic fibrosis poster child an appointment with the President. He had to leave it to someone with more orthodox views.

Don Riegle has spent his share of time in exile from the Republican Party and the congressional establishment in his three terms as a representative from Michigan. This book hardly will be his passport back inside. He spares little detail in relating the everyday conversation and trivia that members of Congress exchange. Some people will find that fascinating, because they like to know which congressmen still have flat-top haircuts, for example. Others will find those parts of the book less than surprising, because if there is one thing "O Congress" does, it shows that congressmen are no more and no less human, no better and no worse than the people they represent.

In any event, it is obvious that Riegle has little use for the "fraternity" rules which determine who has the power and who has the influence in Congress. By not giving notice that he wasn't going to play by those rules, he undoubtedly has sacrificed some of his own impact in Congress. It may be more than a little difficult for Riegle to have an intimate conversation with any of his colleagues.

If the book reveals anything meaningful, it is the personal pressures on the successful politican—the one who runs for public office and wins. Don Riegle's "diary" entries poignantly reveal the tremendous strain on family life which underlies the high divorce rate among public officeholders. His recounting of his conversations with his children after his separation will make even the most anti-Riegle congressman sympathetically nod.

"O Congress" raises up the underwater piece of the iceberg—the always happy, always friendly officeholder who pays the piper with his personal relationships. His family

are the first victims, then his friends, and frequently his creditors.

The obvious question is that if it hurts so much why do they do it? "O Congress" takes the reader along on the roller coaster that is public life in America. Because it is in diary form and because Don Riegle is a candid man you can get an apt and accurate description of how a congressman can be up one day and wow them, and down the next day and bomb; of how he can be on cloud nine when he gets a standing ovation and beyond despair when his best supporter tells him he has developed political halitosis. Throughout it all, the reader can sense the guilty conscience of those uneasy riders who ask so much of their family and friends that the cords frequently snap.

The crueler question is not whether people know, but whether they care about a congressman's problems. Since there is never any shortage of candidates willing to take the ego trip, the voter takes a pretty hard-nosed view about his politicians. Since nobody put a gun at their heads and forced them to run he expects successful candidates to survive without sympathy. If the heat caused by broken personal relationships is too much, then it is time to get out of the political kitchen.

Don Riegle delivers the cruelest cut of all to himself and his colleagues on the nastiest question of all: Does any of it make any difference? The Republican "insurgency" that he and McCloskey are leading—how many people even know that it's going on and how will it affect the presidential election? The traumas and climaxes of legislative action and inaction on the war—will it make a difference? The whole that is Congress—is it the action arena? Or is it a ship of fools where everybody plays roles and adopts poses that have nothing to do with the real country where the other 210 million Americans live?

What a terrible question to ask.

CELESTINO MATTA-DUENO

HON. JORGE L. CÓRDOVA

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. CÓRDOVA. Mr. Speaker, thousands of families in the rural areas of Puerto Rico would join me in paying tribute to Mr. Celestino Matta-Dueno, who retired on March 31 after a long and distinguished career as Director of the Farmers Home Administration for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

This is the rural credit service of the Department of Agriculture. Under Mr. Matta-Dueno's guidance it has become a tremendous force for better living conditions in the rural provinces of Puerto Rico, as it has throughout the rural United States.

Largely because of the hard work and leadership of Mr. Matta-Dueno, FHA is one of the finest public service organizations in Puerto Rico. Nevertheless, the many who have benefited from his services regret that he is no longer in an active role. They honor him for his dedication and accomplishments in their behalf.

For 31 years, Mr. Matta-Dueno has been directly involved in improving conditions for the small family farmer. He also has taken a leading part in the development of housing credit and community facility credit now extended to the nonfarm rural population through the Farmers Home Administration.

Mr. Matta-Dueno came to FHA's predecessor agency, the Farm Security Administration, as a farm program specialist in 1941 after graduation from the University of Puerto Rico and 4 years of work as an instructor in vocational agriculture. In 1947, when the agency was reorganized as the Farmers Home Administration, he was named Director of the Farm Production Loan Division for Puerto Rico. A year later he became chief of all FHA program operations in Puerto Rico. In 1961 he assumed the state directorship for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and has held that position for the past 11 years.

Twice in his terms of service he received the Superior Service Award of the Department of Agriculture, a record that very few have achieved.

On the first of these occasions, in 1957, he was honored for his leadership in adapting the FHA program to a Spanish-language basis for serving the people of Puerto Rico, and conducting the programs in such a way that a revolutionary improvement was brought about in the fortunes of many rural families.

Farm families in the hills and obscure rural districts, whose living conditions were sadly substandard and whose practices and resources in agriculture were antiquated, found the credit, training, and counsel they needed for a new beginning, in the FHA supervised credit program as carried out under Mr. Matta-Dueno's direction. A familiar figure, widely known, and respected through the rural districts, he was the principal architect of a FHA field force that was able and willing to work with the people in their fields and in their homes. By Mr. Matta-Dueno's example, the Farmers Home Administration in Puerto Rico is the extreme opposite of an office-bound bureaucracy; and, I have observed, so it is today throughout the rural United States under the fine national leadership of Administrator James V. Smith.

The second of Mr. Matta-Dueno's Superior Service Awards was conferred last year. He was honored for the continuing expansion and improvement of FHA services in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands during his work as state director since 1961.

Of all the so-called state jurisdictions in the FHA organization, our islands rank at the top in maximum value delivered to the people, to the community, and to the common public interest.

Credit services through the agency in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands increased fivefold, from $3 million to $15 million a year, between 1960 and 1970, and rose to the level of $22 million in fiscal 1971. Beyond the $9.5 million now outstanding through 2,500 loans to enable small farm families to own or improve the operation of their land, FHA has developed new programs for upgrading rural housing and community facilities, and brought them to a high level of value over the past decade.

Housing credit of $334,000 was extended to exactly 65 families in 1960. Last year, 1,800 families in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands were served with nearly $19 million in credit to finance modernized, adequate housing for families of low or modest income in the rural towns and countryside.

In directing the growth of this program, Mr. Matta-Dueno has worked with housing specialists to design a serviceable modern home adequate for a family in the Puerto Rico climate. This cement block home has become a standard for efficient construction at reasonable cost. It has supplanted thousands of frame huts with thatched or tin roofs which once were the common standard for rural housing in Puerto Rico.

Farmers Home Administration loan and grant financing to plan and build rural community water and waste disposal systems was introduced during the 1960's. This program has led to modernization of services in nearly 100 communities that previously relied on much more primitive facilities.

In all, Mr. Matta-Dueno bears the responsibility for over 56,000 loans and grants with a value above $150 million.

Mr. Matta-Dueno's administration has been marked by excellent and highly productive cooperation with every level of government in Puerto Rico from government to village. He has chaired an intergovernmental committee for this purpose. He also has made his mark as an advocate of better services for rural people by persuading health clinics, banks, and many other lines of business and public institutions to expand their facilities in the small towns.

In all respects the system for delivering credit, personal service and the ways and means of progress in rural Puerto Rico, as developed under Mr. Matta-Dueno's direction, has been a fine exhibit to the world for the United States.

Representatives from many countries, especially in underdeveloped areas of the world, have studied the workings of the Farmers Home Administration in Puerto Rico. Mr. Matta-Dueno has been loaned as consultant to other Latin American countries that seek to improve their rural credit systems along lines of the Farmers Home Administration. His programs in Puerto Rico also have pointed the way to better service for Spanish-speaking citizens in various parts of the continental United States.

As he retires to private life, we hope and expect that his counsel still can be called upon, for we know his devotion to a better chance, a better life for the rural people of Puerto Rico.

We commend Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz, and Administrator James V. Smith of the Farmers Home Administration, on the choice of Dr. Manuel Soldevila as successor to Mr. Matta-Dueno. Dr. Soldevila also is a product of our University of Puerto Rico. He comes to FHA after outstanding service as a field administrator of agricultural experiment work in Puerto Rico. We are confident of his ability to carry on and continue the development of Farmers Home Administration programs, and to achieve the ever greater goals of service that are set by this fine agency.

CIA DOES NOT SMUGGLE OPIUM

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, once again there has been an upsurge in charges alleging direct CIA involvement in drug traffic in Southeast Asia. These allegations have proven false in the past. Last year I personally looked into similar charges and I am satisfied myself that they were without substance. Moreover, in April 1971, Mr. Richard Helms, Director of Central Intelligence, made a public categorical denial of Agency involvement in drug traffic before the American Society of Newspaper Editors. He has personally reaffirmed this denial to me. What the facts actually demonstrated was that the CIA is cooperating closely with other Government agencies in a concerted effort to curb the world drug traffic. The efforts of these U.S. agencies are designed to persuade countries, which for centuries have accepted the growth or local consumption of illicit drugs, to take stringent steps against such practices. They are also cooperating to eliminate the flow of these drugs into the United States.

Most recently, Mr. Alfred McCoy, a graduate student who is about to publish a book on the drug traffic in Southeast Asia, has made the same charges against the CIA. In early June, he aired his charges before a Senate subcommittee and received considerable publicity. Immediately after Mr. McCoy's testimony, Mr. Nelson Gross, senior adviser to the Secretary of State and Coordinator for International Narcotics Matters, publicly and in detail refuted Mr. McCoy's charges. I regret that these allegations have been given further publicity in a statement by a Member of this body when he published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 27, a letter he has directed to Mr. Helms, requesting an investigation of the allegations made by Mr. McCoy.

Mr. Speaker, Director Helms' denial of charges that CIA has been involved in the drug traffic has been confirmed by other senior U.S. Government officials. There has been no substance to the charges that have been leveled and it is most regrettable that the CIA must be the continual target of a tactic which serves to undermine positive efforts that are being taken under difficult circumstances to curb drug trafficking. Those few who promote false accusations to the contrary undermine the good work that is being done and the personal integrity of high officials of our Government. I can assure the Members of this body and all American citizens that our Government is committed 100 percent to solving the drug problem.

Mr. Speaker, while it is unfortunate that these old charges have been publicly aired again, I believe that Mr. Helms' letter of June 28 on this subject should also be included in the RECORD:

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
June 28, 1972.

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

DEAR MR. ASPIN: The Congressional Record of June 27, 1972, carries a letter addressed to me by you announcing your release of "substantial new evidence that indicates U.S. pilots flying CIA operated helicopters have been smuggling opium inside Laos."

I have yet to receive your letter. Pending its receipt, however, I shall begin a thorough investigation of this alleged "new evidence" and will advise you in due course of the results. In this connection, I call to your attention the testimony of Mr. Nelson Gross, Senior Advisor to the Secretary of State and Coordinator for International Narcotics Matters, before the Congressional Inquiry Regarding International Narcotics Traffic on June 9, 1972. He there quoted the Air America Managing Director's statement that Mr. Alfred McCoy's allegation before the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee that Air America aircraft have been transporting opium in Northern Laos on a regular basis is "utterly and absolutely false."

In the interim, I wish to reiterate strongly what I have said publicly to the America Society of Newspaper Editors:

"There is the arrant nonsense that the Central Intelligence Agency is somehow involved in the world drug traffic. We are not. As fathers, we are as concerned about the lives of our children and grandchildren as are all of you. As an Agency, in fact, we are heavily engaged in tracing the foreign roots of the drug traffic for the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs. We hope we are helping with a solution; we know we are not contributing to the problem."

In addition, you will have no doubt noticed in the Congressional Record of June 2, 1971, that Congressman Charles Gubser cited a letter from Mr. John Ingersoll, Director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, attesting to the fact that this Agency has taken a great number of steps against the narcotics trade. Further, we have issued the strongest instructions, and have most vigorously enforced them, to prohibit any inadvertent use of CIA facilities by narcotics smugglers.

In the light of these well-established positions, we find it disappointing to be subjected to the type of public allegation represented by graduate student McCoy's assertions of "new evidence," the innuendo in which can only dishearten CIA personnel of honor and integrity working against this nefarious trade.

I have taken the liberty of sending a copy of this letter to Congressman Gubser because of his interest in these matters.

Sincerely,

RICHARD HELMS, *Director.*

RETIREMENT OF GEORGE ROBINSON

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in paying special tribute to my friend George Robinson on the occasion of his retirement as an employee of the House of Representatives.

Over all the years that I have known George, I can truthfuly say that I have known few people who have been more conscientious or dedicated in the performance of their duties than my friend George Robinson. He has devoted much of his life to the House of Representatives and has always carried out his duties in a willing and cheerful manner.

While I personally hate to see him retire, I fully recognize that after so many years of faithful service, he certainly deserves some rest and relaxation. He has my best wishes for a truly rewarding retirement.

NEW VA HOSPITAL IN COLUMBIA, MO.

HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to report that a 460-bed, $19-million Veterans' Administration hospital was opened in Columbia, Mo., on June 16, 1972. This gives the American people a network of 167 hospitals from coast to coast with which to treat America's heroes. It is to our veterans that we owe the final debt for America's greatness, and there is no better way to show our gratitude than by making certain former military women and men are given the finest in medical care and treatment.

President Nixon noted the dedication of the new Columbia hospital in a special message to the people of Missouri, saying, in part:

> Its opening symbolizes the strong and continuing commitment of this Administration to making the best possible medical care available to every eligible veteran.

He said that meeting their medical need "is one of our highest national priorities."

In his talk at the dedication, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs Donald E. Johnson noted that America is spending more money and caring for more veterans with better treatment than ever before in history.

I was privileged to participate in the stirring dedicatory ceremony, and it made one feel proud and good to observe the modern building, the latest equipment, and compassionate and skilled employees ready to help so many of our former service personnel.

Because the new hospital represents so much for so many, I am most pleased to offer the President's message and Administrator Johnson's talk for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE DONALD E. JOHNSON, ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL, COLUMBIA, MO., JUNE 16, 1972

Dr. Fitzgerald . . . Congressmen Randal, Ichord, Hall and Hungate . . . Secretary and Mrs. Satoh . . . Mayor Hobart . . . members of the Missouri State Legislature . . . Dr. Mayer . . . Dr. Ellis . . . Reverend Clergy . . .

representatives of America's Armed Forces and national veterans organizations . . . distinguished guests, which all in this audience are . . . and my VA associates: We are met this morning to mark the formal opening of a magnificent, new addition to the Veterans Administration hospital system . . . the nation's largest as well as finest hospital system . . . I am proud to say.

And we are met to dedicate this 460-bed hospital here in the heartland of America to a very special purpose: Service to those who have served America in a very special way.

In welcoming this facility into the family of VA hospitals . . . we must . . . and do . . . recognize . . . publicly and gratefully . . . the strong support which the American people have given . . . and are continuing to give . . . to our veterans medical care program.

The hospital which we dedicate today . . . a $19-million-dollar investment on the part of the public . . . offers tangible and impressive evidence of that support.

However . . . even more striking evidence of the will and resolve of the American people that this nation's veterans shall receive the finest hospital and medical care possible may be seen in the fact that expenditures for the veterans medical care program will . . . in the coming fiscal year . . . reach almost two and three-quarter billion dollars.

And this is an increase of more than one billion dollars in just three years since President Nixon appointed me as his Administrator of Veterans Affairs.

I submit that the American people have accepted . . . fully and freely . . . the charge and the challenge which Abraham Lincoln gave them when he told them "to care for him who shall have borne the battle."

I also tell you today that the quality Veterans Administration hospital and medical care program which their support has made possible benefits not just America's ill and disabled and aging veterans . . . but has placed VA medicine in a key position to help ensure for all of our citizens the quality health care at reasonable cost that is their right.

Our attention this morning is focused on this Columbia, Missouri VA Hospital.

In the years to come . . . this 381,000 square feet, six-story structure will continue to be the symbol of VA medicine for the citizens of this great community . . . and for the 100,000 and more veterans in Central Missouri whom it will serve.

Certainly the 900 skilled, dedicated, and compassionate men and women who will staff this hospital when it is in full operation will become active, concerned, responsible members of this community.

Without question . . . the hospital's $14-million annual budget will contribute significantly to the economic well-being of Columbia, Missouri.

And this is good.

Even as we dedicate this hospital . . . however . . . and recognize its mutually beneficial affiliation with the University of Missouri's Columbia Medical School . . . I think that we need to keep in mind the fact that this newest and most modern VA hospital is more than a single hospital. It is more than the 167th Veterans Administration hospital now in operation.

It is part . . . a vital part, I need not add . . . of VA's nationwide health care delivery system.

And when I say "system" . . . I mean exactly that.

In the coming fiscal year . . . which begins two weeks from tomorrow . . . on July 1 . . . this system will comprise 168 hospitals . . . our new Tampa, Florida, hospital will be dedicated in October . . . plus 16 domiciliary homes, 9 restoration centers, 83 nursing care units, and 203 outpatient clinics . . . organized into 37 "regional" Medical Districts . . . and operated directly by VA.

Moreover . . . this system will also continue to utilize non-VA facilities . . . such as other Federal, state and private hospitals, community and state nursing homes, state domiciliaries for veterans, and a variety of other extended care arrangements.

Many members of Missouri's medical community can tell you . . . from personal experience . . . that the VA hospital system also relies heavily on "home town" or fee-basis physicians and dentists . . . as required or desirable.

I state the obvious when I tell you that VA's health care delivery system is the largest under unified management anywhere in the free world.

Not so obvious . . . but very definitely attainable . . . are other advantages which a system of this magnitude can realize . . . such as:

1. Transferring patients . . . readily and with no red tape . . . to the most appropriate treatment modality and location.

2. Fostering the most efficient use of both medical and admistrative personnel . . . and promoting optimum utilization of medical personnel in scarce categories.

3. Saving substantial expenditures in the purchase of supplies.

4. Encouraging avoidance of excessive duplication of expensive equipment.

5. And speeding up problem-solving processes in both the management and medical field.

Permit me to cite two recent examples of the ability of our VA hospital system to cope readily and effectively with new demands and changing circumstances.

The first concerns VA's drug treatment program.

It was just a year ago this month that President Nixon asked Congress to increase our drug treatment budget by an additional $14-million to assist "in the immediate development and emplacement of VA rehabilitation centers which will permit both inpatient and outpatient care of addicts in a community setting."

When we received our marching orders from the President . . . VA had only five special drug treatment centers. In just a little over three-month's time we accomplished a six-fold increase . . . expanding to 32 such centers . . . including the center in St. Louis . . . in 1971.

Within the next 30 days we plan to add still another 12 of these special units.

In addition to these 44 specialized drug treatment centers . . . all of VA's 167 hospitals . . . including this new Columbia VA hospital . . . are mandated to accept veteran drug patients promptly for treatment . . . or, if the situation indicates . . . for transfer to those VA hospitals operating more sophisticated centers.

The measures we have taken . . . in response to the President's call to battle . . . will add up to some 20,000 veterans receiving VA inpatient or outpatient drug care in the fiscal year ending two weeks from now.

A second example of the ability of the VA hospital system to cope readily and effectively with new demands and changing circumstances can be found in the tragic San Fernando, California earthquake of February 9, 1971.

We effected the widescale redistribution of patients . . . with minimum disruption of their care requirements . . . following this earthquake . . . which destroyed our San Fernando VA hospital . . . and which subsequently led to the abandonment of our Wadsworth facility in Los Angeles.

Three years ago . . . when I took office as Administrator of Veterans Affairs . . . I started using the word "quality" . . in referring to VA's hospital and medical care program.

That word was appropriate then . . . but is even more so today.

All of our hospitals are accredited . . . and we are affiliated with 98 of the Nation's medical teaching schools . . . including, of course, the University of Missouri's Columbia Schools of Medicine and Nursing.

Nearly one-half of VA's full-time physicians are board-certified specialists . . . and nearly one-half hold active faculty appointments at medical or dental schools affiliated with our hospitals.

In addition . . . VA hospitals have active affiliations with graduate departments of psychology, graduate schools of social work, occupational as well as physical therapy schools, pharmacy schools . . . plus universities, colleges, junior and community colleges, and technical and vocational schools having courses for professional or technical allied health workers.

By actual count . . . these schools now number 965.

Staffing ratios in our VA hospitals will reach a new high in fiscal 1973 . . . with 207 employees for each 100 surgical patients . . . 164 employees for each 100 medical patients . . . and 105 employees for each 100 psychiatric patients.

Stated another way . . . our total average employment in VA's medical care program in the coming fiscal year will be 153,627 . . . an increase of more than 10,000 employees over 1972 . . . and more than 20,000 over 1971.

On an average day in fiscal 1973 . . . VA will be providing some form of patient care or support to more than 166,000 beneficiaries. During the year we will provide inpatient care for nearly one million veterans. Our planning calls for the average daily patient census here at Columbia to increase from 43 in this fiscal year to 245 in fiscal 1973.

Obviously . . . it will climb still higher in future years.

We will handle almost 11 million outpatient visits . . . the highest number in history . . . in the coming fiscal year.

Included in the 248 new medical units . . . which the record high $2.7 billion budget for VA medicine in fiscal 1973 will permit us to add . . . will be a cardiac catherterization laboratory, electron microscopes, an intensive care unit, and a coronary care unit, a mental hygiene clinic, and a speech pathology unit . . . all here at our Columbia VA Hospital.

I think you will agree that . . . for VA medicine . . . the coming fiscal year will be a busy one, indeed.

But I tell you today that VA medicine can . . . and will . . . do more with final congressional approval of the omnibus medical bill . . . proposed by this Administration . . . which, among other things, will permit our clinics to provide ambulatory care to eligible veterans in order "to obviate" the need for their hospitalization.

While this may require expansion at some hospitals of our system's ambulatory care facilities . . . it will permit delivery of care in new patterns . . . tailored to the specific needs of individual patients . . . and constitute an important step toward preventive medicine.

The VA medical care program is more than patient care . . . of course. It encompasses . . . in fact . . . the triad of modern medicine . . . requiring the operation of extensive programs in *research* and *education*.

On any given day . . . VA medical investigators are involved in nearly 6,000 research projects.

You are familiar with many of VA's medical research accomplishments . . . and shared triumphs . . . such as the elimination of tuberculosis as a killer disease . . . the perfection of kidney transplants . . . the development of portable hemodialysis units for home use . . . the heart pacemaker . . . the laser cane for the blind . . . and others.

And you know that the results of VA medi-

cal research are quickly made available to all of our citizens.

The point I want to emphasize is VA's unique capability for conducting wide-scale cooperative research projects in clinical settings . . . our ability to conduct simultaneously the same research effort in many hospitals.

I submit that this research technique is proof that the VA hospital system offers great potential for reducing the time necessary to test new medical treatments or theories.

We believe that we can apply this same approach successfully in establishing . . . and demonstrating . . . new models or patterns of health care delivery . . . particularly with the appropriate utilization of "para-professionals."

With President Nixon's enthusiastic support . . . VA medicine is making rapid gains in helping to supply the Nation's medical manpower needs.

We will expand the number of health trainees in our hospital system to approximately 62,000 in fiscal 1973 . . . an increase of nearly 10 percent over this year . . . and more than two-thirds again as many as we trained just four years ago.

VA's medical education and training program includes trainees in some 60 professional and technical categories. To illustrate the national importance of this program . . . permit me to point out the following facts.

Nearly one-third of all physicians now practicing . . . and approximately one-half of those entering practice each year . . . have had some or all of their postgraduate training in VA hospitals.

VA contributes directly to the education each year of over 1,000 dental students, over 20,000 basic nursing students, 23 percent of all social work graduates, 32 percent of all didates in clinical psychology, and 25 percent of all pharmacy interns and residents.

Finally . . . I tell you that the VA system is especially well suited to assist in increasing medical resources in scarcity areas. We are already at work on the development of eight Area Health Education Centers . . . using VA hospitals as a nucleus in localities that are removed from centers of higher medical education.

We can expand this effort . . . and already have authority to share with other hospitals scarce medical equipment.

Our program of exchange of medical information . . . especially with medical personnel in rural areas . . . can be greatly extended.

VA hospitals have demonstrate their ability to help new medical schools get started at relatively low cost . . . and to speed up the development and production of new categories of health care personnel . . . such as Physician's Assistants. But more can and should be done in both of these areas.

In the past few months . . . I have participated in the 50th anniversary observance at three of our VA hospitals.

The great success stories written by each of these hospitals were . . . first and foremost . . . the stories of people.

And so will it be with our Columbia, Missouri, Veterans Administration Hospital.

When this newest VA hospital observes its Golden Anniversary . . . whoever is then privileged to serve America's veterans, their dependents, and survivors of decreased veterans as Administrator of Veterans Affairs can speak of the tens of thousands of veterans who will have been cared for in this hospital during its first-half century . . . and of their entitlement to the quality care which they received.

He can speak of the skilled, dedicated, and compassionate care provided them by the unselfish men and women who staffed this hospital during its first-half century.

He can attempt to find words that adequately express the gratitude of the Veterans Administration to the thousands of volunteers in this and surrounding communities who offered their compassionate hearts and capable hands in selfless service to the veteran patients at this hospital.

And hopefully . . . he can cite as a fact the pledge I now make.

Recognizing that to have a friend . . . one must be a friend . . . I now pledge to you officials and good citizens of Columbia, Missouri . . . and to Dean Mayer, Dr. Ellis, and the staff of the University of Columbia Medical School . . . that my Columbia VA Hospital associates . . . and indeed all of us in VA . . . will try to earn you coveted friendship . . . and, in turn . . . to be a worthy friend, a good neighbor . . . and a constructive force for good.

Thank you for making this dedication such an enjoyable as well as memorable moment.

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT NIXON ON THE DEDICATION OF THE COLUMBIA, MISSOURI, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL

Today the veterans administration is dedicating a new hospital in Columbia, Missouri. This brings the nationwide system of veterans' hospitals to a total of 167, with more under construction and in the planning stage.

This latest addition will provide health care services primarily to the veterans of central Missouri. But its opening also symbolizes the strong and continuing commitment of this administration to making the best possible medical care available to every eligible veteran.

Fulfilling the nation's obligation to its veterans is a matter of justice and national honor. Meeting their medical needs is one of our highest national priorities. To insure that they are met, I intend to maintain and reinforce the independent system of veterans administration health care facilities when and as required.

PLAUDITS TO TRIAD

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, in a city two-thirds surrounded by water, maximizing the potential uses of its rivers is an essential job. The Three Rivers Improvement and Development Corp. is a nonprofit organization dedicated to maximizing recreational and commercial uses of Pittsburgh's major waterways. TRIAD displayed another facet last week when it responded to the emergency flood situation by working with local boat and dock owners to minimize property loss and injury.

TRIAD personnel coordinated the myriad bits of information concerning debris, boats, and barges racing pell mell down the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers into the mighty Ohio. They then transmitted this vital information to public officials charged with protecting life and property.

I would like to thank all of the TRIAD staff people who worked so efficiently in this time of disaster. I would like to put their own record of activity into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time.

REPORT TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS ON TRIAD'S INVOLVEMENT DURING PITTSBURGH'S FLOOD DISASTER, JUNE 20–25, 1972

Now that the flood crisis is past and the matter of clean up is underway, we have time to review and report to you how TRIAD responded to the situation.

As early as Tuesday afternoon, June 20, we were extremely concerned that the river would present hazardous conditions for the TRIAD River Renaissance Weekend, scheduled for June 24 & 25. The U.S. Weather Bureau was contacted as early as Wednesday morning. Mr. William Long, Hydrologist for the River Section of the National Weather Bureau, informed us that even if the rain stopped Wednesday, the river would have heavy debris and fast current for the weekend.

Further observation throughout Wednesday demanded an alternate plan for the Weekend activities. Wednesday night we were working with marinas to secure our equipment and other docks and vessels. Many marina owners provided us with information on the increasing danger.

Thursday morning, June 22, further checks with the Corps of Engineers and the U.S. Weather Bureau indicated in our judgment that a serious condition was developing. By 10:00 A.M. the preliminary decision to cancel the river activities for the weekend was made; and after an on-the-scene check, a final decision to cancel the TRIAD river activities was confirmed at 11:30 A.M., and we immediately prepared and distributed a press release to that effect.

At the same time we began calling marinas to alert them of pending damage to vessels, docks, and marine facilities, and in turn received further on-the-scene reports.

Arrangements were made to have the Sesame Street cast and the Pittsburgh Youth Symphony perform at the Civic Arena for two shows Saturday, and the news media was notified of these changes.

Also, on Thursday afternoon, the American Wind Symphony Barge had been moored to two trees in Tarentum, and, in light of the rising waters, was in a precarious situation. TRIAD coordinated the movement of a towboat under Jack Ross and George Douglas to move the Symphony Barge to a safe port at the PPG plant in Tarentum. This swift action saved the barge and unknown points that might have been damaged in its path downstream.

Throughout Thursday night we continued to be involved in working with marinas and boat owners securing property and notifying them of the potential flooding.

Friday morning our observors were stationed at the Hilton Hotel, the Gulf Building, and various mobile points reporting to the Corps of Engineers, and other offices, the continual flow of runaway barges and hazardous debris as it passed down the Allegheny toward the Emsworth Dam.

At one point a barge loaded with salvage junk crashed into the mooring of Grimm's salvage operation below Penn-Central Railroad bridge on the North Side. This huge mass of barges broke loose, struck North Shore Marina tearing it from its moorings, and then headed down river. Our observors immediately called Faust Marina and alerted them to clear people from their docks. Fortunately the swift moving hulks missed wiping out Faust Marina by only a few feet, as they pivoted off the Ninth Street Bridge into the center channel of the river. TRIAD's observation/alerting activity continued throughout the daylight hours.

The Sesame Street cast, in town for a performance at the TRIAD Weekend, finished rehearsal at Heinz Hall at 3:30 P.M. Friday and were then evacuated from the Hilton Hotel. This action was taken by TRIAD in order to keep them in a position where they would be free to perform at the Civic Arena Saturday, June 24. The cast was very concerned that the children of Pittsburgh would if we were forced to cancel Saturday. This be denied a chance to see them in person. They were even willing to perform Sunday wonderful group of entertainers appeared here without charge. Under the most adverse of weather conditions, which caused numerous changes to rehearsal and performance sites, the troupe still wanted to give the children of Pittsburgh the show they all anticipated, in spite of any personal inconvenience to the performers themselves. When it was determined that people could safely venture to the Civil Arena Saturday morning, the scheduled shows were held, and approximately 12,834 people, young and old, did turn out to be awed by Big Bird and his friends and the wonderful music of the Youth Symphony.

Throughout the entire disaster, from as early as Wednesday morning, we were in communication with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Weather Bureau, and other officials regarding river conditions. In addition to that, we talked with marinas and kept two-way communication on the changing conditions. Earl Faust, operator and owner of Faust Marina on the North Side, had taken considerable measures to save his marina even before the flood was predicted. With the help of Whitey Baldinger—who participates in TRIAD water ski shows and other functions, Chris Bigos—one of TRIAD's boat captains, and others, they cabled their docks to the bridge piers and were able to save them. Their near round-the-clock work, at greast risk to personal safety, saved thousands of dollars in boats and equipment, and possibly lives as well.

Captain Jack Ross worked at Oakmont Yacht Club where they saved all but three boats. Jack claims the force of the current actually crushed the docks under this feet.

Port Allegheny Marina took preventive measures and saved all their equipment. George Kasunich, TRIAD's Summer Youth Program Director, was helping at Rodak's Marina in Cheswick; but they lost considerable property. Rudy Nuzzo's Outboard Haven had most of their boats out of the water by Wednesday night, but the facilitiy was wiped out by the swift currents, as was Harbor Isle Yacht Club.

On Sunday, TRIAD issued the enclosed news release and scheduled a meeting with its IPC committee Wednesday, June 28, to assess the situation and take the necessary steps to improve flood readiness for industry and communities, in addition to its pollution control program.

THE RESULTS OF CONGRESSMAN WYLIE'S JUNE QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. CHALMERS P. WYLIE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I recently sent to residents of Ohio's 15th Ohio Congressional District the results of my June questionnaire. For the benefit of my colleagues, I insert this information into the RECORD:

IF YOU WERE A CONGRESSMAN FROM OHIO, HOW WOULD YOU VOTE?

[In percent]

	18-27	28-41	42-57	Over 57
Age of constituent:				
His	9.3	12.2	16.4	14.7
Hers	8.2	11.9	12.9	14.4

	His		Hers	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Assuming the state of the economy to be the number one issue facing the nation:				
(a) Should present Phase II economic controls be continued?	78.1	21.9	77.8	22.2
(b) Would you favor stronger wage-price controls?	78.8	21.2	80.3	19.7
(c) Would you favor an end to all wage-price controls?	12.5	87.5	10.6	89.4
2. Do you favor:				
(a) Continuation of the military draft?	58	42	53.9	46.1
(b) An all volunteer armed forces concept?	61.3	38.7	60.8	39.2
3. Are you in favor of granting amnesty to those who avoided military service by leaving the United States during the Vietnam War?	19.3	80.7	22.6	77.4
4. Do you favor:				
(a) Busing of school children to achieve racial balance?	9.8	90.2	5.5	94.5
(b) Busing of school children to provide equality of educational opportunity?	39.6	60.4	32.2	67.8
(c) Do you think President Nixon's recently announced busing plan would solve this controversial problem?	35.2	64.8	35.6	64.4
5. Do you feel that the federal government is moving effectively to alleviate environmental pollution?	36.6	63.4	34.6	65.4
6. The problem of drug abuse continues to be one of the most difficult to solve.				
(a) Do you favor legislation along the lines of the British system which would supply addicts with drugs under controlled conditions?	27.3	72.7	37.6	62.4
(b) Do you favor stricter enforcement of recently enacted drug abuse legislation providing for very severe criminal penalties for drug pushers?	91.2	8.8	92.7	7.3
(c) Do you favor the cut off of foreign aid to nations producing illegal drugs?	79.5	20.5	81.3	18.7
(d) The President s Commission on Drug Abuse has released a report which favors legalization of private use of marijuana—do you?	31.5	68.5	24.3	75.7
7. Do you approve of the way President Nixon is handling the conflict in Vietnam and elsewhere in Indochina?	70.4	29.6	68.3	31.7
8. Do you approve of President Nixon's trips to Red China and Russia?	85.6	14.4	83	17
9. In general, do you support President Nixon's domestic program?	67.5	32.5	66.3	33.7
10. Do you favor the so-called value added tax, in effect a national sales tax, as a method to reduce property taxes?	41.1	58.9	36.4	63.6
11. Do you think federal programs are helping local governments to eliminate crime in the streets?	37.2	62.8	30	70
12. In your opinion, what is the most important problem facing the nation? (Listed in order by number of times mentioned.) (1) Inflation (2) Crime (3) Vietnam (4) Drugs (5) Pollution (6) Distrust of Government Officials (7) Moral degradation in general (8) Welfare				

REMARKS BY GEN. RALPH E. HAINES, JR.

HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, Gen. Ralph E. Haines, Jr., was in my congressional district to help welcome back the 101st Airborne Division. General Haines was among a group of high Government officials which constituted the official welcoming committee for this first complete division of fighting men to be returned from Southeast Asia. I enjoyed being in General Haines' company for several reasons, not the least of which is because he is a very responsible patriot of our country, who has demonstrated repeatedly his ableness to lead others.

Being impressed with General Haines' dedication to his country and his responsible attitude about our country's place in world affairs, I was not surprised to learn that General Haines is also a dedicated Christian. In fact, he often refers to himself as a "private in the Lord's Army."

I think it a good lesson for all of us that, a four-star general with numerous honors to command himself among his fellowmen, has not forgotten his rightful place in the "order of all men and matter."

It is my privilege to submit in the RECORD for the edification of all who read the daily proceedings of the House excerpts from the text of General Haines' speech as a military breakfast held here in Washington on April 1, 1972, and sponsored by the Full Gospel Business Men's Fellowship International:

REMARKS OF GEN. RALPH E. HAINES, JR.

Brother Allinder, Beloved Friends in Christ: I am honored that you have afforded me the opportunity to talk to you at this Military Breakfast. Those of us who wear the uniform of our country are happy indeed to break bread with our friends from the business and professional community. We meet this morning on that bleak day, about which not a word is written in the Scriptures, between the Crucifixion of our Lord and His glorious Resurrection. As we prepare our hearts to celebrate Christ's triumph over death on Easter morning, I feel it appropriate to consider the challenges we all face as witnesses to His saving grace; so I have selected "Challenges of the Christian Life" as my subject. I'm not sure I can offer anything new, or perhaps even stimulating, after all the spirit-filled speakers you have heard in the last few days. They've been real pro's and I'm a rank amateur in this preaching and teaching business. At best, I can only hope to reinforce some of the views already expressed and perhaps strengthen your faith, as we seek to be effective witnesses in the days ahead which the Lord has allotted to us.

I doubt that it is necessary to make the point with this audience that those of us who serve in the Armed Forces of our country have no apologies for our profession. We consider it a noble one which demands the services of God-fearing men and women. A military career, like any other religious or secular vocation, is a true "calling." As such, it offers unlimited possibilities—yes, even

challenges—to lead lives in consonance with the highest Christian ideals. I reject out of hand any view that we in the military are war mongers. To make a simplistic comparison, we are no more war mongers than firemen are arsonists or firebugs. The U.S. military fights wars only when directed to do so by duly elected and constituted civilian authority. The man in uniform doesn't particularly like separations from his family to engage in hostilities in a distant land. But he accepts that this is an imperfect world and that he is being paid to fight, if necessary in defense of his country. Forty-one years ago, on the plains of West Point, I raised my right hand as a 17 year old stripling and swore: "To defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic and to bear true faith and allegiance to the same." I have sought to discharge that trust well and faithfully. I find no inconsistency between my responsibilities as a soldier and my convictions as a Christian. I feel I can serve my God and my country at the same time—in fact, that service in these fields is complementary and mutually reinforcing. Over the ages, God has been the soldier's constant companion. Like other Christians, we servicemen and women find no problem in combining our faith and our profession and, in so doing, prove our faith and improve our profession.

To return to my subject, what are the challenges of Christian living—both for the civilian and military members of this audience? I'll try to avoid belaboring the obvious and will seek to pitch my remarks above the "Dick and Jane" level. At the same time, I hope to avoid the "intellectual approach."

First, and most basic of all, we are challenged to be committed Christians. Most simply put, this means that we are challenged to acknowledge our sins, to open our hearts to Jesus Christ, and to accept Him completely and unreservedly as our personal Savior, with the full realization that, no matter how unworthy we are, our guilt and sin are washed away by His precious blood. A continuing awareness that we have surrendered our lives to Christ and have found the secret of victorious living must constitute the cornerstone of our faith. It is this bedrock truth on which we can fall back and regroup our forces when we are assailed by the turmoil, trials and tribulations of the world.

The first challenge, then, to the Christian is to be truly committed. Regardless of the circumstances in which he finds himself, he can draw peace of mind and assurance from his commitment; and it is a source of sustaining strength to him. Some months ago, I was fortunate to be among a group of officers who listened to Admiral Sir Horace Law, the Chairman of the British Officers' Christian Union. He defined Christian commitment as "giving all that one knows of self to all that one knows of God." Given the limited nature of our mortal comprehension, his words define commitment as well as any of us could hope to.

The second challenge to life as a Christian is to be a continuing Christian. Saint Paul in his Epistles made the Christian life analogous to running a race. As in any race, it is not only necessary to get a good start, but in order to win, it is also imperative to run hard all the way. Now, if we are to continue in the Christian faith, if we are in Paul's words to "run with patience the race that is set before us," we must provide time in our daily routine for spiritual activities. The first of these is Bible study. The Bible contains God's plan of salvation. It is the road map for the Christians. It sustains us in our Christian living. In it, our Lord has given us the experiences of those who have gone before us, so that we can profit both by their mistakes and their successes. In God's word, we can find strength in times of weakness and nourishment for our hungering souls. Many great leaders of the world, both military and civilian, have advocated regular Bible reading for the spiritual strength it imparts. In the midst of World War II, Field Marshal Montgomery said to the men who fought under him, "I read my Bible every day, and I recommend that you gentlemen do the same." General of the Army Douglas MacArthur declared, "However tired I may be, I never go to bed without reading a portion of this book—the Bible."

In the 11th Chapter of Romans we read that . . ."Faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the word of God." The man who cuts himself off from the Bible and wonders why he has no faith is just as ridiculous as a man would be if he stopped eating and wondered why his body wasted away. Christians through the years have differed concerning the most meaningful method for Bible reading. To me, choice of methods is relatively unimportant. What is important is that we find a way to make our reading of the word of God something more than a dull, routine duty or a mechanical exercise in piety. To do this, I am convinced that our attitude in Bible study is decisively important. To derive the most from our Bible reading, it is important:

First, that we read *reverently*, realizing that through the printed word we are having a confrontation with the Lord of life—an interview with God.

Secondly, that we read *prayerfully*. Every Bible reading should begin with a moment of prayer in which we ask the Holy Spirit to surge up inside us so that we can receive God's message.

Third, that we read *imaginatively*—asking ourselves constantly, "How is this applicable to my life today? What does it demand of me?"

Finally, that we read *obediently*. Some action should follow from our study, just as night follows day. We must resolve to do something about the insights, the challenges, the calls to service, and the demands to change that come up during our reading. If we read our Bible regularly in this manner, we will continue to grow and mature in our Christian lives.

As continuing Christians, we must not only seek God's truth through Bible study, but also be ardent in our prayer life. We must talk to God and permit Him to talk to us. Every military man understands that communications are all-important. If they are interrupted, even the greatest commander cannot direct his troops to victory. Admiral Mahan, the great exponent of seapower, whom I quote out of deference to my Navy friends here this morning, said: "Communications dominate war; broadly considered, they are the most important single element in strategy, political or military."

So too in our Christian lives. The line of communication between us and our God must be open. There must be a channel through which we can seek direction and receive guidance. Henry Thoreau wrote: "If a man does not keep pace with his companions, perhaps it is because he hears a different drummer." The man who communicates regularly with God through prayer, who keeps the channel open, hears the drumbeat of God's guidance and, hearing this, keeps his life in step with God's will.

A third responsibility of a continuing Christian is to be regular and reverent in attendance at worship. It is all too easy to let the requirements of a crowded schedule squeeze out those hours that we owe to God. To forego gathering together with our fellow Christians to glorify the Lord and to thank Him for His manifold blessings, is an enormous mistake. Happily, in America, we have unsurpassed opportunities readily available for worship, ranging from attendance at formal services to participation in fellowship gatherings such as ours—and every possible combination of both. Despite this, many find it a real challenge to develop good worship habits. One mark of a true Christian is that he meets this challenge successfully.

With respect to worship, I recognize that, in many instances, the younger generation is "turned off" by religious services within the organized church. I will grant there are shortcomings and imperfections in our churches, just as there are in any human institution—even one inspired by God. However, I feel that Christian denominations today, as never before in recent time, are testing their fundamental beliefs and practices against the word of God as recorded in the Scriptures. At the same time, ecumenical movements such as this are tending to bring God's church back together. I would hope that we would draw, in full measure, from the spontaneity, sincerity, and joy with which our youth worship the Lord—and incorporate these qualities into our various Christian denominations. I too like to praise the Lord out loud in a church service without getting "five demerit looks" from people from ten pews around.

The third challenge in our Christian life is to be a witnessing Christian.

The Epistles of St. Paul provide us with inspiration and practical advice concerning Christian witness. In terms of historical background, the Ephesians in the first century lived in a world where sensuality and immorality completely dominated the scene, where the lie was the mark of sophistication, and greed the keystone of ambition. Ephesus provided a social climate in which the basic drives in a man were played upon; and he was drawn, as if by a magnet, into the clutches of vicious evil. In this kind of world, the early Christians found it difficult to make their way. If they accepted the standards of their world, they could not retain their integrity or even their identity as Christians. On the other hand, if they withdrew from society and lived lives totally apart, they would be in no position to perform as disciples of Christ. In Chapter 5 of his Epistle to these confused and perplexed christians, Paul said, "Once you were darkness but now you are light. Live then as children of the light." This advice taken to heart, enabled the early Christians to turn the world upside down. This became their motto—"Live then as children of the light."

Our world hasn't changed much through the ensuing centuries. We face today some of the same challenges and problems the Christians at Ephesus faced and we face them in every walk of life.

If we are to be positive witnesses to our faith, two things are necessary. First, we must be convinced ourselves about the reality of sin, the necessity of repentance, and the indispensability of Jesus Christ as Divine Savior and Lord. Unconvinced souls will never convince others.

I have a weekly Prayer Breakfast and Bible study at Fort Monroe, which meets at 0600 hours every Friday morning, and that hour really tests one's religious convictions. The group is composed of about ten generals, eight colonels and three Department of the Army civilians . . . all immediate members of my staff. We have been studying the Book of John of late. In the first chapter of this marvelous Book, there is a tremendous statement of faith by Andrew. As he sought to bring Peter to the Lord he said, "We have found the Christ." What conviction there is in these words! He didn't say, "I *think* we have found the Christ," he said, "We *have found* the Christ." There was no doubt in his mind. Convinced himself, he was able to convince Peter. If we are to be positive witnesses to our faith, we must be just as positive.

Secondly, in addition to being convinced ourselves, we must find ways of communi-

cating our faith to others. Even though we live in a world of communications, our problems in communicating with one another are paradoxically complex. We find as much trouble communicating with our fellow men as we do with God. We can put a man on the moon and communicate with him—but, all too often, we find it difficult to communicate our faith to the man next door. If we have a product to sell, an election to win, an idea to propagate, we use communications to tell the story, to let people know, to state the case, to declare the advantages, arouse prospects, and win a favorable verdict. This goes on every day in a variety of forms. How infinitely more important is the communication of our soul winning mission! The nearer we draw to election time, the more certain we are to see hundreds of workers pounding the streets ringing doorbells, speaking man-to-man, selling their candidate. We Christians can learn much from such efforts. What we need to accelerate our soul winning quest and to reinforce the efforts of great evangelists preaching to thousands in huge arenas are more individual spirit-filled Christian laymen actively, lovingly, warmly, persuasively telling the story of God's good news in Christ.

Those of us who have been baptized in the Holy Spirit are beneficiaries of an infinitely valuable gift. We have grown in our faith a step beyond accepting Christ as our personal Savior. This "drenching, overflowing, saturating of our souls and bodies with the Holy Spirit"—to use the verbiage of Dennis Bennett—adds tremendously to our abilities as soul winners. While I may be a bit prejudiced in expressing this viewpoint, I am, at the same time, a testimonial to its validity. As many of you know, on the 23rd of July last year, at a Full Gospel meeting in Buffalo, I experienced a bubbling up and finally a violet eruption of the Holy Spirit which had been living inside me for some years. Several of you here this morning were accessories before the fact. Ruth Egert, Chet Weirich, Harold Bredeson, Larry Hammond, and Myrl Allinder —along with my good wife—really ganged up on me. [Digressed to Personal Testimony]. Today I'm on fire for the Lord. And I'm witnessing up a storm! The Holy Spirit has given me a burden. Over the past eight months, I've been led to give my personal testimony to Jesus Christ at rallies and crusades, on radio and TV, in pulpits and at prayer meetings, before cadets at West Point, and before thousands of officers, non-commissioned officers, and men and women of the United States Army. I believe the Lord is using me to rekindle spiritual zeal and moral awareness in troop units, training centers, and service schools at scores of military installations across this great land. I told the Lord last July I was ready to do what he wanted of me—and I'm trying to carry out the orders of my Commander-in-Chief. I'm a Private in His Army—bucking for Private First Class. Cut in stone over the entrance of the Archives Building here in Washington are these words, "Past is Prologue"—which means in less pretentious language: "You ain't seen nothing yet!" I feel these words may have application to my efforts to be a channel for the dissemination of the word of God. I don't intend to relax in the service of the Lord—although some have advised me to slow down before I burn myself out. You see, I still have a full-time job commanding the largest Army command in the Free World today—about a half a million men and women, military and civilian—to which I am devoting my full energies. Despite that, I expect to continue as a practicing overcomer in spreading the word of God—an "overcoming overcomer" if you please.

The example that we give others is an essential aspect of our Christian witness. Whatever you try to do to lead others to Christ must proceed from the basis of their knowledge that you are sincere in your devotion. Thereafter, you must be alert to the opportunities which the Lord provides. I know of no set rules when it comes to acting out one's role as a "child of the light." Circumstances vary infinitely, and each of us gradually learns primarily through trial and error, how he or she is able to influence others toward a Christian life.

I do feel that we can identify one of two "don't's." Among these is the error of mistaking the nature of our advantage over those who are not yet saved. Let's bear in mind that, while we are infinitely better off than they, we are not better! All we have done is to receive Jesuc Christ as our Savior and, in so doing, to accept His gift of salvation; we have earned nothing on our own merit. We are miserable offenders against God's holy laws. If we remember this, we will avoid any temptation to be condescending or overbearing or patronizing to those whom we must seek to engage in a Christian life.

A second precaution that I'd like to note deals with our tendency to be "put off" or easily discouraged. Each of us is here today because, in part, of the prayers and assistance of friends and families. They must, many times, have been tempted to give up on us. I know my wife, who has been a constant source of inspiration to me throughout our 34 years of marriage, has been very patient with me . . . and has carried me through many rough spots with her faith and prayer power. As I have overcome my bullheadedness and renounced false beliefs in a host of areas, she has been kind enough not to bruise my masculine pride even further by telling me "I told you so." Until the 23rd of July of last year, Sally could have used with full applicability, if with little delicacy, the words of St. Stephen to the High Priest and the Council just before he was stoned to death: "Ye stiffnecked and uncircumcized in heart and ears; ye do always resist the Holy Ghost; as your fathers did, so do ye."

We can in some measure repay the efforts of our loved ones and reflect the spirit of our gratitude through our own efforts on behalf of others, and through the persistence with which we maintain those efforts.

Much more could be said on the subject of the challenge of Christian life; and many would say it differently and certainly far better. In fact, many have said it far better at this Convention. In my layman's view, however, commitment, continuation and witnessing are the salient elements of our role as Christians; and anyone who earnestly tries to fulfill them quickly learns that they constitute a most challenging task.

More than anything else, I want to encourage each of you to live your faith. Make it come alive for yourself and for those around you. As Jesus tells us as recorded in Matthew's Gospel, 5th Chapter, 16th Verse: "Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father which is in heaven." Half-way measures will never satisfy a true devotion to Christ, and you must find your own way to express what you feel and believe. I talked earlier about the difficulties some of our people are having in finding satisfactory spiritual dynamism within the established churches. In addressing the challenge of Christian life, I have dealt with components of that challenge. But commitment, continuation and witness focus on one encompassing imperative; and that is we must let Christ live in us as we live in Him. We must trust in the guidance of the Holy Spirit and pray that God's will be made our own—that each of us be transformed from shy, private worshipers into bold Christians and true "children of the light"!

As Christians of today, we are challenged to exert greater effort to bring the light of life and peace and understanding to the world. We must not remain in an ivory tower withdrawn from life, but through our positive witness of dedicated Christian living, bring the light of Christ into the lives of our brothers. I pray that God will grant us the wisdom and strength that we must have to meet the challenges which we embrace as spirit-filled Christian men and women. Glory to God! Praise the Lord! Hallelujah! He is Risen! Amen, Amen and Amen.

OPERATION HEALTH SAVING: MEDICAL CARE FOR THE ELDERLY

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, recently the Des Moines Register on May 20 published an editorial about an experiment in health care for the elderly in Waukon, Iowa. I would like to call attention to Operation Health Saving and commend Rev. Arlin Adams for this very successful beginning which focuses on the health care needs of a group of special concern to me, those over 65. I would like to include both this article which indicates the need and value of a program of preventive health care examinations for the elderly as well as the report on the first year's efforts.

The article and report follow:

WAUKON SHOWS THE WAY

Waukon, pop. 3,900, showed this spring what a small community can do to promote health care. The event was "Operation Health Saving." Free physical examinations—including electrocardiograms, dental checks, sight and hearing tests—were offered to all persons over 65 who had not had a physical in two years.

The Rev. Arlin H. Adams, administrator of the Veterans Memorial Hospital at Waukon, organized the program. Adams had guessed that 20 or 30 senior citizens would accept the offer. But 200 persons registered. The list had to be pared to 104, and another clinic will be held this fall to take care of the rest. The clinics could become regular events, Adams said.

The clinic opened at 7:30 a.m. on a Saturday, and ran continuously for 12 hours. Six doctors, two dentists, an optometrist, podiatrist, and audiologist donated their time, assisted by nurses and other volunteers. Members of civic groups provided free transportation, and teenagers served as hosts.

Adams estimates the value of the donated professional services at $4,000.

Those found in need of medical attention were told to see their family doctors—and most needed help, Adams said. One woman was in imminent danger of losing both legs due to a diabetic condition. She was checked into a hospital the following Monday. An elderly man arrived barely able to walk; he had lived through the winter without shoes, and without indoor plumbing. A high incidence of glaucoma was discovered.

Neither Medicare, which serves the elderly, nor Medicaid, which serves the poor, covers the cost of preventive health examinations for the elderly. (Medicaid pays for such examinations for children up to age 6.)

The Waukon experiment should help call attention to the importance of preventive medicine.

"We're kind of proud that our little town did this," Adams said. They have a right to be.

A SMALL HOSPITAL SERVES OR OPERATION HEALTH SAVING!

(The first report from Waukon, Iowa)

April 1st, 1972 was a red letter day for 104 Senior Citizens in the Waukon, Iowa area, people 65 years of age and over and who had not had a thorough physical examination in at least the past two years. The aforementioned 104 people were given this examination for the total cost of $1.00 per person by the Good Samaritan Complex in Waukon. The Good Samaritan Complex is composed of the 44 bed Veterans Memorial Hospital and the Good Samaritan Nursing Center, a 76 bed institution. The administrator is the Rev. Arlin H. Adams, Chap. LTC, AUS, Ret. The Waukon service area includes an area of circa 13–14,000 population. Waukon is a town of less than 4,000 people in N.E. Iowa.

What was, is Operation: Health Saving? It was, is and will be again, a diagnostic clinic which consisted in the giving of a very thorough physical examination to those elderly people who for one reason or another were unable, or did not feel they were able, to get such an examination for themselves. Medicare or Medicaid gives no help in Preventive medicine to the elderly. Preventive medicine is what these people need and many feel that they can't afford the $68.00 payable, even were they admitted to an overnight stay in the hospital for such an examination. The physical, on April 1st, included everything, teeth, eyes, hearing, lab work, x-rays, podiatry, otology, the works. One little lady said, "My word, that young doctor I had poked his nose into every opening in my body!" "He was thorough!"

WHO WERE ALL INVOLVED

Naturally the older people needing the service area were involved. And such beautiful people they were! In they came, after having been pre-registered, the halt, the lame, the spry, with canes, even a few in wheelchairs, all smiling hesitantly, just a bit afraid that this was an April Fool's day joke.

Also involved were the Pink Ladies, Good Samaritan Ladies, Candy Stripers, office girls, nurses, aides, housekeepers, lab, x-ray personnel, and a bunch of lovely teen-agers who came in just to offer their help. Volunteers were used to lead the examinees from place to place. We had a one on one, or buddy type system and it worked well. A word about the Candy Stripers and teen agers, there was Instant Rapport between them and the aged. To see them all going, hand in hand, up and down the halls, into and out of the elevators, chatting, smiling, laughing—well, it was truly great.

Another group of people involved were the professionals—the doctors, the dentists, the podiatrist, the otologist, the optometrist, the physical therapist, the Lab and X-ray technicians. These people gave their services for the day. Many nurses and aides also donated their work, all so that the entire cost would be as little as possible. The doctors and other health professionals gave evidence of their love for people, their care and concern for the health of all, regardless of ability to pay or not pay. Talk is being made of some changes in procedure for the second Operation: Health Saving to be held perhaps again next April.

It was a day of joy and gladness. Had there been absolutely no results from the physical angle, had nothing been discovered, everyone in excellent health, the day would still have been tremendously worthwhile. Some of the elderly had not been out of their apartments and houses all winter long. The shrieks and shouts of joy as they saw old friends and neighbors, some for the first time in years, that alone was a joyful noise! The entire social angle by itself was worth every bit of effort put into the day.

WAS ANYTHING WORTHWHILE FOUND BY THE EXAMINATIONS?

Indeed so! The optometrist informed us that normally one might find 2 or 3 suspected glaucomas in a group of that size and in that age span. We found a possible 12 of our 104 folk in the suspect class and several, since, have turned out to have glaucoma! Now, with proper treatment their sight can be saved to some extent, and other eye problems are being treated. The total days of extra sight saved for these people, between now and their deaths, well, who can count and evaluate that?

In the hearing matter, over 90% of the people were found to be suffering some hearing loss or another. Some were of a type to be aided by hearing aids, some were not. But for those who just thought their hearing was the result of old age, not able to be remedied, and who now have treatment, who now will hear better, longer, again, who can put a monetary value on that?

Look at this! One little lady came in with such bad diabetic ulcers on her legs and feet that she could hardly walk. Gangrene was imminent. She was given orders to be pounding on the door of her physician by Monday AM. She did. Tuesday she was in the hospital. Her legs were saved. Was that worthwhile? A poor old lady walks and is independent in her own apartment for some years yet, needing neither nursing home care nor hospitalization, not crutch nor wheel chair. Worthwhile? You bet!

This too bears seeing? One large bodied man, in his seventies, was brought in by wheel chair, his feet were too bad for him to do more than stagger on. We found that all winter he and his wife lived in an older house, one with a "path" not a bath, and Dad had to go out to empty the pot, bring in the wood and water. Mother could not. But you see, Dad had to go outside in subzero weather without shoes or slippers. His feet were so sore, so swollen that he wound up doing these chores barefooted, even in weather way below zero and in deep snow! His feet are being treated, the County Home Makers are at work helping! Good? Much!

A number of people said, over and over, "What a blessing this is. I knew something was wrong with me but I felt I could not afford a physical examination just to see if there were." Many cried with joy and said, "Thank God for the doctors and the hospital for doing this."

WHO BORE THE COST OF THIS ALL?

The $1.00 diagnostic clinic was, for all purposes, a free one to the elderly. The dollar took off the onus of charity and was allegedly to cover the cost of some of the x-ray film. Many of the recipients were so pleased at the bargain they got. But the bargain was made possible by the Good Samaritan Complex absorbing much of the cost and above all by the doctors, dentists, and all other professionals donating their services for the day. It was estimated that had we had to pay all the people, including the volunteers (and they at only $1.60 per hr.) according to their normal rates our cost for the day would have been a staggering $4,000.00 or there abouts. It was a 12 hour day for most of our personnel. So the gratis labor, the efforts of care and concern for others by the doctors and entire staff is what made this possible. No such clinic can possibly work without that dedication unless somewhere there is either State or Federal money available. Should that be the case, and we don't know that it is, then perhaps more health institutions will be ready to tackle such an operation.

HOW DID THIS COME ABOUT?

Chaplain Adams, administrator and Chaplain of the Complex, a member of the Ev. Lutheran Good Samaritan Society of Sioux Falls, So. Dak., received the idea from an article written in a Social Services magazine by the Dr. John Mason, Director of Services for the Aging of the American Lutheran Church.

Dr. Mason had seen some pre-retirement physicians in England a few years ago. Britain has socialized medicine yet even there it was found that many elderly did not make proper use of it. People kept putting off going to the doctor, specially in the rural areas and among the poorer people, even as they do in America.

The Rev. Adams had also discovered that too many elderly were brought into the hospital or nursing home when it was too late to do much about the physical breakdowns. On reading Dr. Mason's article the administrator presented the idea to the Medical Staff which discussed it thoroughly and agreed to hold such a clinic. The date was set by the Medical Staff and then it was up to the administration to work out the logistics and details. April 1st was designated as the date.

The logistics of the clinic were neither small nor easily overcome. In a small, non-tax supported hospital, just breaking even in the expense column, the finances alone took some shuffling. Extra glassware and needs for the Lab were gotten, film for X-ray, disposable garments for use during the examinations, lunch and coffee, arranging the schedules of workers, getting needed equipment into the various areas, setting up time schedules, etc., etc., for the professional staff, all were met and solved. Some were not solved very well; next time we know what things caused the bottle necks and we will be able to run things a bit more smoothly. Although, with excellent cooperation the day went remarkably well.

HOW WERE THE PEOPLE NOTIFIED?

Once the date was set and a pre-registration form was worked out, the cooperation of local news media was sought. The first news reelases were issued a complete month in advance. Local papers, radio stations, area TV outlets, and every minister, pastor and priest were all given the releases and their cooperation asked for. Subsequent press releases followed to all of the same people. A number of state wide newspapers, a radio network and three TV stations caught the vision and tremendous publicity was generated for this first of its kind in America!

When the project was originally mentioned, the Medical Staff was not too sure of its relevance. Would 10 or even 20 people need this in our area? After all we had doctors who made house calls, we had a fine small hospital readily available, one with an open door policy! The administrator thought maybe 40 might need the service.

Within two weeks of the first publicity over one hundred people of the area had already registered! Before the actual day came over two hundred had registered; The Medical Staff concluded that we would be able to do a really thorough job for 104 people for the day. The first 104 were notified as to their acceptance and given a time to report. The remaining 120 will be waiting for the next such clinic. Remember, these were people 65 and over who had not had a good physical examination in at least two years. We do know of a few who slipped in but for the most part these people had not had an examination. In fact, a goodly number said this was the first such examination in all their lives! As for those who did slip in, our philosophy is that we would rather be "took" by some rather than miss caring for those who needed it.

A BIRD'S EYE VIEW OF THE FINDINGS

We have already covered several of the items, the high incidence of suspected glaucoma, the little lady whose legs were saved and elderly gentleman with the poor feet. Some of the base statistics are as follows:

Total number involved—104 of whom 60 were female, 44 male.

Possible glaucoma—7 females out of 60; males were 5 of 44.

Urinalysis—2 males with abnormalities demanding immediate attention, the one needing attention soon; 6 ladies needed attention at once, 4 soon.

Blood tests—all males normal and only one lady abnormal now. (Abnormal Now is the Medical Staff's wording for needs immediate attention, Abnormal Soon, means needs checking on in the near future.)

X-ray—3 men needing immediate attention, 2 soon; Ladies—11 Now and 4 soon.

Podiatry—The podiatrist was amazed at an exactly even break in what may turn out to be an important statistic in the future—52 people had arthritic knees and 52 had no problems at all and of the 52 who had problems with arthritis in the knees everyone had some sort of foot trouble and had done nothing or little about them. Of the 52 who had no arthritic knees everyone had some sort of good foot or arch support and wore them regularly.

The question arose in the Medical Staff as to whether there is a relationship between those two facts. The statistics in this area will be closely scrutinized again after the next clinic. Maybe we have discovered something, maybe nothing, but it will be interesting to follow up. 9 men, 12 ladies had urgent needs, 9 men and 16 ladies needed some good checking up soon.

Dental—10 men need immediate attention, 7 soon; 8 ladies need work done at once, 8 later.

P.T.—One man and eight ladies needed immediate attention; 8 ladies and five men needed attention soon.

EKGs—Things to be studied: Only 8 men but 22 women needed immediate work and study done on their coronary problems, most of which had not been suspected prior; then 9 ladies and 7 men needed attention soon. We were interested in the larger proportion of females needing heart study.

Otology—hearing losses were found in most. Of those that could be helped we found the following, 13 men and 14 ladies needed immediate attention and help; 8 men and 9 of the fair ones had problems that should be looked after soon.

A report form was sent to each person going through the clinic. Remember, this was diagnostic only. The doctors and specialists read the charts, studied the X-rays, etc., and made the proper comments for each person examined; a brief report was sent to the individual who then presented this to the physician or health professional of his choice for further action. Doctors living elsewhere simply have but to call into our Medical Records and they will receive either a verbal report or a transcript of any or all of the reports.

ANY SOCIAL SERVICE TYPE NOTATIONS?

Yes, we found that ten of the people had neither radio or TV. No regular contact with the outside world. Another 11 admitted to not having a bathroom, only a "path" to the Chic Sales. And, a total of 13 were interested in a low rental housing development of some kind. Good Samaritan is seriously thinking of doing something along that line but first must add an additional fifty beds to the nursing home.

IS THERE SOMETHING HERE TO MAKE US THINK?

When one considers that if we stretch our statistics and say that we cover a 14,000 population service are and then have already over 220 people registered out of that total population for such a clinic and add to this the information gathered by the various Senior Citizens groups (who also worked with might and main for this) to the effect that at LEAST another 200 people in the area fulfill the qualifications, well, we were horrified. To think that in our land, in a place where medical services are available that there should be such neglect of physical health by just the very segment of the population that needs it most, this causes one to gasp! If approximately 3% of our people need health care and we extend this across the nation, then the resultant six million or so is staggering. And friends from the cities tell me that in the poverty areas and ghettos, black and white, the averages will run much higher in our senior citizen groups! What a tremendous field of work for all of us! Truly the most neglected person today is the aged, regardless of color, creed or wealth! One might well conclude that never before has so much been said about and so little actually done for so many.

WHAT COULD POSSIBLY CAUSE THIS NEGLECT?

In one word, poverty! Either real or anticipated. Everyone working with the elderly knows how the marginal and even better incomed people anticipate poverty. For example, in our own small town of less than 4,000 we had a survey taken about three years ago. We found that over 200 family units, including from one to four people, were existing on less than $200.00 per month and half of these were hardly existing on incomes of less than $100.00 per month. On this little income some were paying taxes and upkeep on houses, trying to run a car, pay insurance, etc., and also eat a little here and there. No wonder they were their own physicians and diagnostic experts.

Oh, they have Medicare and such like. Do they now? Oh, yes! Hogwash! How many of these people can afford over five dollars a month for their self pay portion of Medicare. With incomes like that you might as well promise them something on the moon! They simply can't afford Medicare at those prices! Something is radically wrong in our land when people who made their money in fifty cent and dollar a day times now have to live in two and three dollar per hour times and receive no outside help for such a basic need as complete, thorough and proper medical care!

My good friend, Dr. Carl A. Becker of Racine, Wisc., says that it is criminal to offer these people help by way of OAA or Welfare! Right on, Carl! He says. "These are a proud people and should have their needs met without the constant use of third or fourth party interceders. They should receive this through the mails in some way similar to Social Security." And I agree.

WHAT CAN BE DONE ABOUT THIS?

Here in Waukon I am sure that our Medical Staff will rise to the occasion once more. But shall we continue to do this indefinitely, having a practically free clinic? We are interested in reaching out with preventive medical care but somewhere, some time it is going to have to be paid for. Two or three such clinics to get the ball rolling for all America is a small price to pay, but it can't be an indefinite thing.

We are hoping that our small brush fire will now gradually build up and eventually sweep across the nation. Two hospitals in Iowa are already investigating the possibility of their putting on such a clinic. We of the Good Samaritan Complex are hoping that some of the great, the high, those in power will also catch the vision and pitch in to do something to prevent the millions of elderly from going down to old age far more blindly, far more decrepitly, agonizingly and helplessly than ever needs to be. Industry has long ago found out that preventive maintenance is cheaper, better in the long run than neglect until repair and costly replacement is necessary. Can't we learn from that?

Should anyone be interested in the minutia of details connected with the program, please feel free to write, or call Rev. Arlin H. Adams, Administrator, Veterans Memorial Hospital, Waukon, Iowa 52172. Phone—319/568-3411.

COLORADO RIVER SALT PROBLEM

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, those who heard the respected President of the United Mexican States speak in this Chamber on the salinity of the Colorado River may believe that the sole responsibility for this situation rests on Arizona. Such is not the case, as was pointed out by Mr. Rich Johnson, executive director of the Central Arizona Project Association, in a statement dated June 27, 1972. The statement follows:

COLORADO RIVER SALT PROBLEM

Arizona is the last State from which water flows into the Colorado River, but the first to be blamed for all of the River's salinity problem.

The truth is that every use of water from the Colorado River and every return flow in the six states above Arizona contributes to the salinity of the River before it reaches Arizona. Every acre of land irrigated in the four Upper Basin States contributes approximately two tons of salts to the mainstream of the Colorado before the flow reaches the Lower Basin. Municipal and industrial return flows add to the total salinity problem. In addition to these man-caused sources of salinity there are natural sources of mineralization in the mainstream and its tributaries.

Currently water delivered from the Upper Basin to the Lower Basin at Lee Ferry annually carries about 8,500,000 tons of salts (600 parts per million), about half of it being the result of man's use of the River and half from natural mineral sources.

When the water released at Hoover Dam for delivery to the Lower Basin reaches Parker Dam its salinity is about 726 p.p.m.; and when it reaches Imperial Dam, having received return flows from irrigation use on the Colorado River Indian Reservation and the Palo Verde Irrigation District in California, its salt load reaches 845 p.p.m.

The salinity of Colorado River water at Morelos Dam in Mexico in 1971 averaged 1163 p.p.m.

There is no question that Arizona contributes to the salinity problem of the Colorado River, but so does every other state in the seven-state basin. That fact is recognized by the Department of the Interior; and a salinity control program now under study by the Bureau of Reclamation recognizes that fact. Points of major salinization have been identified, and plans are being developed for their control.

The Colorado River salinity problem is a total basin problem, not a problem created by water uses in Arizona alone. No one State can or should be expected to resolve it, either by reducing its authorized uses of water or by paying for projects to remove salts.

The problem can be resolved by implementing plans presently being developed by the Bureau of Reclamation; and, at the international level, by constructing a nuclear power and sea water desalting plant on the River to dilute the salinity of water delivered to Mexico. Legislation looking towards this latter solution has been suggested by Arizona Rep. John Rhodes.

The often repeated suggestion that the salinity problem, as it affects Mexico, should be resolved at once by eliminating return flows of approximately 220,000 acre-feet from the Wellton-Mohawk Project in Arizona is an unfair demand and is totally unacceptable to Arizona.

The Treaty that guaranteed delivery to

Mexico of 1.5 million acre-feet of Colorado River water annually, without reference to quality, was an agreement between the two Federal Governments. There may indeed be a moral obligation to deliver water of reasonably good quality to users in Mexico; but there is at least an equally compelling moral obligation on the part of the United States Government to resolve the salinity problem without damaging the rights of water users in Arizona and the other states of the Colorado River Basin.

COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I recently read two articles written by Sylvia Porter on the community school concept. H.R. 11709, a bill I have cosponsored with many House colleagues, would provide Federal moneys to help local communities set up community school systems. Since Mrs. Porter's articles explain how such a system operates, I insert them in the RECORD:

COMMUNITY SCHOOLS—I

(By Sylvia Porter)

In the rural area where we have a country home, our property taxes have just about gone out of sight—primarily, of course, to finance the handsome, beautifully landscaped elementary and high schools which try to educate other people's kids.

In a matter of days, these schools will be closing for the term and in large part will be unused and utterly wasted until the area's kids go back in the fall.

This is a real squandering of resources. This is, in the words of Sen. Church (D-Idaho), "a kind of disuse of schools and extravagance that modern America cannot abide." This is, in bluntest summary, in today's environment plain stupid.

Last year property taxes climbed more than 9 percent, on top of a 35 percent upsurge between 1967 and '70.

Many older Americans are now paying as much as 20 to 40 percent of their meager incomes to the local tax collector. So distasteful and oppressive have our local taxes become that only 47 percent of local school bond issues were approved during the last fiscal year, a new record low and a resounding come-uppance for today's school officials—for the biggest chunk of all property taxes goes for schools.

Also, the National Education Assn. points out, local school districts bear more than half of school costs today; the state kicks in 41 percent, the federal government about 7 percent.

Yet, while the cost of supporting our elementary and high school system has nearly tripled during the past decade to almost $50 billion, the typical school is locked up about 50 percent of the time.

The overwhelming majority of the schools are used only five days a week, 39 weeks a year. The schools are restricted to the formal education of Americans between the ages of five and 17 or 18. Even pre-school "Head Start" children have been banned from the elementary school in some cases.

Meanwhile, there is an ever-mounting need for further education of the older American—ranging from vocational retraining to retirement preparation and planning, consumer education, nutrition, music, arts, crafts, etc.

What's the answer?

The one that leaps out from even this short analysis is to find new ways to use our idle public schools to serve all of us. And this answer would also help slash our local tax bills by avoiding the need to build additional expensive facilities and by keeping more real estate from falling off local town tax rolls.

In fact, some 300 U.S. communities have done precisely this—with a wondrous array of activities and services and with refreshingly positive results. For instance:

In Gloucester City, N.J., a broad tutorial program has been set up, using the elderly along with elementary school students to "help kids with their homework" and personal counseling.

In Salem, Oreg., about 100 different classes and activities are going on, with some 2,000 attending each week—ranging from knitting lessons to mountain climbing and small business administration. One lady involved in the program noted tartly that this was the first time she had set foot in the local school in 32 years.

The extra cost of expanding the Salem school has been about 6 per cent of the regular budget. "With that 6 per cent, the time the school is open can be increased by two-thirds," say officials in charge.

Your local school could be, in the words of Barry E. Herman of New Haven's Winchester Community School, a place where:

Children and adults can study and learn and where learning can take place 18 hours a day or more;

Educational or vocational skills of people of all ages can be upgraded for the benefit of the individual and the community;

People of all ages can take part in such activities as sports, physical fitness programs, informal recreation, arts and crafts, musical programs, civic meetings, adult education, home economics, tutoring;

People can find health services, counseling services, legal aid, employment services, homemaking help;

All residents of the community can study and cooperate in the solution of significant neighborhood problems.

COMMUNITY SCHOOLS—II

(By Sylvia Porter)

In Brockton, Mass., (population about 90,000) one in 50 is enrolled in adult education classes—including English as a second language for the Spanish-speaking newcomers. Using the Brockton public school system evenings, weekends and summers are two dozen different groups ranging from a drama group to the symphony orchestra.

Total cost: $150,000 out of a yearly school budget of $17 million.

In the high school of Elizabeth, N.J.—only 15 miles from Manhattan—citizens of all ages are attending classes in basic English, remedial reading, arithmetic, swimming, plumbing, etc.

Among this program's hidden advantages: vandalism in and around the school has become negligible. Now the new high school, says its architect, "is being developed as a community school, with all the facilities for full-time, year-round use for young and old."

In Boca Raton, Fla., where more than one-third are age 65 or over, another "our school" atmosphere has developed. Among the goings on in Boca Raton's public schools: a new Audubon Society chapter and regular meetings of a voluntary patrol unit of the U.S. Coast Guard. Says Community Education Director Courtney Cheri:

"Silence may well be the costliest item in our school budgets today. The waste of public facilities lying idle for a great portion of the afternoon and evening far outweighs the cost of opening the doors for community use."

And in Boise, Idaho, at least 67 different programs go on each week during evening hours in 10 public schools. Among them: Boise's citizens of Basque origin are taking a course in conversational Basque and would-be hunters have started an archery course.

Cost to date: about $60,000. In addition, the city is now considering turning to existing schools instead of building a planned new $200,000 senior citizen center—which would save significantly on construction and future maintenance costs as well as prevent the removal of more real estate from the tax rolls.

In response to this solid record and much more similar evidence, Senator Church (D-Idaho), is proposing the Community School Center Development Act, sponsored jointly with Senator Williams, (D-N.J.). It would:

Make modest federal grants to bolster community education training programs and to develop new ones;

Give modest federal financial assistance for the establishment of new community schools and the bolstering of existing ones and would also help train and pay community school directors;

Promote and assist, via the U.S. Commissioner of Education, the idea of the community school.

Hearings are scheduled before the Senate Education subcommittee later this year. No price tag has been set on the idea, but, says Church, "Why not start modestly?" And he adds, "It's a proven idea which has worked well in more than 300 communities. And it probably would save a lot more money in the long run than the very small amount needed to set up the program."

Actually, the concept of the community school goes back at least a generation—to the pioneering work done by the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation in Flint, Michigan. And actually, you need not wait for any new laws to help your own community develop and use a community school.

You can, for instance, let community organizations of all kinds hold meetings in your local school. The elderly, particularly, lack buildings in which to meet.

You can set up special feeding programs for those who need them—breakfasts for underprivileged children, dinners or perhaps lunches in special shifts for the elderly.

You can use school buses as extra transportation to take groups of older people sightseeing or on outings or to the theater.

You can launch rehabilitation programs—physical, vocational, occupational—for those in the community who need them.

You can conduct drug awareness programs for both students and adults, experimental programs in delinquency prevention, etc.

You can use the schools as meeting places to inform residents—again, the elderly in particular—of special services available and valuable to them.

The possibilities for using a community school to your own and your community's advantage are limited only by the limits of your imaginations—which could mean they are limitless.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, without question, one of the most serious problems facing our Nation today is that of highway safety. The toll of highway deaths and injuries is shocking and outrageous. We must work continuously to bring these conditions to an end.

One of the most important means of bringing sanity to our highways, both in regard to the human and mechanical elements, is through the news media—print and broadcast.

The news media is doing its part in the never-ending campaign for highway safety. This has been well documented again and again. So that we do not forget their good deeds, we are annually reminded of them through the announcements of the print and broadcast media winners of Alfred P. Sloan awards for distinguished public service to highway safety.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to place in the RECORD the announcement of the 1972 Alfred P. Sloan Awards winners. With particular pride I call attention to the fact that an outstanding publication in my congressional district, the Bergen Bulletin of Palisades Park, received the award for weekly newspapers with circulations under 4,000.

I offer my congratulations to the editors, writers, and reporters of the Bergen Bulletin, as well as the staffs of all other media winners for their outstanding work and a job well done.

The announcement follows:

THE 1972 ALFRED P. SLOAN HIGHWAY SAFETY AWARD WINNERS ANNOUNCED

Nine print media and eleven broadcast media awards were announced today in the annual Alfred P. Sloan Awards for distinguished public service to highway safety.

In addition to the newspapers, magazines and radio and television outlets honored this year, two special Sloan creative awards were announced: in the print media, to Mrs. Kay Evers, of the Daily Ardmoreite, Ardmore, Okla.; and in the broadcast media, to Kimball C. Cummings, Jr., of KNXR Radio, Rochester, Minn. Each will receive $1,000.

The Sloan Awards program, in its 24th year, is conducted by the Highway Users Federation for Safety and Mobility under a grant from the Automotive Safety Foundation. The awards are designed to recognize performance by the broadcast and print media "to encourage vigor and innovation in the development of public service programs and activities aimed at the reduction of traffic accidents, injuries and deaths." They are named after the late Alfred P. Sloan, former president and chairman of the General Motors Corporation and a pioneer highway safety leader. The eight publications honored in the print media categories are:

Daily Newspapers—over 50,000 circulation—the Miami Herald, Miami, Fla.

Daily Newspapers—15,000–50,000 circulation—the Marion Star, Marion, Ohio.

Daily Newspapers—under 15,000 circulation—the Daily Ardmoreite, Ardmore, Okla.

Weekly Newspapers—over 4,000 circulation—the Voice-Jeffersonian, St. Matthews, Ky.

Weekly Newspapers—under 4,000 circulation—the Bergen Bulletin, Palisades Park, N.J.

Magazines—general circulation 1 to 5 million—American Youth Magazine, Southfield, Mich.

Magazines—general circulation under 1 million—the Air Force Driver Magazine, Norton Air Force Base, Calif.

Industrial and Trade Publications—Commercial Car Journal, Philadelphia, Pa.

In the broadcast media, winners include:

Radio—large market area—WEEI, Boston, Mass.

Radio—medium market area—KRMG, Tulsa, Okla.

Radio—small market area—WJAG, Norfolk, Neb.

Radio—network—National Broadcasting Company (NBC), New York, N.Y.

Television—large market area—WSB–TV, Atlanta, Ga.

Television—small market area—KTWO–TV, Casper, Wyo.

Television—educational station—Mississippi Center for Educational Television.

The Sloan Awards judges also selected KGW–TV, Portland, Ore., and WCKT–TV, Miami, Fla., for honorable mention awards in the television large market category.

A special posthumous citation was directed for Officer Irv Hayden of the Chicago Police Department, a WGN Radio traffic reporter who was killed in a helicopter crash last summer, to be symbolic recognition of the risk all airborne traffic reporters take in the line of duty.

THIEU REGIME SHOULD MODERATE DICTATORIAL ACTION

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of our involvement in the Vietnam conflict we have been assured by three successive administrations that our presence is required in order to assure the existence of democracy in South Vietnam. What we have seen develop in South Vietnam, however, is sometimes anything but a democratic government.

The South Vietnamese Government is rife with corruption. Hardly a month passes without an exposé of yet another Vietnam scandal. In the last election President Thieu succeeded in eliminating his opposition until he was the only candidate left on the ballot. Mr. Thieu has imposed martial law and on the 27th of June the Vietnamese Senate, lacking a quorum, gave him the power to rule by decree. The passage of this so-called special powers bill came at an 11th hour meeting after all of Thieu's opponents had left the chambers.

Recently the press has reported still more violations of democratic principles in Vietnam. I refer to the arrest of some 8,000 people suspected of sympathizing with the Communists. Granted, the South Vietnamese Government is in the midst of an invasion from North Vietnam. Nevertheless, the arrest and jailing of this many people on little or no evidence I believe goes far beyond the demand of internal security. The New York Times has reported that 1,200 persons have been sent to Con Son prison without benefit of a trial or right to contest any of the charges against them. Many of these arrests were based on nothing more than a single denunciation by a neighbor or acquaintance.

These are not only Communists that are being arrested. The 8,000 includes many non-Communists who have chosen to express their opposition to governmental policies. Their unlawful detention only serves to weaken the position of the South Vietnamese Government since it only further debases the credibility of the Thieu regime. I believe the South Vietnamese Government would enhance its strength substantially by exercising restraint during this time of crisis. At this point, I insert in the RECORD an article from the Christian Science Monitor of June 22, 1972, followed by an article from the Washington Post of June 27, 1972:

THIEU GOVERNMENT ARRESTS 8,000, INCLUDING NON-COMMUNIST RIVALS

(By Daniel Southerland)

SAIGON.—The Saigon government has arrested some 8,000 persons as a "preventive detention" measure since the beginning of the North Vietnamese offensive.

Critics, including some national assemblymen from the provinces where arrests have been made, say that many of the arrests do not involve Communist sympathizers and that the government has been taking advantage of martial law to remove some of its non-Communist opponents.

They also say that the government is picking up some persons whose only crime is to have relatives on the Communist side and other persons who worked for the Viet-Minh against the French or for the National Liberation Front but who quit the Communist side years ago.

Relatives and friends say that they have been unable to find out where many of those who have been arrested in the Saigon area are being held. In the past, Vietnamese say, they were usually able to determine the location of an arrested person through the police.

OFFICIAL POSITION

Under past procedure, three different intelligence reports were required in a dossier before a suspected member of the Viet Cong "infrastructure" could be arrested.

This was, in theory at least, supposed to act as a triple-check on abuses.

Now only one report is required, and some sources believe that this has opened the way for more irregularities in a system which was hardly free from abuses in the past.

Government officials argue that their main aim has been to arrest people who might act as guides or give aid to North Vietnamese infiltrators.

They say that another aim is to prevent Viet Cong-inspired disturbances, particularly in the cities and towns. These officials contend that the Communists planned to coordinate such disturbances with their military operations.

"Normally, they couldn't make arrests so easily because of the political opposition," said an American source who has kept track of the arrests.

"Before the offensive, if the government arrested all of these people, there would have been many protests and demonstrations," said one Vietnamese who knows a number of persons who have been arrested.

"This is the best moment to arrest people," he said. "No one would dare have a demonstration now, and the newspapers are afraid to write anything."

"There have been a lot of arrests of people who are not pro-Communist," said Tran Van Tuyen, a prominent lawyer, opposition leader in the National Assembly, and member of the staunchly anti-Communist Vietnam Nationalist Party.

"It is true that there has been some Communist infiltration, but not as much as the government says," Mr. Tuyen declared in an interview.

"The administration has taken advantage of the situation to neutralize the opposition," the deputy said. "Many of those arrested are not big-name personalities. They are not Communists. But they are antigovernment."

"There is nothing new in all this," Mr. Tuyen said. "But the government has intensified what it was already doing in the past."

Well-informed sources say that the greatest number of arrests—4,000—have been made in Military Region IV, which encompasses the Mekong Delta to the south of Saigon.

Two thousand have been made in Military Region I, most of them in the Hue area. About 1,000 persons have been picked up in Region III, which includes Saigon, and another thousand or so in Region II.

In Hue and its surrounding districts more than 1,300 were arrested. Only 76 of these were said by official sources to be hardcore "A" and "B" category members of the Viet Cong "infrastructure."

SOME TO CON SON

More than 1,200 of those arrested in Military Region I were sent on South Vietnamese Navy LSTs to the prison island of Con Son without the benefit of a trial or the right to contest any charges presented against them.

Most student leaders of any importance at the universities of Hue and Saigon have been arrested. A few are in hiding.

A high-level government official stated that all the leaders in the student union at the University of Hue were discovered to be Viet Cong cadre. But independent observers doubt that the government has any proof to this effect.

After the Hue student leaders, including the chairman of the student union and the secretary-general, were arrested, the government installed a new pro-government student leadership.

AGGRESSIVE POLICE MAJOR

The arrests in Hue were organized by an aggressive police major named Lien Thanh. The charges against those arrested were not reviewed by the province security committee, as would normally be the case, or even by the province chief himself.

"Nobody had a check on the [arrest] lists," said one informed source in Hue. "The government used the crisis as an excuse to clean up the non-Communist left."

American advisers to the special branch of the police, which has been in charge of many of the arrests, were not even informed in many cases of the "preventative detention," moves.

"We knew nothing about it until it was already under way," said one adviser. "We were only told about it 10 days after it started."

"They've stopped asking us for advice," he said. "But that's what Vietnamization is supposed to be all about."

Over the years, the United States has given financial and material support to the South Vietnamese police that runs into tens of millions of dollars. But it would appear that the Americans have less and less say as to how the aid funds are used.

Government officials say that many of those who have been arrested will be released after the current crisis is over.

But a number of American sources wonder whether "preventative detention"—even if it lasts for only a few months—will not end up pushing some of those who were on the non-Communist left toward an alliance with the Communists.

"I can think of no better place to send people than Con Son Island if you want to turn them into Communists," said one American source.

FORMER "GRADUATES"

In the French period, many well-known Communist revolutionaries, including the present president of North Vietnam, Ton Duc Thang, spent time on the island. Con Son was known to some of its "graduates" under the French as the "University of Ho Chi Minh."

Recent case histories indicate that many nonsupporters of the Viet Cong have come out of prison as Communist sympathizers.

THIEU BILL PASSED BY MINORITY

(By Thomas W. Lippman)

SAIGON, June 27.—Supporters of President Nguyen Van Thieu staged a rump session of the South Vietnamese Senate tonight and voted to approve a bill authorizing him to rule by decree for six months.

Only 26 senators, less than a quorum, were present in the garish, smoky chamber when the vote was taken at 11 p.m. after opponents of the bill walked out. All 26 voted in favor of the bill.

Thieu's opponents are expected to challenge the legality of the action on several counts. But experienced political observers believe the bill will be put into effect immediately and will have run its course before any court action can be completed.

The so-called "special powers bill" has been up and down the legislative ladder since early last month, twice passed by the lower house, rejected once by the Senate and slightly rewritten. It authorizes Thieu to act without consulting the National Assembly in matters of defense, security, economy and finance.

Since political arrests are already commonplace, the nation is under martial law, the draft has been extended and new taxes have been imposed, it is not clear what the real impact of the bill would be. But Thieu, who has been demanding universal approbation for his handling of this spring's crisis, has made it an issue, and it has acquired a symbolic importance.

After six weeks of intensive lobbying and legislative armtwisting, Thieu appeared within reach of his goal when 52 of the Senate's 57 members gathered this morning to resume the debate.

What he got instead was a parliamentary burlesque that blocked his supporters from bringing the bill to a vote.

Of the five missing senators, two—both opponents of the bill—could not be accounted for. Other members of the opposition intimated that the government had had them kidnaped to prevent them from voting. The president of the senate, Nguyen Van Huyen, who also opposed the bill, refused to call the session to order until the two could be found.

There was no legal requirement that they be present, but sources close to the Senate said the anticipated vote would be so close that neither side could spare any of its supporters.

As so often happens here, conflicting rumors began to circulate about what happened to the two men. Vo Van Iruyen, 76, a landowner who is first deputy president of the Senate, and Nguyen Van Chuc, an obscure backbencher.

The suggestion of kidnaping was countered by a report that they had made a deal with the government to stay away, thus keeping face with their political factions while avoiding a negative vote on the bill.

By late in the day, Senate sources said, Chuc's wife and Truyen sent letters informing the Senate of the reasons for their absence, but Huyen still refused to call the Senate into session because he believed the letters were written under pressure.

Supporters of the government then invoked a rule allowing any five members to force a session. Opponents argued that approval of the committee chairman was necessary for such a move, but when Thieu's supporters persisted, the opponents walked out.

That left the 26 who supported the bill. Although they were all in agreement, they debated the measure for more than two hours. That, a reliable South Vietnamese journalist said, was "to keep it from appearing as if the decision was taken in advance."

ACTIVITIES OF THE 92D CONGRESS

HON. JOHN W. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the 92d Congress is drawing to a close, and it is appropriate to pause and recount some of the highlights of these past 2 years. This has been a dynamic Congress, which has also been deliberative and mindful of the imperfections in the law which need to be remedied, rather than being anxious to experiment for experiment's sake. It has also been a Congress which has wisely refused to participate in many programs without careful attention to the effects of such participation.

As is the custom, Mr. Speaker, and as is fitting and proper, I wish to report to my constituents on some of the actions which we in the Congress have taken.

PROTECTION OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

One of the foremost concerns has been the protection of our constitutional rights, which were conceived in turmoil, born of a spirit of willingness and cooperation and nurtured by a common desire to create a nation which would bestow upon its citizens the greatest degree of personal freedom on earth.

Through its activities, this Congress has sought to fulfill its obligation to those principles which have made our Nation a promised land for so many. After generations of dispute over the proper role of women in our society, the 92d Congress has finally acted in the tradition of its most enlightened forebears by passing the equal rights amendment to guarantee equality to persons of both sexes. The Congress also sanctioned an amendment which fulfills the right of 18-year-olds to vote, an action which my colleagues will remember was first initiated by the State of Georgia in 1945. Both these amendments were long overdue and both will serve to fill the gaps which passage of time and progressive thinking caused to appear. Both reaffirm rights which were not specifically granted in the Constitution, but which our Nation's traditions and heritage established by principle. Both were needed by our society and I am gratified that the Congress saw fit to act as it did in these instances.

I am also pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress rejected an attempt to change the first amendment of the Bill of Rights with respect to freedom of religion. The first amendment states:

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof . . .

This is the most sacred of our freedoms, and our forefathers evinced their concern by placing it first of all our guaranteed rights. I know that many people have been misled by recent Supreme Court decisions and administrative actions with regard to prayer. I do not believe that the Supreme Court has prohibited public prayer. Some few peo-

ple have deliberately misinterpreted the prayer rulings and have capitalized on the public's confusion. Following the Court's 1963 prayer decision, the House Judiciary Committee held hearings running to nearly 3,000 pages seeking a way to improve the language of the first amendment. They could not do so. The proposed constitutional amendment which the House refused to sanction would have chipped away at the cornerstone of religious freedom in America and would have invited friction between religious denominations. I have received many letters from pastors, priests, rabbis, and church groups in my district expressing alarm lest the Congress change the first amendment. I sincerely feel that to alter the first and most sacred of our amendments to clear up a temporary state of confusion would be disastrous for this Nation's religious heritage, which our forefathers fought to protect. I look to the Supreme Court to clear up this confusion with new rulings.

In another area of constitutional rights, I am deeply disappointed that Congress has not seen fit to enact strong language prohibiting the busing of our schoolchildren for the purpose of achieving racial balance. I am opposed to racial quotas in any sector of our society, and I submitted testimony to the House Judiciary Committee when it held hearings on busing this year. Although I have signed three discharge petitions to have the Judiciary Committee send an antibusing bill to the House floor, I would prefer a legislative solution which would not entail amending the Constitution. However, the only legislative solutions which the Congress has come up with have been unsatisfactory. Recently, the House voted on a higher education bill which contained numerous antibusing clauses. It is my feeling that these were merely token and did not go to the heart of the problem. The bill contained provisions to stay court-ordered busing until all appeals have been exhausted but did not reverse previous orders, most of which have been in the South. For this reason, despite my strong belief in aiding our colleges and universities, for the first time I voted against an education bill.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND WILDLIFE PROTECTION

This Congress has been by far the most active in attempting to protect our quality of life. Among the many environmental bills that passed the House are the comprehensive Federal Water Pollution Control Act amendments, which make it national policy that discharges of pollutants into our Nation's waters will be eliminated by 1985 and that these waters will be raised to swimming and fish-breeding quality by 1981. The Congress also acted in several instances to protect the natural wildlife balance of our ecology. The House has passed bills dealing with the protection of marine mammals, wild mustangs, whales, and bald eagles. Additionally, the House approved a bill which prohibits the shooting of birds, fish, or other animals from airborne vehicles.

EDUCATION, SOCIAL SECURITY, CONSUMER PROTECTION, MINIMUM WAGE

Georgia was one of several States which President Nixon slated to receive substantially less in funds for education in the next fiscal year than it did last year. I and a majority of my colleagues found this situation intolerable and passed the Hathaway and other amendments to the Labor-HEW appropriations bill. These amendments restored Georgia's funding level in most categories and increased Georgia's overall share $7.5 million over last year's allocation. Additionally, the House passed legislation to broaden the GI bill and its benefits.

This year's social security amendments will bring needed relief to many of our aged and infirm. These persons very often obtain their only livelihood from social security and, more than other groups, are subject to the whims of the economy, as they live on fixed incomes. As of this date, the House has increased social security benefits 5 percent and voted to raise the outside earnings limitation. This same bill also contained language to revamp our welfare system, bringing it under Federal control, subjecting it to nationwide standardization, instituting uniform penalties for fraud and cheating in the program and including strong work provisions.

This Congress also established two agencies to assist the public. The Consumer Protection Agency will aid citizens with a variety of problems including faulty products and warranty violations. The Office of Drug Abuse will coordinate all Federal drug programs and educate the public to the evils of drug addiction.

ACTIVITIES OF SPECIAL INTEREST TO THE SEVENTH DISTRICT

This Congress has acted on several measures which are of particular interest to citizens of the Seventh District of Georgia. On June 16, the President signed into law a bill which broke the logjam in the construction of the Rome Post Office-Federal Building. Last year, the Congress passed a bill to guarantee $250 million in Government-backed loans to Lockheed, a measure which was considered essential to the company's survival. I devoted my fullest efforts to the passage of these bills, and I am gratified that my colleagues saw fit to vote for them. Similarly, the House recently approved an authorization for the procurement of an additional 12 C–130 aircraft, to be manufactured at Lockheed-Georgia. The entire Georgia delegation assisted in having these planes added to the authorization after the administration had failed to include them initially. One bill which has not yet passed the Congress, but for which I have high hopes, is a measure to guarantee economic assistance to areas which have been hard hit by unemployment, including several Seventh District counties. I have introduced this measure and intend to press for its enactment.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I have been privileged to participate in a number of activities which I would like to reiterate for my colleagues and for my fellow citizens of the Seventh District. Chief among these are my chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development, my appointment to the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and my elevation to second in line for the chairmanship of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics next year. I am pleased that my subcommittee has now become the focal point for research and development activities in the Congress. This year both the House and the Senate passed a record authorization and appropriation for the National Science Foundation, which is under the jurisdiction of my subcommittee. Included in these funds were grants for science education and institutional development which will aid schools throughout the district and the Nation. The House also passed two additional bills which I sponsored and which originated in my subcommittee. The first will create an Office of Technology Assessment to evaluate the possible good and bad effects of technology contained in proposed legislation. The second bill authorizes $25 million for a 3-year fire research and safety program. In another area, unemployment in our highly skilled technical groups, my subcommittee held 6 days of Washington hearings and then held additional hearings in Marietta to determine the local interest in our legislation to assist these unemployed persons. Later in the year, we also held hearings on the subjects of the relationships among science, technology, and the economy and on energy research and development.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the citizens of my district would be interested in many of the other bills which I have sponsored or co-sponsored, but because of the constraints of space, I will not attempt to go into all of them. I would however, like to list them as follows:

LIST OF BILLS

H.Res. 858–859—Release Funds for Farm Operating Loan and Waste Facility Grant Programs.
H.Res. 944—Release Funds for Rural Electrification.
H.R. 12980—Franchises; Territorial Rights.
H.R. 13071—Broadcast License Renewals.
H.R. 13395—Amend Uniform Relocation Act.
H.R. 13701—Accelerated Public Works.
H.R. 13741—Economic Disaster Area Aid.
H.R. 12605—Depository Libraries.
H.R. 13025—Wildlife Conservation.
H.R. 14986—S. Atlantic Basin Conservation.
H.Res. 891—Peace and Unity of N. Ireland.
H.R. 14296—Funds Impoundment Notification.
H.R. 12677—Occupational Safety and Health.
H.R. 13948—National Blood Bank.
H.R. 14450—Multiple Sclerosis Commission.
H.R. 14506—Law Officers' Bill of Rights.
H.R. 14881—Prison Reform.
H.R. 12510—George Andrews Lock And Dam.
H.R. 13668—Braille Designations on Money.
H.J.Res. 1092—Convert to Metric System.
H.R. 12728—Social Security Amendments.
H.R. 14513—Estate Tax Charitable Trust.
H.R. 14566—Small Business Tax Simplification.
H.R. 14660—Charities Lobbying Exemption.
H.R. 14822—Tax-Free Pensions.
H.Con.Res. 546—Trade Adjustment Assistance.
H.R. 4212—Federal Crop Insurance Program.

H.R. 6134 and 9401—Fish Farming Assistance.
H.R. 7303—Farm Credit.
H.R. 9711—Agriculture Dept. Legal Counsel for Loanees.
H.R. 8580—Lockheed Loan Guarantee.
H.R. 34—Conversion Research and Education.
H.R. 6124—Conversion Loan Authorization.
H.R. 6835—Transportation R. & D.
H.R. 335—Mass Transportation R. & D.
H.R. 4412—Narcotics Control.
H.R. 3610—Higher Education Tax Credits.
H.R. 4213—Freedom of Choice Amendment.
H.R. 4905—Higher Education Gift Incentives.
H.R. 6233—White House Conference—Education.
H.R. 10912—Higher Education Tax Deductions.
H.R. 15193—Education for Retarded Children.
H.R. 5446—Interstate Environment Compacts.
H.R. 6484—Prohibit Strip Mining.
H.R. 9557—Ocean Mammal Protection.
H.J. Res. 279—Earth Week.
H.J. Res. 385—Joint Committee—Environment.
H. Res. 567—VOA Broadcasts to Soviet Jews.
H. Res. 663—Phantom Jets for Israel.
H. Con. Res. 111 and 249—Prisoners-of-War.
H.R. 177—Catastrophic Health Care Costs.
H.R. 2294—Encourage Medical Personnel to Practice in Areas of Shortage.
H.R. 3655—Conquest of Cancer Act.
H. Con. Res. 151—P.H.S. Hospitals, Clinics.
H.R. 6471—Federal Penalties for assaulting Law Officers.
H.R. 7406 and 12740—Benefits for Law Officers and Firemen killed or totally disabled in the line of duty.
H.R. 8341—FBI, Secret Service Retirement.
H. Res. 206—Extradite Diplomatic Kidnappers.
H.R. 5382—Natl. Guard Technicians Benefits.
H.R. 12220—U.S.S. Arizona Memorial.
H.R. 2569—Federal Workers Freedom-of-Choice.
H.R. 2573—Aircraft Excise Taxes.
H.R. 3115—Russell Dam.
H.R. 3602—Tax Credits for Hiring Hard-Core Unemployed.
H.R. 4262—.22 Caliber Ammunition.
H.R. 5632—Consumer Class Action Act.
H.R. 10743—Written Decisions by Supreme Court in Reversing State Criminal Decisions.
H. Res. 119—Select Committee on Aging.
H. Res. 326—Interstate 75.
H. Res. 328—Select Committee on Energy Resources.
H. Con. Res. 251—Clemency for Lt. Calley.
H. Con. Res. 217—Congressional Notification of Federal Grants and Contracts.
H.R. 3269 and 10243—Office of Technology Assessment.
H.J. Res. 403—National Man in Space Week.
H.R. 4214—Raise Outside Earnings Limitation—Social Security.
H.R. 6725—Tax Benefits for Single People.
H.R. 15509—Fiscal Responsibility Act.
H.R. 6111-6114—Campaign Reform.

GOVERNMENT PRAYER IN SCHOOLS?

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I favor complete separation of church and state. I will oppose any form of Government regulated prayer in our public schools, whether it be by local, State, or Federal Government. I do, however, believe in voluntary prayer and Bible reading in our schools and in all public places, as this is truly a "Nation under God."

Last year the House rejected an amendment to the Constitution of the United States that would have weakened the first amendment to our Constitution, which guarantees freedom of religion. I believe that proposed amendment would have violated our time-honored tradition of religious freedom. That freedom has been protected for 200 years by the first amendment. I believe the amendment which we rejected would have destroyed the principle laid down in the first amendment, that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion. At that time the beloved and great Dr. Billy Graham was reported as favoring this amendment we rejected. Since then, Dr. Graham has publicly clarified his position.

I commend to the attention of the Congress and of the American people the following article and editorials from the Charlotte Observer, the Florence (S.C.) Morning News, and The Baptist Courier:

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer, April 5, 1972]

GRAHAM ENDS HIS SUPPORT OF PRAYER AMENDMENT

(By Sam R. Covington)

"I don't think we should ever force prayer," Billy Graham said in Charlotte Tuesday, revealing he had changed his mind on the controversial efforts to put a prayer amendment in the Constitution.

But there should be another court test of what many people believe to be a Supreme Court ban on prayers in the public schools said the Charlotte-born evangelist.

Graham, speaking on the eve of the Charlotte area crusade, said he supported past attempts to amend the Constitution.

But studying arguments before Congress on the matter convinced him that the Supreme Court had only struck down enforced prayer exercises, not voluntary ones.

Graham said he felt teachers should feel free to teach the Bible and conduct religious exercises. A prayer amendment straw vote in Florida primary revealed overwhelming support for school prayer, he said, and he's convinced people across the nation support it.

[From the Florence (S.C.) Morning News]

PRAYER

Evangelist Billy Graham has taken a second look at what the U.S. Supreme Court said about prayer in the schools and has changed his mind about the controversial efforts to put a prayer amendment into the Constitution.

After studying the arguments before Congress on the matter, he's now convinced, he says, that the Court only struck down enforced prayer exercises, not voluntary ones.

Clearly, the state cannot require prayer in any of its institutions without violating the fundamental constitutional doctrine of separation of Church and State.

[From the Baptist Courier, April 27, 1972]

GRAHAM NOW OPPOSES PRAYER AMENDMENT

Evangelist Billy Graham has changed his mind and now opposes any "prayer amendment" concerning the public schools. His statement is carried elsewhere in this issue. We are glad he belatedly saw the light. Last November Dr. Graham supported the Wylie amendment to the Constitution that would have reaffirmed the right to prayer in the public schools. The proposed amendment lost by 28 votes. The *Courier* consistently opposed the amendment as unnecessary tampering with the Constitution. Prayer in the public schools is a right that, although misunderstood, has never been in jeopardy.

We commend the evangelist for his open-mindedness in continuing to study the issue. We especially salute him for the courage to make public his change of mind. It is difficult for any public figure to announce and justify a reversal of position on a controversial issue. There are those always who will suspect his motives.

Dr. Graham's announced mind change is a timely reminder to everyone in public life including elective office holders, businessmen, pastors, even editors, that their opinions influence others. They should study the issues carefully, arriving at a conclusion only after prayerful deliberation. This will not eliminate the possibility of a mind change, but it makes the prospect less likely.

[From the Baptist Courier, April 27, 1972]

REVERSES FEELINGS—GRAHAM SAYS HE NO LONGER SUPPORTS PROPOSED AMENDMENTS ABOUT PRAYER

(By W. Barry Garrett)

CHARLOTTE, N.C. (BP)—Evangelist Billy Graham at a press conference here on the eve of his Charlotte area crusade said he had changed his views and no longer supports proposed prayer amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

This is in contrast to a statement by Graham at a previous press conference at the Charlotte airport in November 1971, just before the vote in the U.S. House of Representatives on the "Wylie" prayer amendment. At that time the evangelist stated that if he were a congressman, he would vote for the prayer amendment.

The Wylie amendment failed by 28 votes to obtain the necessary two-thirds majority in the Nov. 8 vote.

Prior to the Nov. 8 vote, Graham sent a telegram to the author of the bill, Rep. Chalmers P. Wylie (R., Ohio), stating "I am for the prayer amendment now before Congress."

But in the April 1972 press conference, Graham, flanked by United Methodist Earl G. Hunt Jr. and Southern Baptist Convention President Carl Bates, honorary co-chairman of the Charlottee crusade, said that he had studied the arguments before Congress for the prayer amendment.

He said that he was convinced that the Supreme Court had only struck down forced prayer exercises, not voluntary ones.

The new Graham statement was made in response to a question by Sam R. Covington, religion editor of the Charlotte Observer, concerning the recent Florida primary election "straw vote" on prayers in schools.

In his reply, the evangelist suggested that the original Supreme Court decision on prayers and Bible reading may have been misinterpreted by lower courts and by school boards so that religious exercises and Bible teaching were dropped unnecessarily.

He also said that he thought there should be another court test to clarify what many people believe to be a Supreme Court ban on prayer in the public schols.

In the press conference here, Graham did not develop fully how he thought religion and education should be correlated in the public schools. However, he did suggest that moral guidelines should be part of what the schools inculcate. He also thought that Catholics, Jews and Protestants could agree on a program of instruction based on the Ten Commandments.

"We need some moral authority in the schools, and what could be better than the Ten Commandments?" he asked.

Reinforcing his long-held position that the state should not impose set forms of prayer or demand that all pray, Graham said that

he is "against any type of forced prayer that the state draws up."

However, he said he felt that teachers should feel free under the present rulings to teach the Bible and conduct religious exercises.

The new Billy Graham statement was interpreted by some Baptist leaders as another indication of a rising feeling in the nation that constitutional prayer amendments are not the real solution to the problems raised by religion and public education.

In Washington, a group of national religious leaders are currently considering promotion of a national congress on religion and public education within the next year or two. Several Southern Baptists are included in the group advocating such a national congress.

TRIBUTE TO JAPANESE

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join Congressman MATSUNAGA in paying tribute to Japanese Americans. Whatever thanks may be given for the repeal of title II of the Internal Security Act is, in my humble view, insignificant compared to the vote of thanks owed to all Americans of Japanese ancestry by their fellow Americans for their matchless example of endurance and faith in the ultimate triumph of justice during one particularly dark chapter of American history.

Many recall that sad chapter in the life of our people during World War II and those of us especially who live on the west coast remember with humiliation what happened to our neighbors, our friends—purely because of their ancestry. They were summarily imprisoned; their property was confiscated; their rights were suspended, and a whole segment of our citizenry was detained in concentration camps without trial, convicted in a most demeaning fashion, and en masse, on mere suspicion.

Lesser affronts have sent people spilling into the streets demanding instant justice, demanding instant compensation, and summary punishment for the evil-doers. Japanese Americans chose to take the long view of history, realizing even as the blind poet Homer did some 2,000 years before Christ that war brings out both the best and the worst in a nation. It has taken more than a quarter of a century to see this "long view" vindicated, but the triumph of that special strength of character that we have come to associate with the Japanese-American community is utter and complete. They have not merely endured; they have prevailed. And in the process they have exhibited to Americans who stem from a different cultural tradition, and whose faith in its moral teachings are sometimes today seen to be faltering, an unparalleled lesson in meeting injustice with forgiveness, intolerance with tolerance, suspicion with trust, and most importantly, hatred with love.

A people unwilling to persevere in the hope and faith of the ultimate triumph of justice may not hope to endure as a nation, let alone prevail. And so I say again, your fellow Americans are in your very special debt for the example you have set.

TEXAS TRADE MISSION TO U.S.S.R., RUMANIA

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to report to the House encouraging developments in the field of trade relations between our country and the U.S.S.R. A recent trade mission representing Texas oil and petrochemical industries, reports the Department of Commerce publication Commerce Today, met with resounding success—initiating multimillion dollar export transactions.

Feeling that my colleagues also will welcome this advance in peaceful and mutually beneficial trade between the United States and the U.S.S.R., I would like to offer for the RECORD the text of the Commerce Today article on this important trade mission:

MISSION TO U.S.S.R., RUMANIA OBSERVES TEXAS-SIZE INTEREST IN OIL EQUIPMENT

A Texas-size interest in U.S. oil field and petrochemical equipment greeted a trade mission from the Lone Star State last month in both the U.S.S.R. and Romania.

Reporting from Austin early this month that "one member has already been recalled to Moscow by Machinoimport to put the 'finishing touches' on a $16 million project," Mission Director James H. Havey exclaimed: "Now if that ain't tradin' Texas style, what is!" Havey heads the International Trade Division of the State's Industrial Commission, which organized the mission with U.S. Department of Commerce assistance.

SEE BIG MARKET

The "Texas Ten," as the members dubbed themselves, see a multimillion dollar market for their products developing from their 14-day visit in the two countries. In the Soviet Union, they had to revamp their schedules to include Saturday work, in order to accommodate requests from the Russian industrialists for extra appointments and conferences. At a reception at Moscow's National Hotel, so many officials asked to be added to those originally invited, that attendance was recorded at "125 percent."

The USSR Chamber of Commerce conducted a business-practices orientation for the mission. Later, group meetings were held with officials of various Government organizations, including the Ministry of Gas Industry, Ministry of Oil, and the State Committee of the USSR Council of Ministers for Science and Technology.

VISIT RUMANIA OIL FIELD

Highlight of the visit to Rumania was a special invitation to the Ploesti oil field, where the mission members were given a detailed and comprehensive tour of the refinery and industrial plants.

The Texas Ten manned the U.S. Trade Development Center display booth at the Bucharest International Trade Fair, an exhibition of industrial equipment related to petroleum, chemicals, plastics, and rubber. Business appointments in Bucharest followed much the same pattern as in Moscow.

Companies represented on the mission were Gearhart-Owen Industries, Fort Worth; Varel Manufacturers, Dallas; Halliburton Services, Duncan, Okla.; and from Houston, the Oil & Gas Manufacturing Co., Johnston Division of Schlumberger, Rucker Shaffer, Daniel Industries, Bowen Tools, and W-K-M Valve Division of ACF Industries.

MEMORIES OF "MAC" McCLAIN

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to a great public servant—State Representative Elmo "Mac" McClain of Quincy, Ill.—whose sudden death on June 15 is a tremendous loss to the State of Illinois, his neighbors in Missouri, and our Nation.

His contributions toward honest politics and good government were many, and his service to the community crossed party lines. Our colleague, PAUL FINDLEY of Illinois, has frequently commented to me concerning the useful work performed by Elmo McClain. Mr. FINDLEY said:

Regardless of political differences, in any matter affecting the best interests of Quincy and Western Illinois, you could always count on the strong support of Elmo McClain.

There are few too many men of his caliber and his untimely passing will be sorely felt.

The following article by Will Davis of the Quincy Herald-Whig explains why we had such great respect and admiration for Elmo McClain, and the great legacy he has left with us:

MEMORIES OF "MAC" McCLAIN

(By Will Davis)

About 5:30 p.m. Thursday Rep. Elmo (Mac) McClain was wheeled down a first floor corridor along emergency treatment rooms at St. Johns Hospital in Springfield to the third floor intensive care unit.

The nurse with graying hair was furious because a maintenance man had just told her she could not use the emergency elevator until he finished waxing its floor. This, she fumed, was strictly against regulations and she promised a report to high authority as she punched a button to summon the maternity elevator.

It came and as the upward trip started Mac told her, "You'd better calm down or they'll put you to bed and keep you up there where I'm going."

A grin—once described as "more Irish than St. Patrick's Day"—spread over his face and he told two of his closest friends in the Illinois House, representatives Joe Fennessey and Toby Barry, and this writer: "I'm the one who is supposed to worry. I'm the patient."

A small incident in the life of a man who was to leave it five hours and 47 minutes later, but it illustrated just two characteristics of many which cause an intense sense of personal loss felt even by the few persons around here who had never met him—humor and an abiding concern for others.

This is not a tribute to Elmo McClain. Sincere words by other friends in positions of power and prominence have provided that. These are merely observations by one who started with him on legislative duty days in Springfield at breakfast, talked with him several times a day in the House chamber and Capitol press headquarters and usually finished the day by watching the 10 p.m. news in one or the other's adjoining rooms at the motel before a book and bedtime.

His wife, other members of his family and many friends called him "Elmo." We were one of those who called him "Mac."

Mac McClain was a study in contradictions. Almost always his decisions were personal, not political, yet he had one of the sharpest and most intuitive capacities for the real meaning and impact of a speech, statement or action we have ever encountered.

The result was, he never allowed personal beliefs or doctrines to interfere with support of what he considered the political good of his district and state. He, also, never let politics sidetrack him from being steadfastly true to his own deeply held convictions of what was honest or dishonest, good or bad.

That is a difficult course in public life, but his ability to walk such a path was one of many things that set him apart and made him successful both in his elected office and his private life.

Mac had too much natural dignity to be forced into wearing the false face of fake humility. He understood his power as a lawmaker, but used it properly and sparingly.

Two weeks ago he called a state agency and when the official he sought was not available he talked with a secretary. "This is Elmo McClain from Quincy," he explained before outlining a request for routine information. Five minutes later he still was receiving excuses as to why such information could not be given unless a written statement, etc. was first received.

"Maybe I should have said this is Representative Elmo—" he began.

"Oh, why didn't you say so?"

"Why should it make any difference?" Mac replied.

He called his wife Marge several times each day from Springfield and looked forward to the time when all seven children would be graduated from college or university. "If I can see to that," he often said, "I will have been a success."

He will not see that, but he was a success.

If testimony is needed one event on the House floor last Wednesday was only repetition of demonstrated respect by members of both parties many times before.

The temper of the House has grown shorter as this session has lengthened. Just before Wednesday night's meeting concluded Mac rose and asked leave for a bill which originated in the Senate to be allowed to bypass committee hearing to save time in the dwindling days remaining. Typically, it was a bill to help somebody else.

A member of the House leadership objected and usually that would have ended such an effort because a single objection is enough. However, Mac used his next parliamentary move and asked that rules be suspended to accomplish the same purpose. This meant a roll call vote and other attempts to suspend rules during a long day had consistently failed.

Mac McClain made it with votes to spare and half of those votes came from the Republican side. They accepted his statement that the bill was needed and they knew he would never ask such a favor for personal publicity or benefit.

When we first went to Springfield two and one-half years ago it was to report from our fourth state capital. We knew the difficulties and time involved before we could gain acceptance from those who sincerely believe someone with our job is a hereditary antagonist.

Without seeming to do so, Mac guided us through casual introductions by name and newspaper before adding the all-important words: "My friends." This is the way we early became an honorary member of what we called the "Irish Mafia"—Mac, Fennessy of La Salle and Rep. Leland Kennedy of Alton.

This membership was educational, orientational and enjoyable. It also was the key to an expanding first-name relationship with other legislators, officials and knowledgeable representatives of private interests.

Monday begins the final day of Mac's last session. Today we cannot imagine its inevitably long days passing without recognition by the speaker of "The Gentleman from Adams" and the refreshingly natural explanation by that gentleman of why he had asked for an infrequent few minutes of members' attention.

For friends elsewhere and neighbors here at home there is consolation. When the same words in memoriam are used in Springfield, Washington and Quincy—"warm" and "decent"—Mac McClain must have left enough of himself to make some of us better humans.

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION STATEMENT OF NATION'S 196TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, the United States celebrates its 196th year of the Declaration of Independence on this Fourth of July. We are only 4 years away from a momentous 200 years of self-government. The organization Congress created to help plan, develop, enbrating our 200th birthday, the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, has issued a statement for this Fourth of July which I am inserting in the RECORD for myself and my seven congressional colleagues serving on the Commission. The ARBC statement follows:

STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION, JULY 4, 1972

Six years ago on July 4, 1966, the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission was established by a Joint Resolution of the Congress. The Commission was specifically charged by that Resolution to plan, encourage, develop and coordinate observances and activities commemorating the historic events that preceded and are associated with the American Revolution. The Commission was further instructed in all its planning to give special emphasis to the ideas associated with the Revolution which have been so important in the development of the United States in world affairs and in mankind's quest for freedom.

Those ideas, all based on the essential worth and dignity of the individual human being, were both heretical and evangelical in their day. It was the "troika" of heresies contained in the second paragraph of the Declaration of Independence—the heresy that all men are created equal, that they have a *right* to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and that governments are instituted among men to secure those rights—which inspired 13 small, poor and weak colonies to defeat the Armed Forces of the British Empire.

But, they did not stop there. They went back with General Lafayette to France, became "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity" and inspired the French Revolution only 13 years after our own began. Since then, those heretical ideas have resulted in the overthrow of autocratic governments and the establishment of representative democracies around the world. Literally hundreds of millions of human beings have owed and now owe their personal freedom to the 56 men who had the courage to sign the Declaration 196 years ago.

Those ideas are no longer heretical. They have become respectable, and as they have gained respectability they have lost their original evangelical fire. We tend to take them for granted. But we must resist that tendency because those three ideas are worth more to America and Americans than all the gold at Fort Knox, all the oil beneath our soil, more than the combined resources of the richest, most powerful and most generous nation the world has ever seen, because they created that nation. And when those ideas die, America will be dead.

In this Bicentennial Era, the challenge to all Americans is to revive and revitalize those ideas, to make use of their eternal truth and their demonstrated power to show a tired old world what we have been able to do in only two centuries.

The challenge is to demonstrate by our 200th birthday that we have brought full and true equality of opportunity where once there was slavery and male domination, that we have brought decency where there was poverty, sufficiency where there was hunger, conservation where there was devastation and exploitation, beauty where there was ugliness, peace where there was war.

It is the hope and intent of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission that each Independence Day for the next four years will bear witness to dramatic increases in such involvement and support until on Liberty Day, July the Fourth of 1976, every community in the United States can celebrate with good conscience the unqualified success of the greatest experiment in representative government the world has ever witnessed.

GEN. WILLIAM C. WESTMORELAND

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I know that every Member of this House would like to congratulate Gen. William C. Westmoreland on the wonderful service he has rendered the people of our country and the world. General Westmoreland has been recognized as a natural leader since the day he graduated from West Point.

I am certain every person in South Carolina will agree with me that he deserves the applause and heartfelt thanks of each citizen. We very seldom have a man from our State who has been given the responsibility of commanding an army during a war such as Vietnam. As a Congressman from South Carolina, I want to be one of the first to congratulate General Westmoreland on his performance as an exemplary leader, and express the appreciation of the people of my State for his service. I had intended to be present at the retirement ceremonies honoring him this afternoon; however, since Congress has many bills pending on the floor of the House where final votes will be taken, it was impossible for me to be present.

We regret to see General Westmoreland leave the Armed Forces. We realize however, that when a man has dedicated every day of his life for more than 30 years to the vigilance of America's freedom, that he should have an opportunity to spend a portion of his days in a civilian capacity. I wish for General and Mrs. Westmoreland an opportunity to do

everything they have wanted to do during the time their commitments were to their country. The State of South Carolina is proud of their service, and I am happy to have had an opportunity to call on other South Carolinians to pay honor to our great general, William C. Westmoreland, on this date.

NATIONAL ENERGY ETHIC

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, the energy crisis facing our Nation today demands a new approach to the conservation of energy. The days of "cheap energy" are gone, particularly now that we have begun to consider the total cost, including environmental, of producing energy.

The House Republican Task Force on Energy and Resources, of which I am chairman, has investigated the possible savings which could result from improved energy conservation techniques. In one area alone, building insulation—we have found that substantial savings can be effected by utilization of available materials in combination with new standards. For instance, upgrading thermal insulation in residential buildings could save over 15,000 trillion B.t.u.'s of energy over a 10-year period. Not only would this save the equivalent of 15 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, but air pollution would be reduced by approximately 2½ million tons per year.

Of even more importance, though, than new building techniques and insulation standards is a new way of thinking of energy. In a speech at Denver on June 28, 1972, Secretary of the Interior Rogers C. B. Morton used the term "a new energy ethic." As Secretary Morton said:

> We must seek a new and more imaginative way of thinking of energy—that reflects an awareness of our finite assets.

Our energy assets are unquestionably finite.

We must continue the search for new sources of clean energy and fuels, particularly sources such as geothermal and solar, offering minimum environmental impacts while providing for the growing needs of our society. But, simultaneously, we can decrease our demand, to decrease the probability of electric power blackouts and fuelless winter days. As Secretary Morton stated:

> The President's Joint Board on Energy Matters estimates that by energy housekeeping and rather simple installations we can reduce national energy demands by as much as 5%. This could make the difference during peak load periods.

Continued research and development of energy-saving techniques is required and will, I believe, provide benefits far outweighing the costs. We will need, though, explicit, quantitative analysis allowing us to select those ideas which offer the best return for our energy investment.

I recommend Secretary Morton's speech to my colleagues, and I include it in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF ROGERS C. B. MORTON

I am particularly honored to have an opportunity to be with you here in Denver.

As building owners and managers you, and others in your industry, have become increasingly aware of our energy supply situation which, left unattended, could and surely will develop into a full blown energy crisis.

After twenty years of experience in political and public life I have developed a profound respect for crises. They are a primary consuming element of government management.

The possibility of energy supply shortfalls is different, however, it's the only aspect of our future that all of the experts—those in research and throughout government agree upon.

The potential of an energy crisis is of immense proportion:

Each American uses today 50 percent more energy than he did 10 years ago. And those needs are increasing.

Since 1966, our demands for energy have been increasing faster than our gross national product.

Since 1968 we have been using natural gas faster than we find it. New priorities in the marketing patterns of natural gas are being considered and established.

As the industry reaches into the Continental Shelf and deeper into the crust of the earth and as it becomes increasingly responsive to environmental hazards, domestic operations have become more difficult. Costs have escalated. According to Chase Manhattan Bank study, the oil industry alone will need $150 billion in the 70's. That's two and a half times the need of the 1960's.

Cleaning up our environment as just one factor will require great amounts of fuel. It will be needed for proper disposal of our solid wastes, in recycling programs, and in the treatment of waste water and gases. Our newer cars designed to use nonpolluting lead free fuels require 15 percent to 20 percent more fuel than our present generation of cars.

By 1985 we will have to import perhaps half of the petroleum we need. The quantities imported by sea will be vast, on the order of 12 million barrels a day. Last February in a statement before the Congress, Admiral Elmo R. Zumwalt, our Chief of Naval Operations estimated "this will require the equivalent of from several hundred to over 1,000 tankers, each of 70,000 tons, fully committed to deliveries of oil to the U.S." The strategic implications of this are ominous.

Many of you have experienced or are familiar with the brownouts in our cities during peak load seasons. You have listened to your maintenance engineers complain of power fluctuations and accelerated light bulb usage. During long hot spells in summer and consecutive weeks of unrelenting cold in winter—many of us have as much interest in the weather as we do in market activity, or who wins the ball game.

At the expense of sounding overly partisan, the winters of 1970–71 and 1971–72 were comparatively mild and the summers were not unduly hot. I won't address that as an Administration accomplishment but it helped. Who knows what it will be like this summer? Or next winter?

Regardless of what happens it will clearly affect our power situation.

Our present energy demand is being supplied from very thin margins of surplus. Without decisive action now, it is difficult to look to the future with optimism.

In his Clean Energy Message to Congress on June 4, 1971—the first Presidential statement devoted entirely to energy—President Nixon established national energy goals. He clearly expressed the nature of the crisis, and outlined our management goal "A sufficient supply of clean energy . . . to sustain healthy economic growth and improve the quality of our national life. . . ."

What is needed is positive action backed by thorough analysis and planning—a new energy ethic if you will. New technologies providing a more effective use of our energy, at still an economical price—and scheduled utilization of our vast, untapped, energy assets. That is the program contained in the President's energy message, and we are responding.

We are working for the creation of an energy ethic. We must seek a new and more imaginative way of thinking of energy—that reflects an awareness of our finite assets.

Many of you, and others in your community, are now as concerned with insulation systems to reduce energy consumption as you are with the availability of marketable building space.

It is estimated that the cost of insulation to meet new Federal Housing Administration standards in the average home, will equal the fuel savings in one year in average climate.

In amortizing a building it's a sound investment. Good insulation increases cooling and heating efficiency by as much as 30 percent. Conservation of energy adds to fulfilling the needs of our national energy ethic, it's good business practice.

One unneeded light bulb uses 2.4 kilowatt hours a day. That's 976 kilowatt hours a year—at current rates about $26 a year.

And yet I wonder how many of you are concerned about wasted electricity in unoccupied offices, closed closets, and the locked stairwells in your buildings, and what this means when multiplied on a national basis.

A leaking hot water faucet that will fill an ordinary cup in ten minutes wastes 3,280 gallons of heated water a year, or about $6 in energy costs. That sounds like very little, yet I suspect we could have a superb vacation from energy leaks in our own buildings.

The President's Joint Board on Energy Matters estimates that by energy housekeeping and rather simple installations we can reduce national energy demands by as much as 5%. This could make the difference during peak load periods.

I can't help but be reminded of a comment a friend of mine made while we were discussing these same points: "So the Republicans have dimmed the Capitol lights after working hours to save energy—I suppose the Democrats did it because they couldn't pay the bills."

As apocryphal as this may seem—it points up the fact, we clearly need a national energy ethic.

Consider your role and impact on our national energy use patterns. Think of the areas where you can contribute to our national strategy of economic energy use.

On the government side, we are developing new energy systems affording us a more effective use of our vital source materials.

In line with President Nixon's Clean Energy Message we are moving swifty to delevop the fast breeder nuclear reactor, to develop the necessary technology for coal gasification, and to harness geothermal steam.

We are striving to develop energy systems that will convert up to 75 percent of the total energy input into available electrical energy, compared to our current national average of 32 percent.

These new technologies will be expensive, take years to perfect, and will have to satisfy environmental objections regarding siting, thermal pollution and cleaner effluents.

In support of the President's commitment to clean energy and accelerated programs for new technologies we have expedited planned actions to utilize our untapped energy assets.

Here in Colorado and in the neighboring states of Utah and Wyoming lie the greatest known hydrocarbon deposit anywhere in the world—oil shale. Not far from here in the Piceance Basin alone, there is an estimated

potential of 80 billion barrels of oil, recoverable at $4 or $5 a barrel.

The orderly development of these untapped resources will require new technologies and new management systems—not only to maintain an economic return for industry and the consumer, but to preserve the integrity of our environment. Oil shale development is typical of these energy industries of the future

Until recently, however, the use of oil shale as an energy source has been prevented by a mixture of problems—environmental, technical, and economic.

In June of last year we announced a prototype oil shale leasing system. A system which provides for industry's funding and development without degradation of the land. This prototype leasing program is a managment system that will lead the way to safe development not only of our oil shale assets—but of others.

We have held public discussions in open dialogue with representatives from the States, the industry, local communities, and environmental groups.

If I am convinced that *all* the environmental objections can be resolved—we will proceed with leasing offerings later this year.

Thus far the oil industry's response has been encouraging: over $2 million has been invested in exploration. At our call for lease nominations, 15 companies submitted 23 nominations for tracts.

This facet of our energy future will have far ranging effect on your own industry, and others in the mainstream of the American economy.

Based upon planning estimates made last year urban construction to house and support the oil shale industry alone have in Colorado, Wyoming and Utah, will mean the migration of 50,000 to 100,000 people into the areas developed. Some $3 billion dollars will be spent to house and support them. Over $400 million of this would be spent on urban construction alone, with the balance for plant equipment.

These are the highlights of the energy crisis, and the President's program for clean energy in the future. I am encouraged with the progress we have made during the last year.

I believe that we can develop new technologies. We will be able to create a dynamic mangement system, capable of developing new pricing, and regulatory policies, as well as providing new incentives for industry.

In fact we have no alternative than to overcome the demanding economic and environmental problems.

All of these actions, however, will be futile without each of us assuming our personal responsibility to achieve President Nixon's energy goals. . . . as awesome a task as that may seem. A new energy ethic which can take us into the next century will require a total commitment by industry, by the consumer, and by government. Without the commitment and involvement of all three, there is no way to support a sophisticated highly integrated civilization. The days of unlimited supply are over. It must be done . . . our very future as a Nation depends on it.

SANDY HOOK BY BOAT

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, the House Interior Committee has ordered reported legislation providing for establishment of the Gateway National Urban Recreation Center.

In the bill as originally introduced, which I cosponsored, provisions were included for water transportation to help provide access to the park.

At this point, I am including an editorial from the June 18 edition of the Asbury Park Press with regard to this legislation and the need for water transportation. I believe this should be of interest to my colleagues:

SANDY HOOK BY BOAT

Unfortunately, the House Interior Committee has eliminated from the Gateway National Urban Recreation Center a provision for water transportation. The plan calls for establishing national aquatic parks at Sandy Hook and the Jamaica Bay area of Long Island. In each of these areas water transportation from the metropolitan centers offers the only acceptable means of access without placing intolerable traffic and environmental problems on the routes available for ground transit.

Sandy Hook especially calls for water transportation. It is attached to the mainland by a narrow neck that hardly permits of adequate access. And from the Hook to North Jersey and New York the highways are already congested to the point where it is inconceivable that they could accommodate a fraction of the traffic that a national park at Sandy Hook will generate.

In fact, the possibility of water transportation strongly recommends Sandy Hook as a national park near the nation's largest metropolitan center. The boat ride would be a pleasant prelude and postlude to a day of recreation at the park, in contrast to a tedious and tiring drive in bumper-to-bumper traffic on congested highways.

But without boat transit to carry hundreds of thousands of people to and from the park there would arise serious doubt as to the feasibility of the project. For it would be difficult to find or develop ground transit to accommodate those who use the park, or to protect the environment of communities through which the traffic would pass.

FREEDOM FOR THE BALTIC STATES

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the second half of June marks a sad anniversary for all those who value freedom. Thirty years ago this month, the Soviet Union invaded Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia and ruthlessly conquered those republics. Since June 1940 more than one-fourth of their populations have been forcibly deported. In June 1941, mass arrests of the Baltic peoples began with more than 150,000 sent to concentration camps in Siberia.

For 32 years these people have been unable to exercise one of the most basic of human rights—freedom of worship. This religious oppression was recently brought to the attention of the world by the self-immolation of a brave young Lithuanian, Romas Tolantas. The public outcry that followed this shocking event has not been confined to Lithuanians.

Today there are over 2 million Americans of Lithuanian descent in the United States. Recently these citizens paused in their daily routines to mark a national day of mourning and prayer to demonstrate solidarity with the people of their homeland. It is fitting on this anniversary for all Members of Congress to reflect on the fate of the Baltic States. It is all the more fitting for we shall soon be observing the 50th anniversary of the recognition of the three nations by the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is long past the time when the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, which the Soviet Union signed, should be a reality in the Baltic States. The President's diplomacy with the Soviet Union has recently resulted in what we all hope will be a slow but steady normalization of U.S. relations with that country. As real and as significant as that progress may be our relations with the Russians can never be completely normal until the day comes when the Soviet Union allows the Baltic peoples to live in freedom and dignity.

It is to be fervently hoped that our great President will bring up the Baltic question in the U.N. and, at the next meeting with the Soviet Union, request its withdrawal from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

In this connection I would invite attention to House Concurrent Resolution 416 of the 89th Congress, second session, that unanimously passed both the House and the Senate in 1965:

H. CON. RES. 416

Whereas the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and 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 Batlic 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 right to the Baltic peoples.

OIL IMPORT PREFERENCE AMENDMENT

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, now pending on the Senate Calendar of Business as Order No. 804 is the bill (H.R. 13324) which would authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 1973 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce.

However, in addition to authorizing such appropriations this bill contains a section 3 which represents an amendment made by the Committee on Commerce which would require that 50 percent of imported oil, not including residual and No. 2 fuel oil be carried on higher costing U.S.-flag tankers.

Mr. President, I am strongly opposed to section 3 of H.R. 13324. I have so stated in views which I filed in the committee report—No. 841—accompanying H.R. 13324 and in this Chamber on June 13 at which time I inserted in the RECORD an exchange of correspondence between myself and Secretary of Commerce Peterson—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 13, 1972, pages 20629–20631.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, so that Senators may have the benefit of the growing opposition to section 3 of H.R. 13324, my letter of June 16 to the Secretary of State and the reply thereto, and a letter dated June 27, which I received from Mr. Charles W. Else, president, Independent Refiners Association of America, along with an accompanying summary memorandum.

There being no objection, the letters and accompanying memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 16, 1972.

Hon. WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Secretary, Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Enclosed is a copy of the bill, H.R. 13324 and the report of the Senate Committee on Commerce accompanying it (Rept. No. 92–841).

In reporting this bill the Committee amended it by inserting a new section 3 which will require that at least 50% of oil imported on a quota basis, allocations or licenses, other than residual fuel oil to be used as fuel and No. 2 fuel oil, be carried on higher-costing U.S. flag tanker vessels. I and several of my colleagues on the Committee have opposed this amendment. It is my intention to move to strike this amendment at such time as the bill is considered by the Senate.

Accordingly, I would appreciate receiving the views of your Department on this oil import cargo preference amendment and its probable effect upon international relations for the United States. I also would like to have your comments on that portion of the Committee's report which seeks to justify section 3 of H.R. 13324 based upon international precedents (see pages 24–26).

Your timely response to this request will be appreciated.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,

NORRIS COTTON,
U.S. Senator.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., June 27, 1972.

Hon. NORRIS COTTON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR COTTON: The Secretary of State has asked me to reply to your letter of June 16, 1972 requesting the Department's views on H.R. 13324 and the report of the Senate Committee on Commerce accompanying it (Report No. 92–841). The specific question at issue is the new Section 3 of the bill which would require that 50 percent of imported oil, not including residual fuel oil and No. 2 fuel oil, be carried on United States flag tankers.

The Department is opposed to Section 3 of the proposed legislation and believes its enactment would be harmful to our foreign economic relations.

With respect to the statement in the Committee report (p. 24) that there is "ample precedent" for restrictions on oil imports to national flag vessels, we question whether these precedents are either ample or relevant. While France for many years has had the requirement that two thirds of its oil be imported under French flag, waivers of this requirement are frequently granted. Spain, Chile, and Peru are not major shipping nations and their actions can hardly be deemed a precedent for action by the United States. In the case of Chile and Peru, moreover, the reservation of oil cargoes is simply a part of measures reserving half of all imports to national flag lines. It is natural to expect that Japan, with by far the largest shipbuilding industry in the world and low operating costs, and totally dependent on foreign sources for its oil, might have a national policy to carry a substantial share of its oil imports in its own ships, but Japan does not have any cargo reservation laws and, so far as we are aware, there is no "guarantee" of a 50 percent participation by Japanese vessels in this trade. In short, it does not follow that the United States should abandon a long established shipping policy of freedom of choice of carrier for commercial shipments because a few other countries have for their own national reasons instituted cargo preferences on oil imports.

The Committee report (p. 25) states that "this legislation is required by our national security, and therefore it is not inconsistent with our treaty commitments." This Department did not argue that the legislation would be inconsistent with our treaty commitments if there were a justification on security grounds. It simply expressed the belief that the national security need for this legislation had not been demonstrated. As the Department pointed out in its testimony before the Senate Committee on Commerce (S. 3404, May 1, 1972), while recognizing that oil imports will come increasingly from areas which are, politically speaking, relatively unstable, we consider that it is the source of supply, rather than the means of transportation which poses the primary problem from a national security standpoint. We also note that the Secretary of Commerce has written you (June 12, 1972) that his Department, together with the Office of Emergency Preparedness and the Navy Department is now reviewing the national security needs for the United States flag tanker fleet, specifically taking into account the increasing requirements for oil imports. Until this study has been completed it would seem premature to justify the need for this legislation on national security grounds. If it were determined that the national security required transporting half of our oil imports in United States flag tankers, there would still be an option whether to achieve this result through direct subsidies, as intended under the Merchant Marine Act of 1970, or by indirect subsidies (cargo reservations).

The Committee's report (p. 25) states the opinion that a 50 percent oil import reservation "seems no more inconsistent with (treaty) provisions calling for 'national treatment' and 'most-favored-nation treatment' than practices in which the United States and other nations have long engaged." In support of this broad generalization, the report argues that our treaties do not explicitly make any distinction between government-financed or government-generated cargoes on the one hand and commercial cargoes on the other. This Department believes that the distinction is clear as a matter of treaty interpretation and important as a matter of shipping policy. It is accepted internationally that the treaties relate to government actions which affect normal commercial shipments and do not apply to shipments made by governments for their own account or where they are acting in a proprietary capacity. We have interpreted the latter as covering certain export shipments which would not ordinarily move without special loan terms offered by the government, and this has not been contested. Most of our major trading partners, which are also important maritime nations, share the view that purely commercial cargoes should be free to move in accordance with normal private business decisions and should not be directed through discriminatory government legislation. These are also the nations with whom, for the most part, we have treaty obligations.

It is true that some other nations, especially in South America, have adopted cargo reservation measures of considerably broader scope which may in same cases interfere with what we would consider normal commercial shipments. We have treaties calling for "national treatment" and "most-favored-nation treatment" with only two of these countries (Argentina, 1853, and Colombia, 1846), but these and all other South American nations which have cargo reservations favoring their own national flag shipping lines (Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, Peru, Venezuela) have in fact removed any discrimination against United States flag lines by granting them equal access to all government-controlled cargoes in our bilateral trade.

The United States in turn allows 50 percent participation by its trading partner in the carriage of our own "government-generated" cargoes in the bilateral trade. In effect, and without any intergovernmental agreements, each government is giving "national treatment" to the ships of its trading partner so far as government-controlled cargoes are concerned. The governments have also approved, on our side by the Federal Maritime Commission, agreements between the national shipping lines based on the equal access principle and calling for a pooling and equal division of revenues from all traffic actually carried by the parties. These agreements do not in themselves restrict the freedom of all carriers to compete for normal commercial cargoes. They are not, as the Senate report implies, agreements between governments with terms which are inconsistent with our FCN treaty obligations.

It is true as the Senate report points out that certain oil producing states are considering the establishment of national flag tanker fleets to carry a portion of their oil exports. It does not follow, however, that because certain oil exporting states may in the future adopt restrictive measures which we consider uneconomic and ill-advised, the United States should anticipate their example. Carried to a logical conclusion such actions could result in completely bilateralizing the oil transport business. Such a development could destroy the flexibility which has enabled oil importers to use the most efficient and lowest cost vessels for their oil transport needs regardless of flag, a practice which in the long run benefits oil consumers in this country.

Though not mentioned in the Senate report, there is one additional point that we feel should be made. This Department, in collaboration with other interested agencies has for many years protested to foreign governments against the spread of national cargo preference legislation and regulation into the field of commercial cargoes. Though difficult to measure with exactness, we believe that the United States representations to these governments have helped in many cases to maintain a climate of competitive opportunity for United States shipping in our foreign trades and has benefited our merchant marine. The enactment of Section 3 of the proposed legislation would do much to destroy the credibility of any future United States representations along these lines.

If we can be of any further assistance in this matter, please do not hesitate to let us know.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID M. ABSHIRE,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

INDEPENDENT REFINERS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., June 27, 1972.

Hon. NORRIS COTTON,
U.S. Senate
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR COTTON: An amendment adopted by the Senate Committee on Commerce to H.R. 13324, the maritime programs authorization bill for 1973, would require that 50% of overseas oil imports under quota (except residual and No. 2 fuel oil) be carried in U.S.-flag tankers.

We oppose this amendment because:

1) It would impose substantial costs on consumers and independent refiners, exceeding one billion dollars annually by 1980.

2) It would have a special, discriminatory impact upon independent refiners.

3) Secretary of Commerce Peterson has launched a study of other alternatives by which the maritime goals may be attained more effectively, with a deadline for reporting to Congress set at September 15, 1972. Certainly, at a minimum, the 50% flag tanker requirement should not be considered for adoption until Secretary Peterson has reported to the Congress on these other alternatives.

A memorandum and a summary memorandum, with the facts and reasoning in support of these views, is attached for your consideration.

We respectfully request that if, as we hope, you concur in our views, you will take whatever action you deem appropriate to delete Section 3 from the subject bill.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES W. ELSE,
President.

SUMMARY MEMORANDUM

JUNE 24, 1972.

Re H.R. 13324—Adverse Impact of 50% U.S.-Flag Tanker Requirement for Oil Imports.

The Senate Committee on Commerce, on June 7, 1972, reported H.R. 13324, the House-passed maritime programs authorization bill. Section 3 of the bill, added as an amendment by the Committee and not acted upon by the House, would require that 50% of overseas oil imports under quota (except residual fuel oil and No. 2 oil) be carried in U.S.-flag tankers. The Committee report contains a factually erroneous economic analysis which cloaks the magnitude of sharply increased costs, attributable exclusively to the 50% requirement, for our domestic economy but which in fact will inexorably result.

The following points set forth in summary form an accurate assessment of this burden and highlight the superficialities and factual errors in the Committee's analysis:

1. *Cost impact of U.S.-flag preference provision.* Based upon conservative Government and industry cost estimates, the transportation cost impact of the 50% requirement *will exceed $1 billion annually* by 1980. In 1975, the earliest year in which the flag-preference provision could reasonably become efficacious, the transportation cost impact would be approximately three-quarters of a billion dollars. Vastly lower projections relied upon in the Senate report—$24.7 million based on 1971 conditions—totally ignore essential facts:

a. The report artificially assumes that the sources of future oil imports will remain constant. The record demonstrates that practically all growth of waterborne crude oil imports will come from the Eastern Hemisphere, involving the longest tanker hauls.

b. The report ignores a clear statutory mandate of American flag participation by "geographic areas" and assumes that tankers will be used exclusively for shorter hauls where cost would be minimized.

c. The report ignores the absolute shortage of U.S.-flag tanker capacity. It summarily dismisses the prospect of sharply escalating costs by erroneous reliance on a provision for "fair and reasonable rates for U.S.-flag commercial vessels," which in fact has been interpreted to offer little if any relief.

d. Even the Government and industry cost estimates (over $1 billion annually) are based on *current* costs for ocean transportation; all ocean rates, both domestic and foreign, will be pushed artificially higher as a direct by-product of the 50% requirement.

2. *Cost impact on consumers.* The billion dollars in additional transportation costs will be borne largely by consumers in the form of higher petroleum product prices in accordance with the normal operation of our competitive system. The attempt in the Committee report to disguise this fact through an exercise in theoretical economics is plain nonsense, as is any analysis which attempts to project billions of dollars in benefits at minimal cost. Detailed analysis will clearly demonstrate that the Committee report misconceives the manner in which oil industry pricing and the oil import program in fact work. The benefits (and as a corollary any increase in costs) of foreign oil are largely passed through to consumers.

3. *Adverse effects on independent refiners.* To the extent the substantially increased costs of the 50% requirement are not borne by consumers, the independent refiner segment of the oil industry will bear a disproportionately severe impact. The "independent refiners" are those who have no substantial ownership link with their crude oil supply, thus being compelled to purchase their raw materials in a market dominated by their major company competitors. Independent refiners currently are afforded relatively larger import quotas than are their major competitors in order to offset the majors' other special import control benefits and to approach a competitive balance. The allocations of imported oil they receive help the independents to obtain domestic crude, by exchange of their allocations with the majors, and to average down their overall raw material costs.

a. The principal result of the 50% requirement for the independents will be sharply to decrease their ability to obtain domestic crude oil and reduce, disproportionately vis-a-vis the majors, the values realized for the independents' offshore import allocations. Recent experience as to the effects of increased tanker rates empirically verifies this conclusion.

b. The viability and competitive vigor of the independent refiner segment will be seriously undermined, resulting over the longer term in added detriment to consumers.

c. Owing to the shortage of U.S.-flag tankers and with sharply escalating spot tanker rates, independent refiners will be denied the option of importing overseas crude oil directly. Their major competitors, on the other hand, owning or controlling most of the U.S.-flag fleet, will continue to enjoy that option.

d. Faced with already large capital commitments, independent refiners will be unable to purchase their own U.S.-flag tankers, while, by contrast, their major competitors will have the ability to do so and the option also to convert their existing foreign-flag bottoms to U.S. registry.

4. *Impact on our national security and other public interest factors.* Instead of promoting national security, the 50% requirement will have precisely the contrary effect, as the Department of State and other Government agencies have pointed out.

a. The independent refiner's special national security role, as a flexible and geographically dispersed source for oil, will be seriously undermined.

b. New refinery and petrochemical plant capacity in the U.S. will be inhibited, and the exportation of such capacity to foreign locations will be accelerated.

c. The construction of superport facilities in the U.S., and of mammoth tankers (VLCCs) dependent upon those ports, will be postponed, if not precluded.

d. Our flexibility in the event of emergency to draw upon the free world pool of efficient tanker tonnage and upon varied worldwide sources of crude oil will be eliminated, as tanker ownership and control is polarized, in retaliation, under the flags of oil source countries.

e. The impact on domestic employment and investment in the refining and petrochemical industries will be sharply adverse as such investment and jobs are syphoned off to foreign locales.

f. Such export of refining and petrochemical capacity will have obvious detriment to our balance of payments.

5. *Conclusion.* For these reasons, the 50% U.S.-flag tanker requirement should be rejected. At minimum, no action should be taken pending the analysis publicly promised by Secretary Peterson to the Congress no later than September 15.

JOAN SMUTKO AND THOMAS HUDSON ATTEND WASHINGTON WORKSHOP CONGRESSIONAL SEMINAR

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, this week I have had the pleasure of meeting two exceptional young people from the 23rd Congressional District who are here in Washington attending the annual Washington Workshop Congressional Seminar. They are Miss Joan Smutko, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. John S. Smutko, of 26720 Normandy, Bay Village, and Thomas Hudson, son of Mr. and Mrs. Jack H. Hudson, 1626 Elbur, Lakewood, Ohio.

Joan is a graduate of Bay High School and Tom has just completed his junior year at Lakewood High, where he was selected by the faculty and school board to attend the seminar. I was pleased to note that Tom's participation in the program was made possible by a generous scholarship grant from the Union Car-

bide Corp. in his home town of Lakewood. Corporations that involve themselves in community citizenship programs are to be commended for their faith and interest in our Nation's young people and our system of government.

I am pleased that Joan and Tom have had the opportunity to spend this very worthwhile week studying their National Government on the scene, and I am particularly proud to have two such intelligent, well-informed youth representing Bay Village and Lakewood from our district.

BUTZ INCREASES FARM FEARS

HON. BOB BERGLAND

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. BERGLAND. Mr. Speaker, time and time again the American farmer has been blamed for conditions beyond his control. He is blamed for rising food costs. He is condemned for subsidies which, though nothing more than a pitance when compared with other industries, have become a favorite target of the uninformed.

At the same time, farmers and the residents of our smaller communities, those same people who some would have us think are taking advantage of the taxpayers and consumers, are being driven from their lands and home and into the festering cities.

Lorence Winter, a constituent from Wheaton, Minn., has movingly expressed his fears and concerns in a letter to Secretary Butz. I would like to share his message with you at this time:

WHEATON, MINN.
June 18, 1972.

Hon. SECRETARY EARL BUTZ,
Department of Agriculture.

DEAR SIR: The Minneapolis Tribune—Date June 16, 1972—Volume CV1—No. 23P, carried this headline, "Food chains warn sharp price rise is under way."

The following day, June 17, 1972, the Minneapolis Tribune—Volume CV1—No. 24P, carried this front page headline, "Butz gets report urging end of farm supports."

Now Mr. Butz, I should like to pose some questions, reactions and opinions relative to the above.

First of all, was it mere coincidence that these related headlines appear in perfect timing to affect a political impact on the food and fiber consumer of our land?

Secondly: Is the Young Executive Committee of your department aware that their recommendations are in direct conflict with the agricultural plank on which President Nixon was elected?

Are you aware, Mr. Butz, that this policy would completely destroy a way of life and an independent industry that throughout our history has served well the needs of our country. During my lifetime of well over 60 years I have seen these farmers provide in plenty for the needs of all. When great wars arose these farmers girded themselves and worked long hours to provide for the needs of our allies besides our own.

Rural people have provided more than their share of our country's leaders and today remain the only stronghold of individual thinking and initiative.

Now your committee tells us we must destroy the family farm because Baronies and Corporations can produce more cheaply.

I will neither dispute nor agree to this latter. Economists disagree! But I will tell you as most farm leaders have told you for years, *They will not sell cheaper!!*

Why should they? They will put a price on their product just as industry does today. These corporations will not deliver their produce to a market where they must ask, "What will you give?" They will establish their price through their organization and the consumer will pay it. After all, even today food is still more essential than automobiles or TVs.

Let the consumer be warned. Corporations are not the answer to cheap food. This is truly naive thinking. When the "Big Three" cornered the auto market, did the price go down?

Your committee says that this policy should reduce subsidies by $6,000,000,000.00. Could I ask why farm payments are always called "subsidies" while payments to industry are tax incentives or depletion allowances? In my opinion the tax incentives which your committee proposes to rehabilitate the displaced farmers will need to be so large as to make the 6 billion look like chicken feed. Furthermore the experiment of putting heavy industry into rural areas or small cities has a very dubious history. They demand special services, special tax treatment, temporary or short term leases or free leases and often leave the community holding the bag! The industry these communities need is the family farm.

We probably should not consider the individual heartache, misery, anguish, and frustration of moving some 6 million individuals from their homes but we cannot ignore the impact of moving these masses into metropolitan areas. These are going to be misplaced persons regardless of any rehabilitation money the government may give them. They will not fit into the congestion, pollution, crime and traffic jams of the big cities. They will be lost souls. The cities don't want them! They will be victims of iniquity and the aggressive will join the criminal element.

What this nation needs, sir, is not more corporations but less. Why do we advocate breaking up the feudal system in foreign countries and then turn around and encourage it in our own? Should this proposed policy be put into force, it will result in more barons of wealth and poor peons and the final outcome will be anarchy and revolution.

I notice that several farm organizations have already denounced the report of the Young Executive Committee. I hope this course will be followed by every other farm organization as well as by every civic organization in every city. In short, by every citizen in the land!

Dear sir, there is yet time, there is room in our country for all our people if we will only make it desirable for them to live where that room is. Let us think more of "the way of Life" and less of frugal wealth. Let's wind down the rush to crowded cities. Your department has the tools to encourage a return to nature and the soil where millions of our city inhabitants are yearning to be. Let's promote homes where children can laugh and play among the wonderful plants and animals of nature.

This great country of ours was based on the family and the home. Love and religion was basic to every child's thinking.

Today we encourage our people to believe that success is wealth, powerful and dangerous machines, questionable entertainment of low moral fiber and a night at the tavern. The result is a people fully confused and bursting with nervous tension.

If this nation is to be saved we must return to the home, the family fireside and religion.

We must have more individualism and less and smaller industrial cartels and monopolies. I sincerely hope that the Dept. of Agriculture will begin by using its powers to save the family farm.

Yours very truly,

LORENCE WINTER.

ADDRESS OF DR. FREDERIC W. NESS

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Frederic B. Irvin was recently inaugurated as the 12th president of Newberry College in Newberry, S.C.

Newberry College was chartered by the State of South Carolina as a college of liberal arts in 1865. However, the founding of the institution dates back to February of 1831, when the first classes of a Lutheran Academy were held. Thus for 142 years Newberry College has continuously used its cultural and academic resources to make invaluable contributions to the educational and spiritual life of the area.

The inauguration ceremonies for Dr. Irvin were splendid and impressive. Dr. Frederic W. Ness, president of the American Association of Colleges, delivered the inaugural oration. I commend to the attention of the Congress and of the American people this outstanding and timely address of Dr. Ness:

ADDRESS BY DR. FREDERIC W. NESS, PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES, AT THE INAUGURATION OF DR. FREDERIC B. IRVIN AS PRESIDENT OF NEWBERRY COLLEGE, APRIL 21, 1972

The normal practice at such ceremonial occasions is for the visiting orator to devote his brief span of time to alerting the new president (sometimes referred to as the sacrificial lamb) to the horrors that lie ahead and to warning him to make good his escape while there may still be time. When I sat down a few days ago to draw up these notes, however, I recalled a personal experience of many years back which seemed to have some relevance to my assignment today and which suggested modification of the standard procedures.

The joining of a president and a college, I would remind you, is not unlike the mating of man and wife. Now, when my bride and I were inducted into our present state of connubial bliss on the distant but enchanted isle of Martha's Vineyard we had both arrived at which might euphemistically be described as our mature years. Observing protocol, a night or two before the event we paid a visit to the officiating pastor in his book-lined study for the customary few words of last-minute advice. Looking us over quietly for a moment or two the good man opened the conversation by saying simply, "Well, if there is anything you two don't know about getting along together, it's too late for me to tell you now."

The analogy is obvious: When I first made contact with Dr. Fred Irvin back in the 50s, he was already a seasoned and highly effective college president. In the intervening decade he has held a variety of responsible positions of national and international significance, positions which called for keen intelligence, unusual diplomacy, and no small

measure of low animal cunning. Therefore if there is anything he doesn't know about the intricacies of managing so strange an organism as a college, it is too late for me to tell him now. Or possibly even too late for him at this stage to try to learn.

Therefore, and with your indulgence, I would instead like to consider with you an issue which I believe to have implications for this academic community and for all of higher education as well. I want to talk, in fact, about the cheerful possibility of the bankruptcy of the liberal arts college. Quickly to allay your fears, let me assure you that I am not today concerned about budgetary matters. Some independent liberal arts colleges, to be sure, are likely to slide into fiscal bankruptcy in the next few years and possibly even more will before the end of this decade if certain forms of relief do not become available, and soon. But since I am no longer a college president desperately trying to balance a budget, I have the leisure to be concerned at the moment with the more subtle bankruptcy of liberal learning as a concept, as a system, even as a way of life.

While Dr. Irvin was still president of Thiel College I had the honor to be invited to address an Honors Day convocation on his campus. Responding to slightly more than idle curiosity, I pulled the old speech out of my files the other day and reread it with a degree of modest interest. The title was "The Perils of Lilliput"; and the general theme, that unless the small liberal arts college rethinks its objectives and develops a truly distinctive approach to the education of those individuals placing their futures in its tender custody, it will cease to exist as a viable educational entity.

(By way of digression, may I remind you, President Irvin, that on the day of this memorable address of mine at Thiel College you, Sir, deliberately absented yourself from the campus. Well, you can't get away this time!)

Although very few of the colleges which I had in mind on that earlier occasion have in fact ceased to be, I think my prediction has greater validity today than it did nearly two decades ago. I see it now, however, in somewhat different dimensions.

Perhaps it is overly dramatic for me to suggest that liberal learning is in danger of bankruptcy, and yet to me the elements are becoming all too evident. Of this much I am certain—we simply can no longer proceed in a business-as-usual fashion. The world around us in changing, has changed. The system—if it is right to call higher education a system—as we know it and promote it was designed for a quite different set of circumstances.

That we sense these changes and are uneasy about them is evidenced by the substantial number of experiments and innovations that are taking place on college campuses all the way from Bangor to San Diego. But examined closely, nine-tenths of these innovations turn out to be little more than tinkering with the status quo. All too often they seem to be designed essentially to preserve the traditional, however ingeniously disguised, rather than to make the hard effort to penetrate to the heart of the academic problem.

It is true that we are beginning to learn, perhaps the hard way, what we can no longer live with. For example, in administration the old pattern of the benevolent despot in the president's office has yielded to a system involving, among other things, much greater faculty participation. And this is, on the whole, a desirable development. Unfortunately in some instances it has simply replaced one irrationality with another, to the place where on a few campuses today so many are in the act that the essential role of leadership can no longer be exercised. Even such basic economies as are involved in securing increased faculty productivity have become next to impossible. Given a choice between benevolent despotism or participatory chaos, I'm afraid that I would have to side with Plato of old.

Related to this, we have learned, too, that the traditional concept of loco parentis is self defeating if what we are seeking to instill in our "junior scholars" is the desire for responsibility and maturity. Thus we are engaging our students actively both in self governance and self education. And this is indeed a salutory change. But here again we are caught in the uncertainties of just how far is far enough. Further, looking at this development purely legalistically, I wonder how many colleges at the moment have an idea of the full implications of the lowered age of majority. In certain states the 18 year-old is now recognized as a legal adult. What this means to many of our long-standing academic customs and practices is profound and but dimly understood.

We have learned, or are beginning to learn, that learning itself is far more important than teaching—though we certainly have little notion at the moment as to what this signifies in terms of the proper role for the instructor. Many of our senior faculty members are never likely to modify the conventional patterns of lecture and examination. Not a few of our younger instructors, on the other hand, feel that there is no difference between student and teacher and govern their relationships and academic praxes accordingly. Perhaps both are right. I suspect, however, that neither is on target.

We have learned, however imperfectly, that there are important ways in which the world around us can serve as the classroom and laboratory, that under proper guidance the student in absentia can function in part as his own experimental mentor. But we are none-the-less wise in approaching this new academic relaxation with a degree of caution. Again the question is how far is far enough. Many of our current programs, both on campus and off, assume unrealistic levels of maturity and self determination. Thus they may offer quite the wrong regimen for a substantial percentage of our students. Can we really expect a man to run who is only learning to walk? Perhaps not, though on average I would still opt for giving it a try.

We have learned, or are beginning to learn, that a lot of the rituals which had operated as if sanctified are questionable if not downright dispensable. As one example, I recall reading correspondence dated in the early part of this century in which a distinguished American educator was questioning, to a distinguished European counterpart, the whole concept of academic grading. Yet it has been only in the past few years that the profession as a whole has taken up the issue. Some colleges, with an impetuous eagerness to "get with it," have thrown out the grading system entirely and others are pellmelling to get on the band wagon—this despite the absence of adequate evaluative substitutes or any hard data on possible impacts on the student's subsequent academic aspirations.

These are but a few of the things we have learned, or are beginning to learn. And although, as I have pointed out, each requires a word of caution, my reservations do not, singly or in combination, suggest any such dire consequence as academic bankruptcy. On the contrary I view them on the whole as offering favorable augary of a more effective climate for learning.

What I am really concerned about, however, is what we have not as yet learned. As the poet is thought to have warned us, a little knowledge may be a dangerous thing. (And, by the way, President Irvin, a little college may be a dangerous thing, too.)

What we need first and foremost, I would suggest, is to learn new and different ways of looking at knowledge. And it follows, as the night the day, that we need new and different ways of looking at college as well. We need to rethink our goals and our missions, to redesign the liberalizing functions of our institutional patterns of learning.

Before I elaborate, it might be worth asking why significant change seems to be so difficult, so slow in accomplishment. The simplest answer lies, of course, in the well-known fact that social systems are reformed, and reformable, from within only under the most extraordinary circumstances. Another way this has frequently been expressed is that moving a college is not dissimilar, in its complexity, to moving a cemetery. The living seem to assume some of the characteristics of the moribund in the process.

The basic difficulty in reforming a college from within is that the potential reformers have generally been products of the system and any innate ability to step aside and look upon the system with a critical or creative eye is quickly dimmed by the necessities of academic survival. Wordsworth, in his "Intimations of Immortality," described the process as the all-too-rapid immolation of the sentient soul within the prison walls of maturity. To put the matter bluntly, the faculty member, brought up in, for, and by his particular academic discipline, is understandably more concerned with the survival under the rules of the game than with changing the rules and thereby re-forming the game.

(I'm all the more willing to level such charges in the sure knowledge that I'll be leaving town shortly after the termination of these ceremonies!)

My basic contention here is that we, all of us—faculty, administrators, students—have come to accept, largely uncritically, that human knowledge is properly and inevitably pigeonholed into the disciplinary categories of history, English literature, economics, physics, geology, and so forth. Characteristically when we cloak this division of knowledge in a learning system, we assume that it is sacrosanct, untouchable. Further, we identify learning with the thing learned and etch in concrete what should at the very least have remained quasi malleable. We thus become far more concerned with substance than method, with rigid verities rather than evolving truths, with standardized expectations rather than with individualized fulfillment.

Although we have not as yet learned how to reorder our traditional academic patterns, I suggest that it is quite possible to approach a college education in terms of modes of knowing rather than of isolated (or even interrelated) categories of knowledge. This may well be dreaming, but it is not just idle dreaming. Once, in fact, in a wild thrust of creative impulse, I came up with just such a design. My failure to carry it off has been one of the major disappointments of my career.

I won't describe it to you in detail, both because of time and because it has been partially immortalized in print. Expounded under the hucksterish rubic "The Sequential Seminar in Creative Development," it sought to undermine the current rote or mnemonic system of learning by crossing the disciplines with linkages based on the ways in which the mind works and the man learns. Frankly it was a little too complicated even for its designer, but, to the extent I understand it, I still think it makes a great deal of sense.

We have not, I believe, learned as yet how to take students where they are, developmentally, and to design academic programs to meet developmental needs. Perhaps a system which aspires, at the post-secondary level, to educate a very high percentage of the total population is much too large and complex ever to do so. But even many of our small colleges are not demonstrably con-

cerned with such individualization, despite claims set forth in their annual bulletins.

I am beginning half to convince myself that we should seek means of deliberately suspending the educational progression of the individual at one or more of his growth stages in order to accommodate other priorities. For example, I find myself questioning that is ethically right for the majority of our young people to be virtually forced to remain in a dependent state through the late teens and early twenties—just at a period in life when they are feeling the greatest urge to test their wings. A few successful flights may be worth dozens of falls.

Or again, if it were easy to slip back into the educational scheme, wouldn't it be far healthier for the young man and woman to be introduced to the responsibilities of marriage at the time when the mating instinct reaches its physical and psychological apogee instead of continuing with a system in which so many of our youth who aspire to advanced degrees must pay such a heavy price in diminished personal involvement. But maybe I'd better focus my thoughts on more strictly academic matters.

We have not, I believe, learned enough about the inadequacies of the cognitive/rationalistic mode of knowing. How well I remember one occasion a few years back when a young militant student, earnest and deeply frustrated, cried out at me in exasperation, "I know you understand what I am saying, but can you feel what I am feeling?" This was no idle query, and I am afraid that the adequacy of my response left much to be desired. There is more to life than knowing. The E.Q. (emotional quotient) may be more important to individual and even societal well-being than the I.Q. Yet our educational system has given far too little care to this need.

Even as I say this I am reminded of the recent study conducted under the auspices of the Carnegie Commission which concluded that the college graduate, on average, is a happier individual than the non-graduate. Perhaps if we reordered the curriculum by introducing such courses as Happiness I, Contentment II, and Ecstasy III and IV, we could do even better, we could have an even more salubrious impact. But you will forgive me if I remain skeptical. I am equally skeptical, however, that the way we now combine, and the ways we now present, our smatterings of the humanities, the social sciences, the arts, and the sciences contribute much to intellectual liberation, let alone emotional maturity.

We have not as yet learned, in the collegiate setting, how to relate liberal learning creatively to the vocational needs of our students. I speak as a wary (as well as weary) father whose two youngest daughters are recent graduates of fine liberal-arts programs, one with a major in history, the other with a double concentration in art and English. Need I tell you, they both had a problem, as did the father who was anxious to get them off the pay roll. They simply had nothing to offer the job market. Somewhre in my notes I have a statement from a professor of liberal learning who declared that if he ever discovered in his teaching anything of immediate, practical value, he would resign at once. I am sorry that I was not there, in a position of authority, when he made the offer.

Our colleges of liberal arts and sciences were originally initiated as vocational institutions; and, though usually not acknowledging the fact, they have for years been involved in certain types and stages of vocational preparation. For example, many liberal-arts institutions are turning out graduates a high percentage of whom go directly into elementary or secondary school teaching. Others of our colleges achieve status through continuing to induct large numbers of their students into graduate and professional study. Yet both of these "markets", if I may be forgiven the term, have undergone a dramatic decline and are not likely to pick up again for a long time to come. What, then, is or should be our response?

I must pause for just a moment on this one and ask why it is that for the past seven hundred years or so the professoriate has been primarily interested—and I state this as an observable fact—in trying to turn out scholars, despite the absence of true scholarly interest or ability in all but a handful of their students. Is the answer perhaps simply that this is the easy thing to do? How can the professor of literature, for example, be expected to have any interest in, let alone knowledge of, the career expectations of the business man or the public servant? Yet are we meeting our obligation to our students when we don't at least make the effort?

Well, I do not propose that we immediately convert to vocational or technical schools. I would suggest, however, that we have a considerable obligation to concern ourselves with the vocational needs of our students. Further, I believe that, if we pay more attention to method, we could go a long way toward infusing vocational study with a true liberalization of the mind and spirit. As taught today vocational education is far from liberalizing and liberal education, for most students, is woefully far from "vocationalizing"—but for the sake of the individual as well as of the society we serve, it's high time for these twain to meet.

There are, I can assure you, other very important things we in higher education have not as yet learned; but, to avoid further trying your patience, let me mention only one more.

As a nation and as a society we are currently in the throes of a revolution of the spirit. Yesterday's verities are suffering in the hostile climate of the relative and the uncertain. This is having its impact on every phase of our lives, every hour of the day, every day of the week—including and particularly Sunday.

The liberal arts college was founded and has ostensibly been maintained to promulgate a set of values, for the most part in the Judeo-Christian tradition. But these values, at least as they are practiced, seem lately to be inadequate to meet the needs of our students. Perhaps—and I would underline the uncertainty—it has always been something of a fiction that a college can instill or strengthen values that were not previously held and strongly held. Yet there is some evidence that some colleges do make some difference. At the same time there is present in this college generation a desire, almost unique in my years of experience, to reassert the value of values, to put into practice what older generations were content merely to preach. There is, in short, a new spirituality. Our problem as custodians of society's most evolved institution, the nation's liberal arts college and university, is somehow or other to marshall this new creative spirituality and to focus it for the welfare of mankind.

To do this is perhaps the most important of the things we have not as yet learned. Not to do it, and soon, may well mean the ultimate thrust into bankruptcy of liberal learning and the liberal arts college.

And so, Dr. Irvin, if you think you have returned to the campus as a place of relative serenity after your hectic years in the arena of international conflict, I have done my best in the past few minutes to alert you that we have not resolved all of our problems in the years you've been away. There are still a few things left for you to do.

Thus, in congratulating you and this fine college on so auspicious a marriage, may I wish you Godspeed and enjoin you and your colleagues to think on these things.

AUTISM

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am including in my material part of an article appearing in the Journal of Autism and Childhood Schizophrenia by Dr. Bertram S. Brown of the National Institute of Mental Health, entitled "A Task Force With a Goal." It appeared in the first issue of the journal in January 1971. The purposes of the journal are summed best by Dr. Brown when he says:

It is my fondest hope that through the efforts of the journal's task force with a goal, the efforts of the staff and of the individuals supported by the National Institute of Mental Health, and the efforts of professional groups, voluntary groups, and parents throughout the world, we shall be able to offer our children not only more care and better care, but the great boon of freedom from illness via prevention and cure.

With this in mind, I intend to include an article on autism every Wednesday for the remainder of the session. There is also another article elsewhere in these Extensions on the same topic. I do hope that my colleagues will find the material interesting and will work with me to help provide adequate care and training for the victims of mental and chronic illnesses.

The article by Dr. Brown follows:

A TASK FORCE WITH A GOAL

(By Bertram S. Brown)

One is entitled to wonder: What happened until recently to unfortunate children who, through no fault of man, were condemned to sufferings now belatedly recognized as psychotic ailments? Gottfried Keller, the famous Swiss novelist, told in his autobiography the story of little Emerentia which he found in his native village among a clergyman's manuscripts:

This 7-year-old girl, the offspring of an aristocratic family, whose father remarried after an unhappy first matrimony, offended her "noble and godfearing" stepmother by her peculiar behavior. Worst of all, she would not join in the prayers and was panic stricken when taken to the black-robed preacher in the dark and gloomy chapel. She avoided contact with people by hiding in closets or running away from home. The local physician had nothing to offer beyond declaring that she might be insane. She was placed in the custody of a minister known for his rigid orthodoxy. The minister, who saw in her ways the machinations of a "baneful and infernal" power, used a number of would-be therapeutic devices. He laid her on a bench and beat her with a cat-o'-nine-tails. He locked her in a dark pantry. He subjected her to a period of starvation. He clothed her in a frock of burlap. Under these circumstances, the child did not last long. She died after a few months, and everybody felt relieved. The minister was amply rewarded for his efforts by Emerentia's parents.

This was the fate of a psychotic child in 1713. What has occurred since then is summarized briefly in a "historical overview" in the first issue of this Journal. These developments, slow at first and now in a state of lively fermentation, had to wait until Western culture humanized the sciences and disentangled them from deep-rooted superstitions. The 19th century, inspired by the basic tenets of the French and American

revolutions, set the stage for the implementation of the rights and needs of children. Ellen Key, the Swedish sociologist, could proclaim in 1900 that the 20th century was destined to be the century of the child. Indeed, within a few decades after her prophecy, child psychiatry became a new, productive, legitimate scientific discipline. Serious attention to psychotic children became an inevitable and imperative task of the new discipline and a central focus for many investigators.

As is the case with every new scientific enterprise, the early observations were scattered in a great variety of publications. They appeared as case reports, anecdotes, statistical data, therapeutic experiences and suggestions, and various, sometimes discrepant, theories and hypotheses. Isolated groups of workers with special interests had little contact with each other. Nonetheless a body of material accumulated and now exists in separated clusters.

It is the exciting goal of this Journal to bring these clusters together for the purpose of relieving the sufferings of psychotic children and their families. Fortunately it was possible to gather a task force of scientists representing many fields of endeavor which may contribute to realizing this goal. From this point of view, the journal may be viewed as a major step in the progress of mental hygiene. As the list of the Board of Editors shows, this journal proscribes no theoretically or otherwise constricted roads to understanding psychotic children, but wishes to promote scientifically ascertained observations and facts from every source which can widen our horizon, whether they confirm, expand, reduce, or negate existing hypotheses.

We have come a long way since the days of Emerentia. We still have a long way to go. It is the goal of this Journal's task force to pave this way as expertly and expediently as possible.

When so many talented, energetic, and distinguished men and women come together to work and reflect on a problem such as autism and childhood schizophrenia, surely there is great hope for new understanding and better methods of treatment.

In addition to the obvious national and international importance of this journal's task force, there are very personal considerations which make it a privilege and an honor for me to participate and to write this introduction. When I was in medical school in the 1950's and became interested in mental retardation and autism, a search in the library revealed little helpful material. Two exceptions to this, however, were Dr. Kanner's textbook and his articles. They served as an inspiration as well as an education. As I pursued these medical school interests during my pediatric internship at Yale, the chief of the department, Dr. Milton J. E. Senn, asked me to help study a set of 5-year-old autistic twins. These children had been seen by several leading practioners of the day, and the depth of the pathos of parents and children was awesome. My encounter with this family led to my first published paper, "Akerfeldt Test for Childhood Schizophrenia." Since that time, I have felt that we must pursue our goal of understanding this problem on all fronts, from the biological to the anthropological. Dr. Kanner has led the way.

These early interests in children have led to a set of professional endeavors including 2 years in the White House as President Kennedy's staff person on mental retardation and my work with the National Institute of Mental Health. On becoming Director of the Institute in June 1970, I announced that child mental health would be the Institute's number one priority. An ad hoc committee of more than 80 staff members has reviewed the Institute's activities in the field of child mental health and has made a far-reaching series of recommendations for increasing the Institute's commitments in this field. Copies of the committee's report are now circulating among professional groups, associations of providers of mental health services, and voluntary associations of citizens so that we may have the benefit of their consultation and interest.

It is my fondest hope that through the efforts of this journal's task force with a goal, the efforts of the staff and of the individuals supported by the National Institute of Mental Health, and the efforts of professional groups, voluntary groups, and parents throughout the world, we shall be able to offer our children not only more care and better care, but the great boon of freedom from illness via prevention and cure. This journal will help lead the way.

DETROIT'S ETHNIC FESTIVALS

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, we all know about the troubles which have beset our large cities. From time to time, however, there is a brighter side, as in the case of Detroit's ethnic festivals.

The Detroit Metropolitan Area is blessed with a sparkling variety of ethnic influences. In 1970, Mayor Roman Gribbs, buoyed by the success of the annual Greektown Festival, decided to enlarge the concept. The result has been gratifying, as the June 28, 1972, editorial of the Detroit Free Press testifies.

Under leave to extend my remarks, the editorial follows:

FLOURISHING ETHNIC FESTIVALS

New, innovative ideas for big cities in America abound. Like fireflys, they are hatched, glow with intermittent bursts of enthusiasm, and summarily die. But Detroit is fortunate enough to have a laudable concept transformed into an even more pleasing reality.

The downtown ethnic festivals have been a total success. They have drawn, and will continue to draw throughout the summer, millions of suburban citizens downtown for a fun time. Where the downtown area on weekends was once a series of concrete canyons virtually devoid of humanity, there are now thousands of people enjoying the area in safety.

The idea and its realization have been the work of Detroit Mayor Roman S. Gribbs. Shortly after taking office, Hizzoner looked into the possibility of the city's sponsoring events similar to the long-established Greektown festival. In the summer of 1970, he held three new festivals downtown. Last summer, the number grew to 14, and attracted more than two million citizens.

This year's program, which began with the Irish festival June 2, has been expanded to 19 festivals which will run every weekend until Sept. 24. Latin American, Polish, Indian, Mexican, Scandinavian, Afro-American, and Armenian are but a few of the festivals remaining for the citizens to enjoy.

Under Mayor Gribb's guidance, the city has organized the festivals which spring alive on weekends in the riverfront area behind Cobo Hall. Plainclothes police unobtrusively patrol the large crowds to insure safety. Health inspectors make certain that the food sold is of good quality. Stroh's brewery provides cups of beer and ice cream at cut-rate prices. And thousands and thousands of people of numerous nationalities and backgrounds mingle and meet in a pleasant atmosphere.

So far, the only problems encountered with the festivals have been a result of their huge popularity. Food stands occasionally run out of goodies. Other city projects should be so lucky. The City of Detroit makes no direct financial profit from the festivals; it only breaks even. And there is no admission charge for the festivals.

The ethnic festivals have been such a success that officials from other cities have visited them to learn about the possibilities of instigating similar happenings in their own cities.

Mayor Gribbs says that he is "personally pleased" with the unqualified success of the festivals. The rest of Detroit joins him.

1972 ETHNIC FESTIVALS

July 1–4—American.
July 1–4—Greek (Greektown, Monroe Street).
July 7–9—Far Eastern.
July 14–16—Captive Nations.
July 14–16—Bavarian (Harmonie Park).
July 21–23—Afro-American.
July 28–30—India.
August 4–6—Ukrainian.
August 11–13—Polish.
August 18–20—Scandinavian.
August 25–27—Armenian.
September 1–4—International.
September 8–10—Mexican.
September 15–17—Arab.
September 22–24—Latin American.

CITY OF CHICAGO RESOLUTION

HON. GEORGE W. COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, several years ago, the city of Chicago as well as several other metropolitan cities initiated reduced fare plans for the elderly. However, with this reduction additional financial difficulties developed within the transit authorities in providing adequate service with less revenue. In view of this situation, the city council of Chicago adopted the following resolution introduced by Mayor Daley at their meeting of June 14. I am hopeful that my colleagues will find this to be of great concern. The resolution reads as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the number of persons 65 years or older in the United States today is approximately 20 million—ten percent of the total population; and

Whereas, between 1960 and 1970, older Americans increased in number throughout the Nation by 21 percent, as compared with an 18 percent growth in the under 65 population; and

Whereas, nearly 6.5 million older Americans are now classified as poor or near poor, and one out of every four individuals 65 and older—in contrast to one in nine for younger persons—lives in poverty; and

Whereas, the ability to travel is vital to the elderly in order to acquire basic living necessities and to participate in spiritual, cultural and recreational activities; and

Whereas, the White House Conference on Aging, on December 2, 1971, adopted recommendations which call for "travel at half fares or less on a space available basis on all modes of public transportation", for the elderly, and "operating and capital subsidies" by the Federal government to make this and other recommendations possible; and

Whereas, in February, 1972, Mayor Richard J. Daley and Michael Cafferty, Chairman of

the Board, Chicago Transit Authority, testified before Congressional Committees, urging that the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 be amended to provide operating subsidies for urban mass transportation systems; and

Whereas, on March 8, 1972, Robert J. Ahrens, Director, Mayor's Office for Senior Citizens, in testimony before the U.S. House Select Subcommittee on Education recommended operating subsidies for mass transit systems for any proven loss which results from a program of reduced fares for the elderly; and

Whereas, numerous mass transit systems, including the Chicago Transit Authority, have instituted reduced fare programs for senior citizens and continue to experience fiscal difficulty in attempting to provide an adequate level of services; and

Whereas, Congress is currently considering legislation (as part of the "Omnibus Housing Act of 1972") that carries the important provision of subsidy for urban mass transportation; now, therefore,

Be it resolved, That the Mayor and members of the City Council of the City of Chicago in meeting assembled this 14th day of June, A.D., 1972, urge the inclusion within the "Omnibus Housing Act of 1972" of provisions calling for the reimbursement to urban mass transit systems for proven losses attributed to the reduction of fares for senior citizens; and

Be it further resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the House Banking and Currency Committee of the United States Congress.

RECENT SALT AGREEMENTS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE U.S.S.R.

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Greenville, S.C., News of June 17, 1972, contains an article which I consider most relevant to the continuing debate about the strategic arms agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union.

The writer explains that recent administration statements on the "escape clause" in the treaty and American interpretations of certain aspects of the agreement both give further evidence that approval is in the best interest of this country.

With regard to the escape clause, the President stated that the United States would probably withdraw from the defensive agreement if no acceptable offensive agreement is reached within the 5-year interim period. Withdrawal could also occur if the Soviets expanded or improved their defensive missiles beyond limitations set forth in the treaty.

Another safeguard is the American insistence on counting strategic weapons of our European allies separately, thus assuring the United States of additional weapons if the need arises. These comments deserve the consideration of the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "'Fine Print' Alleviates Fears," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, June 17, 1972]

"FINE PRINT" ALLEVIATES FEARS

Details submitted by President Nixon to to Congress on the defensive missile treaty and the interim offensive missile agreement with the Soviet Union reveal some important areas of disagreement, which paradoxically make the landmark agreements safer for the United States and the free world.

Most important, perhaps, is the escape clause in the treaty, which permits either country to withdraw upon six months notice. In his explanatory remarks, the President made clear that he had informed the Soviet Union the United States probably would withdraw from the defensive missile treaty if an acceptable offensive missile treaty were not negotiated within the five-year limit of the interim agreement.

In addition the United States could withdraw if it found the U.S.S.R. to be improving defensive missiles beyond the bounds of the treaty or the understandings reached with leaders of the Kremlin. This involves both numbers and quality of weaponry.

The "fine print" revealed by the President's communications to Congress also goes far to explain and justify the numerical superiority in land-based offensive missiles and nuclear submarines allowed to the U.S.S.R. in the interim agreement on offensive weaponry.

Previously it was known only that the United States was depending upon technical superiority and ability to deliver more nuclear tonnage to offset the Soviet numerical advantage. The "fine print" shows the United States also is taking into consideration modern submarines built by this country's European allies.

The Soviet Union insists that allied subs be included in the limitation; America holds otherwise. Since this issue is unsettled the United States can proceed legitimately on the assumption that it can count on allied submarines, and of course can cancel the agreements if the U.S.S.R. insists otherwise.

These details, and probably others not yet fully explained, tend to cast uncertainty upon the effectiveness of the treaty and interim agreement. But they do safeguard this country against finding itself locked in an iron-bound box with no avenue for escape.

On balance the treaty and interim agreement appear to be a forward step toward a stable, honorable world peace. Such a step is needed to alleviate justified fear of a nuclear holocaust and to provide a basis for continuing negotiations on more meaningful limitations of both strategic and tactical armaments.

Further study and debate will be required before the Senate can reach a decision on ratification of the treaty and both Senate and House can vote upon the interim agreement. But the recently-disclosed details give further evidence that approval of both is in the best interests of this country.

RETIREMENT OF GEORGE ROBINSON

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1972

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the chorus of congratulations and accolades raised by my colleagues in tribute to our good friend, George Robinson, on the occasion of his well-earned retirement from his service to the Members of the House of Representatives.

Congressman Bill Hill brought George to Washington from Colorado in 1947 to join our congressional staff. Bill Hill was always a great judge of character, and in the case of George Robinson he made an extraordinary choice, to the credit of the great State of Colorado, and to the benefit of the hundreds of Members of Congress George has served so faithfully and so well.

As the acting minority leader, I know I may express these sentiments on behalf of all of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, in wishing George and his good wife, Ethel, every happiness and satisfaction in the years ahead, as they return to Colorado.

George Robinson will be remembered gratefully and fondly here at the Capitol, and we hope he will come back often to see us.

CENTENNIAL YEAR OF "CRACKER JACK"

HON. MORGAN F. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, more than 100 years ago, the great city of Chicago was laid waste by a most devastating fire which took more than 200 lives and caused damage in excess of $200 million. At the same time, a German immigrant with $200 in savings opened a small popcorn stand with one popper.

Since then, Chicago has rebuilt itself into one of the greatest cities in the world. And the immigrant, F. W. Rueckheim built his little popcorn stand into a company that is known to practically every man, woman and child in the world. I am speaking of "Cracker Jacks."

This is the centennial year for "Cracker Jacks," and I would like to join with them in celebrating it. Although baseball may be our national pastime, I think it is accurate to say "Cracker Jacks" have become a national institution.

Since this is the year designated for the celebration of the rebuilding of Chicago and for 100 years of fine products made by the Cracker Jack Co., Mayor Richard J. Daley has proclaimed this period as "Cracker Jack Time in Chicago."

I would like to insert into the RECORD at this time a chronology of events which depict both the growth of Chicago and the growth of the famous "Cracker Jack." I think all candy lovers in the Nation will find it interesting:

CRACKER JACK CHRONOLOGY—IT'S BEEN A CRACKER JACK CHICAGO FOR 100 YEARS

Cracker Jack, a company whose beginnings coincided with the rebuilding of Chicago after the holocaust of 1871, grew as the city boomed. The development of the little popcorn stand of 1872 into the world's largest user of popcorn in 1972, is indicative of the pioneer spirit that has been Chicago's since the days of the early settlers.

The "we can do it" energy of the people of Chicago was infused in F. W. Rueckheim, a

German immigrant, who came to Chicago to work on his uncle's farm in 1869. Two years later he moved to the city to help clean up after the blaze. He had been earning $150.00 per year on his uncle's farm and had saved $200.00 while there.

The story of F. W. Rueckheim and the growth of Chicago are intertwined. They are each representative of the vitality, vigor and vision that make Mideast America what it is today.

In 1871—Chicago, population 334,270, was laid in ashes; three and one-half square miles were burned, over 18,000 buildings destroyed, 200 persons killed and 100,000 persons made homeless. Total loss was estimated at 200 million dollars.

In 1872—F. W. Rueckheim went into the popcorn business with $200.00, one stand, one popper and a partner at 113 Federal Street (then called Fourth Avenue).

And the Chicago Public Library was founded.

In 1873—F.W.'s brother, Louis, bought out the partner and became Bro. in F. W. Rueckheim & Bro.

In 1875—The *Chicago Daily News*, the first one-cent paper, was founded. (Previously, *The American* became a daily in 1839, the *Chicago Morning Democrat* became a daily in 1840, and the *Chicago Tribune*—the first to use the name in the country—issued its first paper in 1847.)

Between 1875 and 1884—The brothers moved the firm five times in nine years, doubling and quadrupling their manufacturing space as demand increased, lastly to a three-story brick building at 266 South Clinton Street.

Meanwhile, the open Board of Trade was organized in 1877; the first Bell & Edison telephone system was installed in Chicago in 1878; the Art Institute of Chicago was incorporated in 1879, and the first electric lights were installed in 1880. The first cable cars were run—on State Street south to 39th Street—in 1882 and used until 1906; and the first asphalt pavement was laid in 1882.

In 1887—Chicago's first municipal electric lighting system was put into operation. In 1889 Hull House was founded by Jane Addams and Ellen Gates Starr. The Chicago Symphony Orchestra began its first season, and the University of Chicago was chartered in 1890; and the Chicago and South Side Rapid Transit Railroad (the "Alley L") opened the first elevated line, from Congress to 39th Street, in 1892.

Chicago's population passed the 1,000,000 mark in 1890.

In 1893—Twenty-one million people who flocked to Chicago for the World's Columbian Exposition, enjoyed wonders like the Ferris Wheel, Little Egypt, and a popcorn-peanuts-and-molasses confection introduced by the Rueckheim Brothers who made and sold their new treat at the fair.

In 1896—Louis Rueckheim solved the problem of separating the popcorn kernels from one another and perfected the confection. F. W. gave the treat to a salesman who replied, "That's a cracker jack!" "So it is!" said F. W., and it has been ever since. The name was trademarked, and the slogan, "The More You Eat, The More You Want," was copyrighted.

In 1897—The Scenic Theater, first moving picture theater in Chicago, opened at 567 South State Street.

In 1899—The wax-sealed package was developed to protect the flavor and crispness of Cracker Jack until it reached the hands of the consumer. This carton was used until the moisture-proof package was perfected in 1902.

In 1900—The sanitary and ship canal was opened and the current of the Chicago River was reversed.

In 1903—F. W. Rueckheim & Bro. became Rueckheim Bros. & Eckstein and bought two buildings at Harrison and Peoria Streets for a new plant site, "The largest of its kind in the world."

And Chicago celebrated its Centennial.

In 1906—The first trains were run through the downtown freight tunnel system, with 60 miles of track, and the first electric street cars ran on State Street. The White Sox beat the Cubs in the World Series four out of six games.

In 1907—Angelus Marshmallows, the firm's second most successful product, received a trademark.

And Daniel Burnham's *Chicago Plan* was first published.

In 1908—A patent was granted for Cracker Jack's wax-sealed package.

"Take Me out to The Ball Game" was written, with the words "Buy me some peanuts and Cracker Jack."

Between 1910 and 1913—Cracker Jack, with coupons for premiums, was sold.

In 1911—An International Aviation Meet was held in Grant Park, "the greatest aviation event the world has ever seen."

In 1912—Cracker Jack was first sold with a prize inside.

In 1916—The first Municipal Pier, later renamed Navy Pier as memorial to Chicago Naval dead of World War I, was completed.

In 1918—Rueckheim Bros. & Eckstein was a $3 million dollar company.

In 1919—The little sailor boy and his dog Bingo appeared on the Cracker Jack package for good. He had been seen on promotional pieces since 1916. The first fully-dipped moisture-proof packages of Cracker Jack went on the market, and Cracker Jack was advertised in the *Saturday Evening Post*.

The White Sox won the pennant, and the first airport in Chicago was established in Grant Park, but was later moved to Maywood, Illinois, until 1926.

In 1922—Rueckheim Bros. & Eckstein became The Cracker Jack Co.

In 1924—Chicago's Union Station, "the most modern railway station in the world," was completed.

In 1926—Soldier Field was dedicated, and the Illinois Central suburban service was electrified, with the first electric train being put into operation.

In 1927—The Chicago Municipal Airport (now Midway Airport) was dedicated on the Southwest Side.

In 1928—The Cracker Jack Co. realized the largest profit in its history—$716,658.95 before taxes.

In 1929—The *Chicago Times* was first published.

In 1929–1930—Chicago boomed. Population passed the three million mark, city produced $4 billion of goods a year, spent $1 billion on new buildings, including the Field Museum.

In 1930—The Cracker Jack Co. purchased a plant site at 4800 West 66th Street, its present home.

In 1932—Franklin D. Roosevelt was nominated for president in the Chicago Stadium.

In 1933—The Mystery or Question Mark Package of Cracker Jack was introduced, with presidential coins or movie star cards as prizes. More than 230,000 children joined the Mystery Club during the next four years by sending coins and cards and receiving a membership card and a prize.

Employment in Chicago's industry had been cut in half . . . payments were down almost seventy-five percent. Foreclosures went from 3,148 in 1929 to 15,201 in 1933. Over 163 banks closed their doors. Land values which had reached the $5 billion level in 1928 dropped to $2 billion at the beginning of 1933.

The Century of Progress Exposition took place in Chicago and attracted over 28.6 million visitors in a two-year run.

In 1934—Brookfield Zoo opened.

In 1936—Cracker Jack added an ecology symbol to its park packages—a green leaf in a circle which reach, "Place Empty Box in Waste Basket."

In 1941—The *Chicago Sun* was first published.

In 1942—The Atomic Age was ushered in at the University of Chicago where Nobel physicist Enrico Fermi controlled and stopped atomic power for the first time.

In 1943—The Cracker Jack Co. received the Army-Navy "E" flag for "high achievement of the production of materials needed by our Armed Forces." The company packed Field and Emergency rations for the Armed Forces, as well as powdered eggs for the Allies.

The new State Street Subway was opened.

In 1944—Cracker Jack advertised on radio for the first time. Cracker Jack, Angelus, Campfire and Recipe marshmallows (all owned by The Cracker Jack Co.) sponsored "News of the Week," a 15-minute, once-a-week radio show broadcast to 17 stations for 52 weeks.

In 1945—More than 10,000 industries made Chicago the largest and most versatile World War II arsenal and supply center. Output was valued at 25 billion dollars. Chicago sent more than 500,000 men and women into military service, equal to 33 combat divisions.

On August 14, the Great War ended.

In 1946—Mother Frances Xavier Cabrini, who died in Chicago in 1917, was proclaimed a saint, the first U.S. citizen so honored by the Roman Catholic Church.

In 1948—A new line of plastic Cracker Jack prizes was developed to increase variety and appeal to children. Cracker Jack used approximately twenty million prizes monthly, and began wrapping them to prevent accidential consumption by children.

The Chicago *Sun-Times* was established by merging the *Chicago Sun* and *Chicago Times*.

In 1950—Chicago's population was 3,620,-962.

Gwendolyn Brooks of Chicago received the Pulitzer Prize in poetry, first Negro woman to receive the award.

In 1952—the net worth of Cracker Jack more than doubled in 13 years, increasing from $1,750,923.21 on December 31, 1939 to $3,637,955.65 on December 31, 1952.

In 1954—The Lyric Opera Company of Chicago was formed.

In 1955—Cracker Jack was advertised on national TV for the first time—CBS–TV's "On Your Account," which was broadcast to 130 stations across the country.

Richard J. Daley was elected mayor of Chicago.

In 1956—Cracker Jack introduced improved, foil-wrapped box.

The Congress Expressway opened.

In 1958—The St. Lawrence Seaway opened.

In 1959—British Queen Elizabeth and Prince Phillip visited Chicago—the first visit of a reigning British monarch to Illinois.

Between 1959 and 1962—Modern over-all marketing strategy to strengthen and enlarge Cracker Jack's consumer franchise was blueprinted in 1959. During the next three-and-one-half years a streamlined, hard-hitting marketing-oriented company was created.

Two additional Cracker Jack items—the Pass-Around Pack, four times regular size, and Park Pack, for concessionaires—were developed.

In 1962—Cracket Jack began a highly creative saturation spot television advertising campaign.

In 1963—Borden, Inc. completed arrangements to buy The Cracker Jack Co. and it became the Cracker Jack Division of Borden's Food Division.

President Kennedy visited Chicago to dedicate O'Hare Airport in March. In November, the city was stunned and grief-stricken by the assassination of the President.

In 1965—Chicago Circle Campus of The University of Illinois opened with 5,145 students on Chicago's southwest side.

In 1966—Two Chicago scientists won Nobel prizes for service to mankind, Robert S. Mulliken and Dr. Charles B. Huggins.

It was a good year financially for most of the seven million residents in the Chicago-Gary metropolitan area. Family income, averaging $11,400, was at record levels, making Chicago the world's richest city, according to the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry.

In 1967—The 50-foot Picasso statue was unveiled in Civic Center Plaza.

In 1968—Cracker Jack was the fastest moving, most profitable item in the confectionery section of all major grocery chains throughout the country.

In 1970—Cracker Jack was being consumed in 24,689,000 or 43.1% of all U.S. households.

In 1972—Cracker Jack is being advertised in 64 TV markets, in 39 TV territories. It is the world's largest user of popcorn, using 25 tons of raw corn per day.

80% of Cracker Jack's output is sold in 97% of U.S. grocery outlets.

Cracker Jack has "won and held public confidence since 1872."

FARM GIVEAWAY PROGRAMS ARE A WASTE OF THE TAXPAYER'S DOLLARS

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 15690, a bill which appropriates $12.9 billion—much of which is used to subsidize huge landowners for not growing crops.

I opposed this measure, as I feel that the farm program is a disaster in three important aspects: First, it is a waste of the taxpayer's money; second, it has not kept down the prices of groceries; third, it benefits only those agribusinesses which are not in need of this kind of "welfare."

WASTE OF TAXPAYER'S MONEY

In this era of a record high public debt—interest on which costs the taxpayer over $20 billion a year—we have a responsibility to reduce Federal spending in order to get the very most out of the tax dollar, and to provide a measure of tax relief to the moderate and middle-income wage earner.

The first item we should cut is the farm program that pays billions of dollars to producers of cotton, wheat, and feed grain not to grow crops.

For the 5-year period 1966 through 1970, the Department of Agriculture paid between $2.5 billion and $3.3 billion annually in direct payments to producers participating in the cotton, wheat, and feed grain programs. In 1970, 17 producers received between $500,000 and $3.5 million each; and over 300 producers received over $100,000 each.

In 1970, to restrict what was quickly becoming "welfare for the rich," Congress limited to $55,000 the amount of direct Federal payments a person could receive annually under the cotton, wheat, and feed grain programs.

This restriction was to save an estimated $68 million a year. However, due to administrative decisions made by Agriculture Department officials, there was no significant reduction in 1971.

The General Accounting Office conducted a study of the arrangements made by some agribusinesses to avoid the intent of the law, and slip through the loopholes allowed by the Department of Agriculture. They revealed that agribusinesses were simply leasing part of their acreage, and thus collecting both Government payments, and rental fees.

One such operation was in California.

According to the General Accounting Office:

A California corporation and its wholly owned subsidiary leased about 11,600 acres of cotton allotments, worth about $2.5 million on the basis of 1971 direct payments, to five newly created organizations qualifying for 53 separate payment limitations. In addition to receiving lease fees, the corporation contracted with the organizations to farm the cotton for fees based on the cost to produce the crops. This latter arrangement, called custom farming, allowed the 53 individuals to receive Federal payments of about $2.5 million without actually farming.

Another such method to avoid the intent of the law is the practice of forming partnerships, a la John Wayne. The GAO revealed a case in Mississippi which illustrates this technique:

Under the 1970 cotton program, a Mississippi farmer received about $87,000 and his adult son received about $46,000. Had the father made no changes in his farming operation for 1971, he would have qualified for payments, in the absence of the payment limitation, of about $79,300. Application of the $55,000 payment limitation would have resulted in reducing his payments by about $24,300.

In 1971, however, the father and son combined their farming operations and joined with a son-in-law to form a three-member partnership. The partners increased the size of their farming operations by leasing additional cotton allotments and, as a result, were eligible, before application of the payment limitation, for $165,152 in 1971 cotton program payments. Because each of the three partners could receive $55,000, or a total of $165,000, a savings of only $152 resulted.

These are not rare examples, Mr. Speaker. According to a March 1972 Department of Agriculture report:

Of about 1350 producers who received more than $55,000 each in 1970 payments under the three programs; 1046, or 77%, changed their farming interests or operations for 1971.

GROCERY PRICES ARE HIGH

While the taxpayer pays up to $3.3 billion to benefit agribusiness, he does not receive the benefit of low-cost food and fiber.

Choice steers at Omaha rose from about $29 per hundredweight in January 1971 to nearly $34.50 in December 1971. In February 1972, choice steers at Omaha were at a 20-year high of $37 per hundredweight.

In fact, food costs have increased by 7.4 percent since the beginning of phase II in November 1971.

According to a study commissioned by former Secretary of Agriculture Hardin, food and fiber can be produced at reasonable prices without the Government subsidy. The report, issued on June 16, 1972, states:

We feel the agricultural industry can provide adequate supplies of food and fiber at reasonable prices and equitable returns to resources, including family labor, with a minimum of government intervention. Programs costing the U.S. taxpayers $4 to $5 billion annually are not needed for these purposes.

Mr. Speaker, the housewife who buys the family groceries knows that prices are high and getting higher.

This farm giveaway program cannot be justified by claiming to keep down the price of groceries.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, the taxpayer is tired of paying his hard-earned dollars to the Government. He is especially irate when the program is of no benefit to him, but, instead, benefits the wealthy.

The taxpayer would like a cut in taxes, but that cut cannot come until we reduce Government spending.

Let us get the fat-cat agribusinessmen—who would not know a boll weevil from a weaved bowl—off the backs of the taxpayer. Let us dump the farm program, and save the taxpayer billions of dollars a year.

How can anybody possibly justify paying billions of dollars to agribusiness for not growing crops while millions of Americans are being denied an adequate diet? While the taxpayer continues to bleed? While the national debt climbs to almost half a trillion dollars? And while the consumer pays record-high prices for groceries?

I cannot.

Therefore, I voted against this bill in an attempt to put an end to this scandalous waste of money.

H.R. 15690

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote against the Michel amendment to the agriculture appropriations bill that would prohibit the issuance of food stamps to strikers. This decision was most difficult because I am very much opposed to upsetting the balance of power between management and labor.

Nevertheless, it was my feeling that the children of a striker are just as hungry as the children of someone who is unemployed. After all, we feed hungry people in many other countries without investigating whether their actions meet with our approval. We offer them assistance because they are in need. Should not we offer aid to the families of American workers who find themselves in the same position?

Further, consider the man who is on strike merely because his union voted accordingly. It is very possible that he, along with a substantial number of his fellow members, voted against striking. However, because the majority of his colleagues voted to strike, those who opposed the strike lose their income for the duration of the strike as well as those who favored it. Why should these workers and their families be penalized?

It has been assumed by many that strikers become eligible for food stamps simply because they are on strike. This clearly is not the case. These individuals must meet the same stringent standards that are required of other needy Americans for participation in the food stamp program. The eligible striker must follow established work registration regulations as well as adhere to strict income limitations.

Making it impossible for the families of strikers to receive adequate nutrition is not the way to stop strikes. This country has displayed a great deal of humanitarianism to the hungry of the world. I feel that we must show the same compassion to our own.

There are many flaws in the food stamp program and I think, as so many other Federal programs, it has grown so great it is getting out of hand and thwarting the original intention behind its enactment, but as long as we have such a program the hungry families of workers on strike should not be excluded from it.

I will, therefore, vote against the Michel amendment.

EPA LAUDS DELAWARE'S ANTI-POLLUTION PROGRAMS

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the Regional Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, Edward W. Furia, recently visited Dover, Del., for a ceremony at which checks were presented to various county and city officials. The checks represented the State share of several important water pollution control projects.

While in Dover, Mr. Furia expressed his evaluation of the work of Gov. Russell W. Peterson and the citizens of Delaware in improving the environment of our State.

Subsequently, the Delaware State News carried an article about this meeting. Because I believe that Mr. Furia's views are of interest to the Senate, I insert the article at this point in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From the Delaware State News, June 23, 1972]

EPA BOSS PRAISES DELAWARE AS "LEADER" IN POLLUTION FIGHT

(By Rolf T. Rykken)

DOVER.—The regional administrator for the federal Environmental Protection Agency yesterday praised Delaware as a "leader" in antipollution efforts and Gov. Russell W. Peterson as "courageous" for providing the leadership.

Edward W. Furia, region III EPA administrator, said that the State of Delaware has been "a leader—if not equal to the best" in its antipollution efforts.

He attributed this to the "extraordinary courage" in the leadership of Gov. Peterson in such areas as the Coastal Zone Act, which prohibits heavy industry from Delaware's coast, and his efforts to stop sludge dumping almost directly off the Delaware coast.

Furia said that Delaware has an "extremely good program" in its Clean Streams Program, which shows "every indication that it will work."

Furia's laudatory comments towards Peterson and the State Natural Resources and Environmental Control Department came during a check presentation program of State sewer funds at the governor's office.

Peterson handed out $1.6 million divided among Kent County, Wilmington and New Castle County in sewer grants for fiscal 1972. (The funds come out a total of $4 million for the whole state.)

The Clean Streams Program, as explained by Peterson, aims at cleaning up Delaware streams by 1976 and the "A-number one way to do that is to provide good sewage treatment."

The program, the brainchild of Peterson and Austin N. Heler, secretary of Natural Resources, calls for the phased funding of all the sewage treatment plant projects in the state—rather than one at a time. The plants that are built also allow for future growth in the area they will serve, since it usually takes from three to four years to build a treatment plant.

New plants or old sewage systems being upgraded (as in New Castle) will provide a more advanced form of treatment, so that effluent (treated sewage) coming out of the plant will go into State streams at a very high level of cleanliness.

Levy Court president Joshua Twilley was presented with a check (the largest one given out) for $986,596, and then complained that he had not received all the funds necessary. (Twilley told reporters he was expecting about $1.6 million which coupled with the $1.3 million received last year, would make up the plant's total local funding of $3 million.

But John Bryson, director of the State division of Environmental Control, strongly reminded Twilley that the regional plant to be built in the Frederica area on the Murderkill River has not been completed and that Kent County has been receiving State funds "about as fast as you're spending it."

He also reminded Twilley that increased federal funding cut the projects cost in half—and saved the State having to finance $6 million. The city of Dover, besides some other smaller jurisdictions will tie into the plant, which is to have an initial capacity of from 10 million to 35 million gallons a day.

Bryson said that Kent County would receive all the funds necessary for the plant. The plant has a total cost of $12 million.

New Castle County Executive William Connor received a check for $283,100 for part of its sewage treatment system.

FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF ACTION AGENCY

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, last July the President called Action in "alliance of the generations." Upon launching the new agency, which consolidated all Federal volunteer programs, he said:

Let us work together to seek out those ways by which the commitment and the compassion of one generation can be linked to the will and experience of another so that we can service Americans better and Americans can better service mankind.

Action has lived up to that great hope in its first year of service.

Despite some protracted and difficult months of deliberation in reaching agreement on the level of funding for Action's international operations—Peace Corps—Action is a success both in human terms as well as in the equally meaningful progress and expansion of its new programs.

Action has put the lie to fears that the Peace Corps is "in trouble" of being "cut down." Since its budget impasse was resolved in April, Americans in greater numbers have been volunteering to join the Peace Corps and there has been an increased interest on the part of developing nations for the Peace Corps to establish programs. In fact, the Peace Corps is entering into agreements with three new nations and already a limited number of volunteers are in place in Central African Republic and New Caledonia. Later this year volunteers will be going to Bahrain, Oman and the Seychelles Islands. Moreover, negotiations are underway with at least six other nations for Peace Corps volunteers. A year ago the Peace Corps was in 57 countries—today it is 63.

Domestically nearly 70,000 new opportunities for volunteer service for older Americans have been created by Action in keeping with the President's commitment to the White House Conference on Aging and by July 1, 1973, this figure will exceed 80,000.

Equally significant, foster grandparent program's budget has doubled to $25 million for 11,000 volunteers. There were 6,200 volunteers last year. Funding of retired senior volunteer program—RSVP—has doubled also to $15 million for 1,500 volunteers when Congress acted quickly on the White House request for more money.

Vista, composed of volunteers working in the urban areas of our States, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Indian reservations, Guam, and Samoa is expanding by 4,500 man-years work on 450 projects during the next year alone.

The university year for Action, started just 1 year ago as a pilot program to enlist college students in volunteerism, has achieved success that exceeds all expectations. In exchange for the year's work off campus in a meaningful community poverty job, UYA volunteers receive academic credit. The number of students enrolled in UYA now totals 1,000 at 25 colleges and universities. More than 400 schools applied for admission. Next year we will have nearly 2,000 volunteers in UYA in over 36 colleges and universities.

Meaningful assistance to the Nation's small businessmen, particularly minority entrepreneurs, is being provided daily by the 4,500 volunteers from Senior Corps of Retired Executives—SCORE. Active Corps of Executives—ACE—are providing 1,500 volunteers from business. In cooperation with the Small Business Administration the volunteers in these programs give advice and assistance to the troubled small businessman who sorely needs expert guidance.

I believe Action and its Director Joseph Blatchford deserve applause and congratulations on the successful com-

pletion of its first year and our wholehearted support at the start of its second.

AID TO NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues who have spoken this week on the need to give aid to parents of nonpublic school students. The survival of nonpublic schools in this country is an urgent issue that the Congress must face.

Last year supporters of nonpublic school education in this country were disappointed with the Supreme Court decisions of Lemon and Dicenso. These decisions ruled unconstitutional a State bill that paid a portion of a teacher's salary for the secular subject he taught and another State law that had the State purchasing services from the nonpublic schools. While momentarily clouding the issue the decisions have left open other forms of relief for the families who want to exercise their right to send their children to nonpublic schools.

On January 19, I introduced legislation that would allow parents a $100 tax credit for tuition expenses. I have been greatly encouraged by recent developments including the minority leader, Mr. FORD, and Ways and Means ranking member, JOHN BYRNES, introducing similar proposals. On June 21, Mr. Caspar Weinberger, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, wrote to Chairman MILLS indicating that the administration would send up this type of legislation next year.

In my own State of Ohio, both houses of the State legislature have unanimously approved tax credit legislation.

If one looks at the policies of the nations in the free world, the overwhelming majority do not cut off funds for the study of secular subjects in schools where children can also study religion and moral values. Canada, England, France, West Germany, Australia, India, Norway, Syria, and Lebanon are just a few of the nations that permit tax dollars to go to nonpublic schools.

These nations, the State of Ohio, and and other State governments throughout the United States have taken this action, because they realize that nonpublic education in elementary and secondary schools is a natural and necessary complement to our public education system.

With the greatly increased costs of nonpublic education the enrollment has been decreasing. In 1965, there were approximately 6,300,000 students in grades 1 through 12. Five years later the nonpublic school education in these grades had decreased to 5,500,000.

The financial problems that are faced by the nonpublic schools will only compound the problems of the public schools if the present trend continues.

In the State of Ohio last year 40,000 students left the nonpublic school systems. As the office of education estimates that it costs $850 per pupil in the schools today, the 40,000 students cost the taxpayers of Ohio an additional $34 million. This cost is even higher when the extra expense of new construction is included.

The tax credit bills that have been introduced in the Congress will not challenge or destroy the significance of public education. The economic benefit will improve both the public and nonpublic sectors. As we search for new methods of school financing this type of legislation is necessary and appropriate, it is my hope that it continues to receive broad bipartisan support.

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT, MAY 1972

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I include a release highlighting the May 1972 civilian personnel report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures:

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT, MAY 1972

Total civilian employment in the Executive, Legislative and Judicial Branches of the Federal Government in the month of May was 2,851,385 as compared with 2,870,842 in the preceding month of April. This was a net decrease of 19,457.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures.

EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Civilian employment in the Executive Branch in the month of May totaled 2,810,244. This was a net decrease of 20,088 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of April. Employment by months in fiscal 1972 follows:

Month	Full-time employees in permanent positions	Change from previous month	Temporary, part-time, etc.	Change from previous month	Total employment	Change from previous month
July 1971	2,521,703	+1,391	381,448	+18,755	2,903,151	+20,146
August	2,524,098	+2,395	366,062	−15,386	2,890,160	−12,991
September	2,527,518	+3,420	317,021	−49,041	2,844,539	−45,621
October	2,529,832	+2,314	303,236	−13,785	2,833,068	−11,471
November	2,528,233	−1,599	300,256	−2,980	2,828,489	−4,579
December	2,525,858	−2,375	300,662	+406	2,826,520	−1,969
January 1972	2,552,081	+26,223	272,945	−27,717	2,825,026	−1,494
February	2,550,984	−1,097	277,284	+4,339	2,828,268	+3,242
March	2,539,790	−11,194	286,419	+9,157	2,826,209	−2,037
April	2,533,275	−6,515	297,057	+10,638	2,830,332	+4,123
May	2,511,363	−21,912	298,881	+1,824	2,810,244	−20,088

Agencies of the Executive Branch have reported a net reduction of 38,949 in total full-time permanent employment since June 1971 (excluding for comparison purposes a shift of about 30,000 Postal Service employees from temporary to permanent status) to the May total of 2,511,363.

Administration orders announced last August were directed at reductions in the category of full-time permanent employment in agencies exclusive of Postal Service. Since June 1971 this employment has been reduced 39,001, indicating further reduction of about 1,571 to reach the level of 1,918,100 projected by the budget for June 30, 1972.

This net decrease in full-time permanent employment of 39,001 reflects reductions of 43,674 reported by Defense in the 11 months since June 1971, partially offset by increases totaling 4,673 reported by other civilian agencies. The Defense decrease includes a reduction of about 15,000 foreign nationals on Okinawa whose services are now provided under contractual arrangements with the Government of Japan and who are no longer regarded as federal employees.

Changes in total employment in May in civilian agencies of the Executive Branch as compared with civilian employment in military agencies were as follows:

	May	April	Change
Civilian agencies	1,710,139	1,714,680	−4,541
Military agencies	1,100,105	1,115,652	−15,547
Total, civilian employment	2,810,244	2,830,332	−20,088

The civilian agencies of the Executive Branch reporting the largest decreases in May were Postal Service with 5,473 and Treasury with 3,138. The largest increase was in Agriculture with 3,342. The Defense increase is largely due to reduction of about 15,000 foreign nationals who are no longer regarded as federal employees.

Total Executive Branch employment inside the United States in May was 2,649,420, a decrease of 2,530 as compared with April. Total employment outside the United States in May was 160,824, a decrease of 17,558 as compared with April.

LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIAL BRANCHES

Employment in the Legislative Branch in May totaled 32,831, an increase of 595 as compared with the preceding month of April. Employment in the Judicial Branch in May totaled 8,310, an increase of 36 as compared with April.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I include a tabulation, excerpted from the joint committee report, on personnel employed full-time in permanent positions by executive branch agencies during May 1972, showing comparisons with June 1970, June 1971, and the budget estimates for June 1972:

FULL-TIME PERMANENT EMPLOYMENT

Major agencies	June 1970	June 1971	May 1972	Estimated June 30, [1] 1972
Agriculture	82,912	84,252	82,601	83,000
Commerce	25,427	28,435	27,976	28,500
Defense:				
Civil functions	30,297	30,063	30,091	30,600
Military functions	1,129,642	1,062,741	[2] 1,019,039	1,011,000
Health, Education, and Welfare	102,297	104,283	106,393	102,000
Housing and Urban Development	14,661	16,030	15,474	15,200
Interior	59,349	57,570	56,521	56,900
Justice	38,013	42,662	44,346	45,100
Labor	10,217	11,352	12,185	11,800
State	23,618	23,398	22,818	22,700
Agency for International Development	14,486	13,477	12,170	12,400
Transportation	63,879	68,482	66,600	66,400
Treasury	86,020	90,135	96,053	98,500
Atomic Energy Commission	7,033	6,920	6,820	6,700
Civil Service Commission	5,214	5,324	5,187	5,600
Environmental Protection Agency [3]		5,959	7,659	8,000
General Services Administration	36,400	38,076	35,614	39,400
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	31,223	29,478	27,930	27,500
Panama Canal	14,635	13,967	13,854	14,200
Selective Service System	6,665	5,569	5,784	6,200
Small Business Administration	4,015	4,004	3,960	4,000
Tennessee Valley Authority	12,657	13,612	13,872	14,000
U.S. Information Agency	9,989	9,773	9,392	9,400
Veterans' Administration	148,497	158,635	161,290	162,700
All other agencies	29,807	31,333	32,900	34,300
Contingencies				2,000
Subtotal	1,986,953	1,955,530	1,916,529	1,918,100
U.S. Postal Service	565,618	564,782	594,834	[4] 613,400
Total [5]	2,552,571	2,520,312	2,511,363	2,531,500

[1] Source: As projected in 1973 budget document; figures rounded to nearest hundred.
[2] Reflects reduction of approximately 15,000 in direct hire of foreign nationals in Okinawa incident to its return to Japan on May 15, 1972. These foreign nationals are no longer regarded as Federal employees and have been converted to indirect hire status under contractual agreement with the Government of Japan.
[3] Established as of Dec. 2, 1970, by transfer of functions and personnel from Interior, HEW, Agriculture, Federal Radiation Council, and Atomic Energy Commission.
[4] Includes approximately 39,000 postal employees subject to reclassification by June 30, 1972, under a labor-management agreement. Such reclassification of approximately 30,000 was reported to the committee in January 1972.
[5] May figure excludes 3,252 disadvantaged persons in public service careers programs as compared with 3,054 in April.

THE NARCOTICS ADDICT TREATMENT AND REHABILITATION ACT OF 1972

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced H.R. 15760, the Narcotics Addict Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1972.

The purpose of this bill is to amend title 18 of the United States Code to enable the Federal criminal justice system to deal more effectively with the problem of narcotics addiction, and to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to enable the States and municipalities to deal more effectively with that problem.

Because of the necessary linkage between narcotics addiction and criminal activity, drug addicts are often not identified as addicts until they are arrested and charged with a crime. It is, therefore, imperative that a means be developed to more effectively use the criminal justice system in the identification of addicts and their referral to treatment and rehabilitative services. The record is clear that punishment of convicted addicts through incarceration in correctional institutions merely leads to a return of the addict to addiction and crime upon release.

The Federal criminal justice system should be a model for the Nation in the establisment of procedures to divert narcotics addicts who commit crimes because of their addiction into treatment so that their rehabilitation from narcotics addication and its related criminal activity may be accomplished.

The Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966 has been the addict diversion mechanism for the Federal criminal justice system. The Narcotics Addict Rehabilitation Act was, at the time of passage, a breakthrough in the law toward the treatment of narcotics addiction as a medical problem. In its statement of objectives to treat the addict for his addiction, rather than to punish him for the criminal offense charged, the act broke significantly with attitudes of the past. The Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act created a system of civil commitment which provides compulsory institutionalized treatment for eligible addicts in lieu of prosecution or after conviction on the criminal charge.

The Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966—NARA—was a response by the Congress to the "revolving door" process which had characterized the treatment of narcotics addicts at the Federal Public Health Service hospitals at Lexington, Ky., and Fort Worth, Tex. The experience of these hospitals in not being able to hold addicts for sufficient lengths of time to effectuate a treatment program motivated the belief that there was need for use of Government's coercive power to hold the addict in a treatment program long enough to allow him to derive the full benefit of the program.

The experience of the past 5 years with the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act has shown that it has not fulfilled its promise. Because only those deemed "likely to be rehabilitated" have been selected as eligible for participation in the treatment afforded by the act, many eligible addicts have been rejected for treatment. Because of the restrictive eligibility criteria in the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act, the large majority or narcotics addicts sentenced to serve prison terms for Federal offenses have not been eligible for sentencing to treatment for their addiction. Only 1 or 2 percent of the addicts sentenced to Federal prisons since the passage of NARA have been sentenced under the provisions of the act. The U.S. attorneys, given responsibility by the act to initiate the civil commitment proceedings, have rebelled against what they deem to be a "social work" function and have not used the act to the extent experienced.

Thus despite predictions during hearings on the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act in 1966 that there would be an average of 900 commitments per year under the commitment in lieu of prosecution provisions of the act alone, in the first 2 years of the program only 207 persons were examined for admission to treatment in lieu of prosecution and only 179 were accepted for treatment under the provisions of the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act. It is, therefore, clear that the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act does not serve its intended function as a procedure for diverting narcotics addicts into treatment in the Federal criminal justice system.

The Narcotics Addict Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1972 replaces the cumbersome NARA referral process with the grant of ample authority to the prosecutor to exercise his discretion in determining at what stage in the criminal proceeding an accused addict will be referred for appropriate diagnosis and treatment. The prosecutor is given three alternatives in my bill:

First, in the case of an accused who is about to be charged with, or is charged with any misdemeanor, or with any felony which does not involve the use or threat of force or violence against another person, the prosecutor may defer the prosecution of such eligible person pending successful entry into and progress in an appropriate narcotics addiction treatment and rehabilitation program;

Second, in the case of any individual charged with a Federal crime, the prosecutor may, subsequent to arraignment, support the requirement as a condition of release pending criminal proceedings, the entry of the accused into a narcotics addiction treatment and rehabilitation program; and

Third, the prosecutor may proceed, in the cases of those individuals who, in his judgment, should not be afforded the opportunity for treatment with deferral of the determination of the charges pending against them, with the criminal proceedings. If the accused is found guilty, the bill empowers each judicial officer of the United States to require examination and treatment of the convicted offender to determine the fact of his addiction, and if such fact is found, to require the individual to enter into treatment and rehabilitation during the term of his sentence.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has been given responsibility in my bill for the diagnosis of narcotics addiction, for conducting the appropriate examinations required for referral to treatment, and for providing appropriate treatment facilities. By giving this responsibility to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, it is my

intention to place the examination and treatment of narcotics addiction in the hands of medical professionals and to relieve the prosecuting attorney of the responsibility of determining what is appropriate treatment for an accused addict.

The bill provides that each narcotics addict held in custody in order to await trial for any offense against the laws of the United States, or any addict held in custody because of such addict's conviction of any offense against the United States, shall have the right to examination and treatment of his narcotics addiction. The bill thus sets forth clearly the right of every narcotics addict who comes in contact with the Federal criminal justice system to receive from that system an appropriate opportunity for the treatment of his addiction. By establishing this right it is my hope that the Federal criminal justice system will begin to be an effective tool for providing treatment for narcotics addiction. At the same time, however, my bill provides adequate safeguards to prevent the accused narcotics addict from manipulating the system to escape punishment for his crime. The accused narcotics addict is given the right to treatment of his addiction, but is given no other right that is not also due to other accused individuals in the Federal criminal justice system.

Despite its failure to develop an effective diversion system in the Federal criminal justice system, the Federal Government is, in general, far ahead of State and local governments in providing for the diversion into treatment of addicts accused of crime. The great majority of addicts are accused of violating State and local laws. Except in a very few jurisdictions, however, State and local prosecutors have no choice but to process accused narcotics addicts in the same manner as all other accused criminals. They do not have the alternative of providing opportunity for treatment and rehabilitation to accused addicts because there are no treatment and rehabilitation programs available to the criminal justice systems of most State and local jurisdictions.

When the addict is convicted of a crime and sentenced, he must enter the correctional system of the State, but again at this point there is generally not available an opportunity for treatment of his addiction. Although good sense as well as good medical practice dictates that an institutionalized narcotics addict receive treatment for his addiction as a part of his correctional program, at the present time almost all addicts imprisoned in this country serve their sentences without receiving any treatment for their addiction. Most States, because of a combination of lack of funds and a lack of experience, exacerbated by the large and increasing number of narcotics addicts entering their correctional systems, are unable to offer even the most minimal treatment programs for narcotics addiction in their correctional institutions.

The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, created by the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, should be more effectively used as a vehicle to provide State and local governments with assistance in the creation of programs and facilities for the treatment and rehabilitation of narcotics addicts accused of crimes. My proposed bill will provide States and localities with funding for narcotics treatment and rehabilitation programs to serve addicts who are led to seek treatment because of experience with the criminal justice system.

My bill is also aimed at channeling additional Federal resources into the treatment and rehabilitation of narcotics addicts. Less than 5 percent of the estimated 560,000 narcotics addicts in the Nation are presently enrolled in Federally-supported treatment programs. We need to establish as a national priority a commitment to provide treatment and rehabilitation services to every narcotics addict. At the present time throughout the country there are waiting lists of addicts who want treatment, but who cannot enter treatment programs because there is no room for them. In all of the cities my Judiciary Subcommittee has examined, as soon as multi-modality treatment programs open their doors, addicts are lining up for treatment. The New York City Health Services Administration, for example, reports that despite a major effort to increase the availability of places in that city's treatment programs, the number of addicts coming forth desiring treatment is outpacing the provision of treatment facilities by 50 percent.

Given the nationwide existence of waiting lists of addicts desiring entry into voluntary treatment programs, there is need for the Federal Government to provide emergency funding for expansion of treatment facilities in those localities most impacted by large numbers of untreated narcotics addicts. My bill establishes within LEAA a special emergency fund to provide local governments with direct, emergency assistance in meeting their critical narcotics addiction related problems. It authorizes the appropriation of $100,000,000 for this fund to enable a massive Federal effort akin to that which is made in the aftermath of natural disasters.

Simultaneously with the creation of the emergency narcotics addiction programs fund, the Narcotics Addict Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1972 creates a requirement that states which apply for funding from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration include in their overall plans a comprehensive State plan for the treatment of narcotics addicts in the criminal justice system and for the establishment of voluntary narcotics treatment and rehabilitation programs. One hundred million dollars in additional LEAA funding is authorized for the funding of State narcotics treatment and rehabilitation programs.

In addition to providing for the establishment of State programs, the bill sets forth a number of evaluative criteria by which the performance of such programs is to be measured. These evaluative criteria are an attempt to establish, for the first time, measurable Federal standards for assessing the performance of narcotics treatment and rehabilitation programs. The present lack of such standards is a primary cause of the failure of the Federal Government to demand accountability for the millions of dollars committed to narcotics addiction treatment and rehabilitation programs. The purpose of these evaluative criteria is to provide information for governmental decisionmakers, and for the general public, on whether the treatment programs we establish are meeting their intended objectives.

In my view, the Narcotics Addict Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1972, which enables Federal, State, and local governments to provide treatment and rehabilitation programs and facilities for all narcotics addicts who desire treatment, and which provides the criminal justice system with programs and facilities to enable the treatment of narcotics addicts, provides for a more effective use of Federal resources than the expansion of civil commitment programs under the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966.

My experience in this area convinces me that there are no simple solutions to the problem of effective treatment and rehabilitation of narcotics addicts. A treatment modality which is successful with one addict can be utterly unsuccessful with another. Motivation plays an extremely important role in determining the likelihood of successful rehabilitation of the addict, and an addict may not be sufficiently motivated towards rehabilitation until he has experienced successive failures to achieve rehabilitation.

What is clear, however, is that there is a need for increased numbers of treatment programs offering increasing varieties of treatment modalities. We must adopt a national goal of providing treatment for every drug addicted person, tailored to his individual need, and we must commit the needed Federal resources to achieve this goal.

A summary of the bill follows:

SUMMARY OF H.R. 15760—THE NARCOTICS ADDICT TREATMENT AND REHABILITATION ACT OF 1972

A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to enable the Federal criminal justice system to deal more effectively with the problem of narcotics addiction and to amend the Ominbus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to enable the States and municipalities to deal more effectively with that problem, and for other related purposes.

TITLE I—THE FEDERAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM AND NARCOTICS ADDICTS

Chapter 314 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to provide the following:

Section 4251—Conditional release pending criminal proceedings.

Under present Federal bail procedures (chapter 27 of title 18 of the United States Code), treatment for narcotics addiction may be required as a condition of release pending criminal prosecution. Proposed Section 4251 provides specific authority for such treatment by the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Section 4252—Contingent deferral of prosecution pending medical examination.

Authorizes Federal prosecutors to defer the initiation of prosecution of any person who is about to be charged with, or is charged with, any misdemeanor, or with any felony which does not involve the use or threat of force or violence against another person, upon the determination that the offense committed is sufficiently connected with such individual's narcotic addiction as to make it in the best interests of the individual and of society to defer the prosecution of that individual. The prosecutor refers the individual to the Secretary of Health,

Education, and Welfare for examination and treatment and can continue to defer the prosecution for so long as he determines the individual to be making progress in the treatment and rehabilitation of his addiction.

Section 4523—Treatment and sentencing.

Authorizes each Federal judicial officer to sentence an individual for treatment and rehabilitation of narcotics addiction, or to suspend the sentence upon condition that the offender enter into treatment.

Requires inclusion in the pre-sentencing report of information necessary for the determining of sentence under this section.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is given the responsibility to provide the necessary examination and treatment of addicts sentenced under this section.

Section 4254—Referral for examinations and treatment.

Gives the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare the responsibility to provide, either directly or by contract with other agencies or persons, examinations and treatment designed to determine whether an individual is an addict and to treat addicts upon such determination.

Section 4255—Rights of addicts to examination and treatment.

Provides each addict held in custody to await trial on any Federal offense, or in custody because of conviction of any Federal offense, with the right to examination and treatment related to his narcotics addiction.

Section 4256—Examination and treatment not conviction; use of information.

Referral to examination or treatment is not to be construed as a criminal conviction. None of the information derived from the addict during examination or treatment is to be used against him in any criminal proceeding or investigation.

Section 4257—Definitions.

The terms "addict" and "treatment" are defined. Both terms retain the definitions given in the present Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act.

TITLE II—THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEMS OF THE STATE AND MUNICIPALITIES AS THEY RELATE TO NARCOTICS ADDICTS

The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 is amended by adding the following new part:

Part F—Emergency narcotic addiction programs.

Authorizes the provision of special emergency funding for any unit of general local government when the Attorney General of the United States determines, upon application by the local government unit, that the rate of narcotic-related crime in the local jurisdiction has reached emergency proportions. When the Attorney General makes that judgment, such determination, and the reasons supporting it, are transmitted by the Attorney General to the Congress.

Upon the determination of an emergency narcotics crime-related condition, funds are provided for the establishment of a broad range of programs for the treatment of addicts with the goal of making treatment available for every addict in the affected jurisdiction. All programs established under the emergency funding must provide adequate evaluation procedures based on eight criteria. All new programs must be certified to be in addition to existing narcotics treatment programs in the local jurisdiction.

The President is authorized to make available the full resources of the Federal Government to assist the local jurisdiction in meeting its narcotics emergency.

One hundred million dollars are authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973 for emergency funding purposes.

Amendment of comprehensive requirements in State plans.

A new Paragraph 13 is added to the 12 existing requirements for State plans submitted in support of Law Enforcement Assistance Administration funding. Paragraph 13 requires that each State, in order to qualify for LEAA funding, demonstrate the existence of a broad spectrum of effective facilities and programs for the treatment and rehabilitation of narcotics addicts in the State criminal justice system, and the availability and existence of voluntary treatment programs to every addict in the State who desires treatment.

One hundred million dollars are authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973 for the funding of State narcotics addict treatment and rehabilitation programs through the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

AIRCRAFT COLLISION AVOIDANCE SYSTEM

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, last year there were 5,000 fatal aircraft accidents. Since 1969 there have been 93 midair collisions. Had the planes involved been equipped with the time frequency collision avoidance developed by McDonnell Douglas Corp. over the past 10 years, their pilots would have been alerted in ample time to take the evasive action necessary and indicated. This particular system has been tested in a variety of typical flight patterns and found to be foolproof. Moreover, it would greatly enhance ground control effectiveness through the installation of complementary ground systems. Any pilot would want such a system, and all should have it. Yet its implementation awaits further study and delay owing to conceptual reservations on the part of the FAA, and the continuing reliance on ground control systems. There is also the question of cost, ranging from $50,000 for the large commercial jets down to $2,000 for general aviation. These costs would decline considerably in response to increased production. But taking the estimated initial costs and applying them to a U.S. airline fleet of 3,000 planes, and a general aviation fleet of roughly 131,000 we can see that equipping our commercial liners would cost $190 million and general aviation $262 million or a total of $312 million to remove that element of risk from the skies over America. Equal in cost to 1 week of the Vietnam war which has taken many American lives, is it too large to invest in saving a good many more? The question can be examined in terms of what expenses might be avoided by the sums spent. The insurance companies estimate that a fatal plane crash costs about $100,000 per occupied seat. A hypothetical collision between two planes and then involving the loss of 300 lives would equal 10 percent of the cost of installing the system on every plane. Even small planes can collide, not only into the larger, as in the case of the Piedmont collision a few years ago which took the life of Under Secretary of Defense John McNaughton and his family, but into one another as in the case of the collision yesterday of two light planes. both on scheduled service over Lake Winnebago, which took 13 lives. These planes were on visual flight rules with a visibility of 5 miles. Had they been equipped with a CAS—collision avoidance system—the crash would not have occurred. Arrangements for cost sharing between airlines, insurance companies and the Federal Government could be made so that the burden does not fall too heavily on any one consumer of the service. Costs could, for example, be borne in part through a cooperative arrangement between the airlines and the Federal Government whereby an airline could agree to a $50 deduction in its deferred pool of investment tax credit in return for a $50 subsidization for the first units installed. General aviation aircraft owners who utilize their craft for business purposes would also use that method, while nonbusiness flyers would receive other appropriate financing assistance and arrangements.

We are now traveling on planes that can carry upwards of 400 passengers and still they come, in size, speed, and numbers. Mr. Speaker must we await some "Titanic of the air" to alert us to our responsibilities as legislators to direct the government by law to require the installation of collision avoidance systems throughout America, and encourage the adoption of compatible systems throughout the world? No, indeed we must not wait that long to do that.

THE MOORESVILLE, N.C., TRIBUNE HAS SENSIBLE SECOND THOUGHTS ON STREAM CHANNELIZATION

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, more than stream banks has been eroded by the U.S. Soil Conservation Service's romance with channelization. The Service's own hard-earned reputation with environmentalists has been worn thin as the agency has pursued the channelization approach. I submit the following editorial from the Mooresville, N.C., Tribune of June 8 as a case in point:

WE PLEAD AN ATTACK OF NOSTALGIA

There is mounting evidence that we were wrong about Ecos and its opposition to the U.S. Soil Conservation Service's channelization practices. Flat wrong.

There is, to start, the well-put letter from Bill Adair in response to our editorial early in May in which we declared we were not joining Ecos in its fight against SCS. We went on to say that our experience in lowland drainage policies of the Soil Conservation Service led us to believe the agency was performing a valuable service.

We have, too, a folder containing a world of material collected by Dick Lowder. The point is made repeatedly in the collected writings that turning natural streams into manmade ditches does more bad than good.

We accept these findings. We stand corrected. From the standpoint of the concerned science teacher, given the view of the fisheries biologist employed by a power company, accepting the gospel according to all converts to the Environmentalist faith, we have no grounds on which to base our support of SCS channelization.

By way of excuse, we must say we were suffering semantical confusion. We felt a nostalgic tugging in references by Ecos to Chicod

Creek in Beaufort County. We remember the stagnant ponds, the drowned crops and the hopelessly inadequate field ditches of our youth there. We remember the agricultural godsend of dredging that changed bogs into productive farmland—before the days of soil banks. We recall the liberated look of the dawn-to-dark, hand-to-mouth farmers when draglines arrived.

The Army's Corps of Engineers and the other government agencies involved in these drainage programs were hailed as conquering heroes.

Honored likewise in their beginnings were coal-burning locomotives and internal-combustion engines. Billowing smokestacks of factories became magnets for children of those liberated swamp farmers.

Now we have had too much of too many good things. Just as the used-up and decaying inner-city is belching people into the suburbs and beyond, the agricultural order of priorities has reversed. The aim now is to conserve, not convert the natural purposes of the land.

The order changeth. We find this altogether fitting. Channelization in 1972 is bad; dredging in 1952 was good.

SPECIAL OLYMPICS

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, on June 22–24, in my home State of Indiana, some 1,200 young athletes participated in the 1972 Special Olympics for the Mentally Retarded. I enthusiastically applaud those young people for their involvement and urge the people of Indiana and throughout the country to actively support these special games and encourage more children to take part in this kind of activity.

For too long, we have neglected the needs of our retarded children. Physical and psychological development is of utmost importance to the retarded so that they can take pride in themselves and in their individual roles in our society. Special attention and active support of their very undertaking is essential in order to insure this development. These "Olympics" provide an excellent opportunity to become involved and show these young people we all care.

I wholeheartedly support the efforts of the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr. Foundation in making these games possible. Past performance at the "Olympics" has indeed been exciting. Retarded children have proven themselves time and time again in the area of physical achievement. I think that it is vital that we reward these achievements with increased attention so that these games and other similar activities will continue to take on added dimension.

We all strive to voice our concern and make a personal contribution to society as a whole—I know of no more valuable way than by supporting efforts such as the Special Olympics for the Mentally Retarded.

Retarded children need others: Let us show each one that we need them in return.

AIRLINE FARES

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, Thursday, some 30 Members of Congress led by our distinguished colleague and my good friend the Honorable JOHN E. Moss of California, presented their final oral argument to the Civil Aeronautics Board in a proceeding known as the domestic passenger fare investigation.

Our proposal to the Board, which took into consideration all of the facts on the record with regards to costs and value of service, is designed to produce low normal fares for the traveling public and more stable earnings for investors. The text of the argument follows:

ORAL ARGUMENT OF HON. JOHN E. MOSS, ET AL., MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, BEFORE THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

INTRODUCTION

May it please the Board; In the chambers of the House of Representatives, directly above the Speaker, are inscribed the following words of Daniel Webster: ". . . Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its power, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered." It is in this spirit that the Members of Congress lay their proposal before you this day.

Interest represented

One point which may need clarification at the outset is, "whose interest do the Congressmen represent?" The answer, of course, is their constituents who are users of the services, non-users affected by the services, or investors. The users and non-users are naturally interested in obtaining low fares, while the investors are primarily interested in stable earnings since the level of corporate profits determines the value of their investments—bonds or stock.

For this reason, our fare proposal has been designed to produce low normal-fares and stable earnings. To achieve these goals we have designed the proposal to take into consideration all the factors which affect the industry, particularly the fact that:

One, most costs are related to block time and not greatly affected by changes in block speed or load factor; and

Two, the fact that more than half of all traffic is price inelastic, but income elastic and therefore affected in the long-run by changes in the business cycle and consumer confidence.

FARE LEVEL

Cost of service

Turning first to the issue of the fare level, and Chart 1, all of the parties are in general agreement that the direct costs compiled by the Bureau from the carriers' submissions are reasonable and related to block time. There similarly appears to be no significant disagreement with those indirect costs related to block time. Thus the point of conflict is confined primarily to those indirect costs associated with ground handling.

Historically, these indirect costs have been considered to be variable costs; they have even been referred to as non-capacity costs. However, all the facts on the record establish that these costs are in fact capacity costs, not variable costs. The Bureau's exhibits, and your own order in Phase 7—Chart 1—treat these costs as capacity costs. For example, you will observe on Chart 1 that you reduced the number of available seat-miles twice, and the number of passenger-miles once, without reducing the ground handling costs. This is the reason why the resulting indirect cost ratio in the Appendices to your order is 50.9 percent, rather than the 48.8 percent found reasonable in the body of your order.

Conceptually, the explanation for this phenomenon is shown in Chart 2. (Not included) Here you will observe in the top chart that the ground handling costs per passenger and the indirect costs per hour increase with distance as the amount of idle time at the terminals increases with distance, as shown in the aircraft routing chart at the bottom of the page.

Second, your attention is invited to the fact that the block speed curve in the top chart rises more rapidly than the indirect cost per hour, thereby forcing the indirect cost per mile to decline with distance. Hence the generally accepted belief that indirect costs decline with distance on a mileage basis is shown to be true. The fact which has not been observed before, however, is that the indirect cost per mile declines at a slower rate than the direct cost per mile, since the latter is relatively constant per hour, whereas the former tends to rise, and you have always refused to look at revenue-hour data.

In addition, the chart also shows one of the principal differences between the revenue-mile and revenue-hour approach. The cost per mile tends to decrease with distance, whereas the cost per hour tends to increase with distance. Thus the argument that there is no difference between the two methods is refuted by this record. The record shows there is a difference. We have thus proved our case.

Furthermore, should any party argue or agree that the indirect cost ratio increases with distance, and that block speed varies, either now or in the future, that party automatically admits on the record there is a difference between the revenue-hour and the revenue-mile—that the rate per hour increases with distance, and the rate per mile declines with distance.

The Members of Congress were able to make this costing breakthrough because they did Research and Development work, utilized the revenue-hour approach, and worked with the facts. When the Members of Congress entered this case, the only fact they knew was that the indirect cost ratio had not historically declined with distance. They did not know why. When they discovered the ground handling costs were being improperly treated, they immediately sent a member of their staff into the field to confirm this fact. As a result, Mr. Klabzuba is probably the most unique witness in this case, for he is the only witness to our knowledge who actually supervised the loading and unloading of respondents aircraft during the period of this investigation. Based upon his personally supervised and conducted field studies, witness Klabzuba agrees with you that the ground handling costs are capacity costs.

Accordingly, you must find that any fare structure proposal which is based upon a declining indirect cost ratio is unjust and unreasonable.

Block time

Going now to Chart 3, historically most airline fares have been constructed on a mileage basis. Consequently, since most costs are related to block time, it is necessary to convert these hourly costs to a mileage basis. This means that every fare has a cost and yield per mile and per hour. However, unless the conversion is precise, the revenue yield to the carriers may not be sufficient to cover all costs. This is the reason why block times are the most controversial issue in this proceeding.

The problem is further aggravated by the fact that airplanes do not always fly in a

straight line, and block times vary. Since the fares are fixed, this causes the earnings to fluctuate with block times. The question is how are the earnings affected—by changing the level of revenues or the level of costs?

As noted previously, the level of direct costs per hour is relatively constant. For example, in its various exhibits, the Bureau changed its block speed and utilization rates, but the level of the direct costs per hour never varied with these changes in block speed or utilization.

With regards to the indirect costs, we have already indicated our disagreement with the other parties, nevertheless it is interesting to note again that when the Bureau increased its average stage length, it also increased the amount of indirect costs assigned to each mileage block. In effect, the Bureau has admitted through its computer program that indirect costs are indirectly related to block time. Remember, it was the *TS* (stop time) and *TC* (cruise time) factors which changed, not the mileage—it remained constant. As a result, the record demonstrates that *all* costs are related to block time, directly or indirectly. The record proves our case.

Turning to the revenue side, every fare has an implied yield per mile and per hour, whether stated or not. Unfortunately, we were unable to secure any revenue-hour data for aircraft from the carriers, the Bureau, or the Board. Nevertheless, we have been able to circumvent this slight inconvenience with revenue-hour data made available to us by the City of Tulsa, Oklahoma bus company. Chart 3 shows this data for a one month period. Looking at this chart you will note that the percentage reationship of yield per mile and yield per hour for the individual routes to system average is not the same for any route, and in three cases there is an inversion. That is, the yield per hour is greater than system average, while the yield per mile is less, or visa versa.

Similarly, in Chart 4 we have compared the cost per mile and the cost per hour for various aircraft to system average. Again the percentage differentials are not identical in any case, and there are a number of inversions. From this evidence, we believe it is reasonable to deduce that revenue-hour data for aircraft will show similar variations.

Looking therefore again at Chart 4, the issue is simply this: given the phenomenon of bus and air transportation that the level of cost per hour is not greatly affected by changes in block speed or load factor, is Route 8 more profitable than Route School? Does Route 10 or Route 12 produce above average annual revenues and earnings? Does Route School produce annual revenues which are a 125 percent above average, or are they really only 3 percent greater?

The answer to these questions determines the profitability of an airline. You must be prepared to answer these questions. We believe the facts show that Route 8 and 12 are more profitable; that Route 10 produces below average annual revenues; and that the annual revenues from Route School are only 3 percent above average.

This brings us to Chart 5, where actual average 1971 block times for various aircraft are compared to each other and with a ratemaking block time. Two things should be observed:

First, the actual variations in block time between the aircraft are relatively small, and tend to decrease with distance;

Second, while these variations, and the variations with the ratemaking block time are small, they are nevertheless in some cases greater than the profit-margin you found reasonable in Phase 7.

For example, at 500 miles the revenue to the carriers would have averaged 13 percent less than that necessary to cover all costs plus profit, at the load factor standard, had the fare structure been based upon 1.3 block hours; and the revenue to the carrier operating the 4-Engine Fan Jet would have been 17 percent less than necessary. Since the ratemaking block time is erroneous, the revenue per hour is inadequate. The revenue-per hour is below average, even though the revenue per mile is above average, just like Route 12 on Chart 4.

Unfortunately, we cannot tell you how much the carriers actually lost in revenue and in earnings in 1971 because of such variations in block times, because no one knows what block times are implicit in the existing fare structure. We suspect, however, the implicit block times may be too high. On the other hand, we can advise you that each one percent variation in block times is equivalent to about a ten percent change in taxable income, given your 11.1 percent profit-margin.

An analogous situation arises where a builder undertakes to do a job for a fixed price, assuming the job to take four days when it actually requires five. He loses two ways: the job itself cost 25 percent more than anticipated, and his revenue per employee-hour is 20 percent less even though his cost per hour is still the same.

Builders, engineers, and pilots are familiar with this problem since they work with hours; traffic men are not, since they work exclusively with miles. Such a pricing man would have been satisfied with the construction job, he made his yield per square-foot. But the pricing man made the error, he used the wrong time per square-foot. The revenue-hour is designed to correct this situation in aviation by giving the traffic department a tool similar to that used by the operations department, a tool which shows changes in overall revenue yield due to changes in block time just as readily as increases in cost per trip.

Fare proposal

Recognizing the importance of this problem to the investor, and the fact the carriers can no longer afford for the Board to proceed blindly in this area, the Members of Congress have advanced the revenue-hour approach to ratemaking which utilizes two benchmarks—one based upon miles, the other based upon hours. This approach has a built in safeguard which enables the carriers to seek relief when the actual block times fluctuate significantly from ratemaking block times as measured by the yield per hour. In a sense this two benchmark approach is the *quid pro quo* to the investor for the load factor and seating configuration standard given the consumer.

We further believe this approach also offers you the easiest out from the predicament you now find yourselves in with respect to the indirect cost ratio. The Members of Congress are the only party which has advanced, on the record, a fare structure proposal in which the indirect cost ratio does not decline with distance.

Under our proposal, as shown on Chart 6, we would have you apply a uniform indirect cost ratio of 48.8 percent, based upon your order in Phase 7, to the Bureau's direct cost, which all parties agree are reasonable on an *hourly* basis, not a mileage basis. Adding a 13.6 percent profit-margin to this cost figure, and using the 54 percent load factor standard per your Phase 7 order and a 10 percent dilution rate, you will obtain your revenue-hour benchmark. By the way, note that the value of the Fare Level Adjustment Factor is about six percent greater than the revenue need per available seat.

Taking this revenue-hour benchmark figure and applying appropriate ratemaking-hours, you will find your revenue-mile benchmarks. The Members of Congress have not yet made this conversion to a mileage basis since they are now of the opinion there are no realistic block times in the record. However, the Members are prepared to undertake this task with your assistance, if you so direct. Alternatively, the Members would ask you to apply 1971 block time, adjusted for the equipment distribution anticipated in 1972, to their revenue-hour benchmark.

While admittedly the resulting figures would not be precisely accurate, they would be more accurate than what any other party has so far proffered, since all their proposals are based upon a declining indirect cost ratio with distance. Naturally, the use of a slightly increasing indirect cost ratio would be preferable, but unfortunately no party has come forth with any evidence which would enable you to establish such a cost ratio.

Thus you must accept the Members of Congress approach, not because it is precisely equitable, but rather because it is the lesser of two evils; because it is closer to the real cost curve; because it is the only approach based upon actual R. & D. studies; because it is the only one that will make certain the revenues to the carriers can be sufficient should actual block time vary.

FARE LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS

Circuity factor

Turning to the various fare level adjustment factors, the first issue we take up is the circuity factor. Since passenger trips come in many varieties—nonstop, multi-stop, through plane, connecting plane—the fare level must be adjusted upward to take into account such dilution in yield per mile. It must be remembered, however, that since many such routings are frequently faster than direct service, they tend to increase the yield per hour, and hence the annual earnings since the level of costs per hour is relatively constant.

Under our fare proposal and that advanced by the Bureau, the circuity factor is built into the block time element. The level of this circuity factor is determined primarily by the mileage used to construct fares, and the permissible routings authorized by a fare.

Mileage element

With respect to the mileage element to be used for constructing fares, the Members of Congress are of the opinion that fares should be based upon nonstop, great circle distance between two airports without regards to route authorization or how the route is actually operated, because in their view this is the most equitable approach in light of the manner in which route certificates are issued, the requirements of Section 404(b), and your ruling in the *Hawaiian Common Fare Case*. A fare structure which is sometimes consistent with a route structure, and sometimes not, is clearly unduly preferential and prejudicial according to your prior ruling, and therefore unlawful. We believe section 404(b) was specifically enacted by Congress to avoid such discrimination.

Furthermore, the use of either the shortest authorized or operated approaches would set up a double standard: one for the carriers, another for the Board. We see no reason for your hands to be tied in this manner, if proper recognition is given to the carriers' revenue need through the circuity factor. The carriers will gain nothing by use of the shortest authorized or operated mileage, since the circuity factor would be reduced accordingly. On the other hand, you and the public stand to lose much. For these pragmatic reasons, among others, you should base normal-fares upon the great circle mileage between airports.

Permissible routings

In regards to the question of permissible routings, two proposals have been advanced. The feeder approach, which we support, is the more flexible of the two. It is designed around the operating characteristics of the airplane, the economies of density, and the general traveling habits of the public. Because it is designed to feed traffic from thin markets into the mainlines at one or more points without regard to the direction of

travel, it is sometimes referred to as the hub-point routing approach.

The other approach, sometimes called the fill-up method, is used by the carriers at present. This approach, which is based upon the shortest authorized route, is linear in nature and designed around the operating characteristics of the choo-choo train.

For sometime now I have wondered what the public's reaction would be to the carriers continued use of the fill-up approach which literally forces the public to use the shortest authorized routing to obtain the lowest possible fare. I received my answer the other day down in Tulsa while waiting to purchase a ticket. There was a little ol' lady who wanted to go to Lansing, Michigan. The agent told her all the flights were filled and that the best he could do for her was a six-hour layover in Chicago. I watched intently, because I wanted to see if possibly the agent might suggest an alternate routing by way of Detroit. Much to my surprise, however, it was not the agent but the little ol' lady who suggested they look at a Detroit routing. The agent went into an immediate state of shock. How could she even consider such an unthinkable thing as a non-linear routing through a beyond point. Nevertheless she persisted. It is very difficult to deal with inexperienced travelers who insist upon using common sense, especially when they are little ol' ladies.

The point of the story is simply this: the Board can either join the public and make available feeder routings, or allow the carriers to continue to impede their movement with the fill-up system, but such routing restrictions are not going to stop the public from using circuitious routings when they are faster and more convenient.

Since the total revenues to the carriers are the same under either approach, the choice between the two routing principles turns in final analysis upon the question of costs. The linear fill-up method calls for a *smaller* circuity factor to be applied to a *higher* cost per mile, whereas the more flexible feeder approach would result in the application of a *larger* circuity factor to a *lower* cost per mile. This fact is supported by the Examiner's finding that the reason carriers operate routes more circuitiously than authorized is for their economic convenience; i.e., lower costs. Consequently, since the Act requires that you their economic convenience, i.e., lower costs. of furnishing service, rather than the smallest circuity factor, you are required to adopt the feeder principle since it will result in lower costs. The record in this phase and Phase 4 demonstrate that fact.

Marketability

With respect to the question of whether fares should be "cost based" or "cost related," the Act specifically requires that fares be based on costs unless the value of service for needed transportation demands a lower fare. This is a question of fact. In this regard, only the Members of Congress have submitted an empirical, probative market survey, or a witness who had personally conducted or supervised such a market study.

The survey was conducted by Sindlinger & Co., which regularly performs similar studies for General Motors, Ford, Sears, Montgomery Ward, various departments of the government, the Price Commission, and the White House. I might interject, the President of the United States is so impressed by this firm's work, that during his recent visit to Moscow he explained the firm's operation to Premier Kosygin during their evening at the opera.

According to Mr. Sindlinger, the results of the survey show that fares greater than costs are marketable at all distance; that cost based fares would not have an adverse effect upon the movement of traffic. Accordingly, you must find that normal-fares must be based upon the cost of service in all markets. There are no facts to support any other finding.

Load factor and dilution

Turning to the question of the load factor and dilution standards, the Members of Congress agree with your finding in Phase 4 that the principal purpose of discount-fares is to generate traffic to fill otherwise empty seats, and thus reduce costs from normal-fare traffic; and that in order that this not be frustrated, the load factor standard should logically be adjusted upward to take into account dilution in yield occasioned by discount-fare traffic. To do otherwise would be unjustly prejudicial to normal-fare traffic, and unduly preferential to discount-fare traffic, and hence unlawful.

In view of your finding that the load factor standard must vary directly with the dilution rate, you must find that any fare proposal which does not carry out this Board policy is unlawful. The creditability of your load factor policy, and your orders, rests upon you carrying out that directive.

For these reasons, even though we believe your 54 percent load factor standard is too low, and your 48.8 percent indirect cost ratio too high (based upon historical experience), we have designed our fare proposal to comply with every one of your prior rulings. The Fare Level Adjustment Factor in our proposal does not increase with dilution rate even if you vary both the load factor and dilution rate.

Dilution rate

With respect to the dilution rate itself, the Members of Congress do not believe a dilution rate greater than 10 to 12 percent should be recognized for establishing normal-fares. There are two reasons for this position. First, a higher rate would have an adverse impact on normal-fare traffic, and therefore be unlawful.

Second, while it is true a higher dilution rate will generate more traffic, it is not economically sound in the long-run. When the economy is booming a higher dilution rate is great for the carriers—it generates more traffic, enables them to purchase more planes and expand their investment base, and raise profits accordingly. But there is a hijacker aboard and he has a weapon called the business cycle. When he takes control with his economic slow down, he kidnaps the income elastic, normal-fare passengers. The carriers lose the traffic and the revenue. More important, they lose their cross-subsidation of the discount-fare traffic. Hence there is only one thing to do, raise fares and reduce the discounts. As a result, the price sensitive, discretionary, discount-fare passenger finds his fare going up 30 to 35 percent, so he gets off the plane too. Thus the investor is left stuck with a rather large over-investment and a relatively small traffic base.

Gentlemen, this nation went through this exercise from 1966 to 1971. Our investor constituents are still paying the price of the excessively high dilution rates of the late sixties. Let us therefore resolve here and now never to go down that road again. The Members of Congress ask you to set a reasonably low Dilution Compensating Factor which will protect both normal-fare traffic and investors.

OTHER MATTERS

Zone of reasonableness

Turning finally to various other miscellaneous issues, the Members of Congress support the so-called zone of reasonableness concept which uses maximum and minimum lawful rates, provided the maximum rate is based upon the cost of providing service and the burden of proof and burden of going forward with the evidence are not shifted to the complainant. In view of the high degree of price in elasticity as shown by the Sindlinger study—that is, fares would have to be increased well over ten percent to have any appreciable impact upon the movement of traffic—it would appear unrealistic to expect the carriers to compete meaningfully on a price basis. Rather, given this market situation, it should be expected the carriers will continue to compete primarily on a service basis. As a result, should the maximum rate be five or ten percent above costs it would only tend to draw fares upward.

Someday the market situation may change and become more price sensitive. When that occurs, the zone of reasonableness may become a useful tool for encouraging price competition. For this reason, the Members of Congress support the adoption of the zone of reasonableness approach. We believe the relinquishing of your 180 days suspension powers in certain cases is a small price to pay for the possibility of price competition.

Zone mileage blocks

There is another zone which we believe deserves your consideration, the zone pricing system. One of the issues in this proceeding concerns the rounding of fares. When fares are rounded to the nearest whole dollar, a variable zone of about 15 to 20 miles is created depending upon the rate per mile. What we are suggesting is that you permit the carriers to round to larger dollar amounts if they establish fixed mileage zones. In other words, should a carrier continue to use variable mileage zones it would be required to round to the nearest whole dollar after tax, but should the carrier adopt fixed mileage zone it would be allowed to round to larger dollar amounts depending upon the width of the zone established. In this regard it should be noted that all parties urging the adoption of great circle mileage system are arguing for a zone pricing system.

Larger zones would permit the carriers to consider using much simplier tariffs, such as those authorized by the Federal Communication Commission. This would reduce their cost of services and make the pricing schedule much easier to understand. More important, since such a pricing schedule would be built around the economies of density and the feeder routing principle, it would allow more flexible operations which in turn could result in a lower cost of furnishing service.

For these reasons, among others, we request that you permit the carriers to round fares to amounts greater than one dollar when they utilize fixed mileage zone. This authority would be permissive in nature, not mandatory.

CONCLUSION

Summary

In summation, the facts on the record disclose:

That the indirect cost ratio increases with distance;

That the indirect cost ratio used for establishing the fare level in your Phase 7 order does not conform with historical fact;

That there is a difference between the revenue-mile and revenue-hour approach, since the former declines with distance, whereas the latter rises;

That there is an inherent block time in every fare; and

That such variations may be as great as the profit-margin itself;

That the feeder principle is more economical and efficient for routing passengers than the fill-up method;

That there is no justification in fact for establishing normal-fare below cost at any distance;

That the load factor standard must vary with the dilution rate; and

That the Members of Congress fare proposal complies with every one of your directives.

Conclusion

In conclusion, gentlemen, the Hon. John E. Moss and 31 other members of the U.S. House of Representatives and United States Senate have carried the coals to Newcastle. They hope they have performed that task in a manner worthy of being remembered.

CHART 1.—TRUNKS—DOMESTIC FORECAST FOR 1972 AT INTERIM STANDARD LOAD FACTOR WITH FARE INCREASE OF 12 PERCENT AND ELASTICITY FACTOR OF —0.7

[Dollar amounts in millions]

	Revenue, passenger-miles	Available seat-miles	Aircraft block-hours	Available seat-hours	Direct operating cost: Overall	Direct operating cost: Seat-mile	Direct operating cost: Aircraft-hour	Direct operating cost: Seat-hour	Indirect operating cost	Total operating cost
Per exhibits in app. 4			4,619	612,620	$3,537.2				$3,399.4	$6,936.6
BE brief—App. 4					64.4					64.4
AA B-727-200					3.7					3.7
EA B-727-100					.6					.6
EA DC-8-61					2.1					2.1
EA B-727QC			8	901	5.0					5.0
As revised in app. 4	112,498	227,864	4,627	613,521	3,613.0	$0.0159	$780	$5.88	3,399.4	7,012.4
Standard depreciation adjustment					(18.4)					(18.4)
As revised in app. 4	112,498	227,864	4,627	613,521	3,594.6	.0155	757	5.86	3,399.4	6,994.0
Belly cargo revenue offset					(180.9)				(48.7)	
									(174.7)	(404.3)
Passenger service operating expense, app. 4	112,498	227,864	4,627	613,521	3,413.7	0.0150	738	5.56	3,176.0	6,589.7
Adjustment for load factor		(16,668)	(320)	(42,010)	(235.5)				(63.3)	(298.8)
Adjustment passenger service operating expense	112,498	211,196	4,307	571,511	3,178.2	.0150	738	5.56	3,112.7	6,290.9
Adjustment for price elasticity	(9,875)	(15,736)	(327)	(43,355)	(241.1)				(64.9)	(306.0)
Passenger service operating expense, app. 1	102,623	195,460	3,980	528,156	2,937.1	.0150	738	5.56	3,047.8	5,984.9
Ratio to total operating cost (percent)					49.1				50.9	100.0

Source: Appendices to orders 71-4-59 and 60. Aircraft block-hours, Civil Aeronautics Board.

CHART 3.—REVENUE HOUR DATA M.K. & O. TRANSIT LINES, INC. (FEBRUARY 1968)

Route	Revenue per mile	Percent differential to system average	Revenue per hour	Percent differential to system average
1	$0.5248	0.4	$6.94	9.1
2	.3604	(31.0)	5.19	(18.4)
3	.3300	(36.8)	4.85	(23.7)
4[1]	.4576	(12.4)	6.36	
5	.4800	(8.1)	6.02	(5.3)
6	.8340	59.6	7.84	23.3
8	.6163	18.0	7.37	15.9
10[1]	$0.5518	5.6	$6.12	(3.9)
12[1]	.5045	(3.4)	6.68	5.0
15	.6028	15.4	7.81	22.8
D.T	.3714	(28.9)	3.01	(52.7)
School	1.1772	125.3	6.59	3.6
System average	.5225		6.36	

[1] Inversion: one rate greater than system average, the other rate less.

Source: Exhibit MOC-1.

CHART 4.—COST HOUR DATA TRUNKS—DOMESTIC TURBO FAN, 4 ENGINE, REGULAR BODIED (12 MONTHS ENDED DEC. 31, 1970)

Equipment and operator	Total aircraft operating expense per mile	Percent differential to system average	Total aircraft operating expense per block hour	Percent differential to system average
B707-100B:				
American	$1.77	(3.3)	$742.02	(3.8)
Braniff	1.63	(10.9)	642.50	(16.7)
Trans-World	1.67	(8.7)	721.87	(6.4)
Subtotal average	1.72	(6.0)	729.31	(5.4)
B707-300B:				
American	1.70	(7.1)	738.41	(4.2)
Pan American	2.07	13.1	945.11	(22.6)
Trans-World[1 2]	1.84	0.5	741.75	(3.8)
Subtotal average[2]	1.83		777.85	.9
B707-300C:[2]				
American	1.85	1.1	766.82	(0.5)
Braniff	1.70	(7.1)	658.35	(14.6)
Continental[1 2]	1.83		837.63	8.7
Northwest	2.34	27.8	880.62	14.2
Western	1.59	(13.1)	752.86	(2.3)
Subtotal average	1.87	2.2	793.68	2.9
B720B:				
American	$2.02	10.4	$812.90	5.4
Continental	1.54	(15.8)	668.78	(13.3)
Northwest[2]	2.13	16.4	762.72	(1.1)
Western	1.71	(6.6)	717.10	(7.0)
Subtotal average	1.81	(1.1)	740.51	(3.4)
DC-8-50:				
Delta	1.81	(1.1)	706.01	(8.4)
Eastern	2.44	33.3	887.45	15.1
National	1.98	8.2	833.21	8.1
United[1]	1.68	(8.2)	760.41	(1.4)
Subtotal average	1.79	(2.2)	745.11	(3.4)
DC-8-61:[1]				
Delta	2.07	13.1	829.77	7.6
Eastern	2.33	27.3	863.92	12.1
National	1.70	(7.1)	736.74	(4.4)
United[1]	1.88	2.7	843.25	9.4
Subtotal average	1.98	8.2	839.63	8.9
DC-8-62: United	1.88	2.7	895.02	16.1
DC-8-63: Eastern	2.08	13.7	844.34	9.5
System average	1.83		770.94	

[1] Inversion: 1 rate greater than the subtotal average, the other rate less.
[2] Inversion: 1 rate greater than system average, the other rate less.

Source: Aircraft Operating Cost and Performance Report, Civil Aeronautics Board, vol. V (Augus 1971) p. 1, 15-17, 42-48.

CHART 5.—AVERAGE BLOCK TIMES (HOURS AND HUNDREDTHS OF HOURS), 1971

Mileage blocks	101-50	201-50	301-50	401-50	501-50	701-50	1001-50	1301-50	1601-50	1901-50	2201-50	2501-50
Domestic trunks:												
Turbofan, 4 engines, regular body	0.63	0.88	1.10	1.27	1.52	1.99	2.45	2.92	3.66	4.18	4.90	5.29
Turbojet, 4-engines	.62	.90	1.04	1.29	1.44	2.05	2.45	(1)	3.71	4.05	4.98	5.34
Turbofan, 3 engines, regular body	.63	.87	1.07	1.26	1.49	1.97	2.44	2.91	3.52	4.14		
Turbofan, 2 engines, regular body	.61	.84	1.05	1.27	1.51	1.86	2.45					
Local service:												
Turbofan, 3 engines	.63		.98	1.15								
Turbofan, 2 engines	.62	.90	1.08	1.30	1.41	1.89						
Average, 1971	.62	.88	1.05	1.26	1.47	1.95	2.45	2.92	3.63	4.12	4.94	5.32
Maximum variation from average:												
High	+1.6	+2.3	+4.8	+3.2	+3.4	+5.1			+2.2	+1.5	+.8	+.4
Low	−1.6	−4.5	−6.7	−8.7	−4.1	−4.6	−.4	−.3	−3.0	−2.7	−.8	−.6
Total swing	3.2	6.8	11.5	11.9	7.5	9.7	.4	.3	5.2	4.2	1.6	1.0
Ratemaking hours[2]	.65	.83	1.02	1.20	1.30	1.76	2.32	2.90	3.57	4.15	4.77	5.42
Variation from 1971 average:												
Block hours	+.03	−.05	−.03	−.06	−.17	−.19	−.13	−.02	−.02	+.03	−.07	+.10
Percent[3]	+4.6	−6.0	−2.9	−5.0	−13.1	−10.8	−5.6	−.7	−1.7	+.7	−3.6	+1.8

[1] Inversion: average block time 3.16 hours, not included in average.
[2] Exhibit MOC-15; 2 decimal points without departure and circuity factor; original source: Exhibits BC-4613-4623.
[3] Also percentage variation in actual yield per hour and annual revenues (assuming same utilization).

Source: Civil Aeronautics Board block time data for year 1971. Order 71-4-59 and 60: Net income after tax, $401,300,000; 5.8 percent of operating revenue. Taxable income, $771,900,000; 11.1 percent of operating revenues.

CHART 6.—FARE STRUCTURE PROPOSAL (JET COACH)

	MOC brief to examiner		
	Short/ medium haul	Long haul	Phase 7 Order (chart 2)
Direct cost, per available seat-hour	$5.40	$5.05	$5.56
Add indirect cost at 48.8 percent of total cost (0.938 times direct cost)[1]	+5.07	+4.47	+5.22
Total cost, per available seat-hour (1.938 times direct cost)	10.47	9.79	10.78
Add return element at 13.7 percent of fare level (0.159 times total cost)[1]	+1.66	+1.55	+1.71
Fare level, per available seat-hour (1.159 times total cost; 2.246 times direct cost)	12.13	11.34	12.49
Add fare level adjustment factor for 54 percent load factor and 10 percent dilution (1.0576 times fare level, per available-seat)[2]	+12.82	+11.99	+13.21
Fare level, per passenger-hour[3] (2.0576 times fare level, per available seat; 4.621 times direct cost)	24.95	23.33	25.70
Less 10 percent in revenue occasioned by discount-fare traffic	−2.50	−2.33	−2.57
Average fare yield per passenger-hour	22.45	21.00	23.13

[1] MOC brief to examiner, per order 71-4-59/60.
[2] MOC brief to board, p. 38.
[3] Benchmark per hour, jet coach. To establish fare level benchmarks per mile and arbitrary charge, apply ratemaking block times which include a circuity factor.

A TOAST TO THE FLAG

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gene Rickett of Knoxville, Tenn., has provided me with a poem which speaks of the love we all share for our flag. With July 4 approaching us this poem takes time to remind us of the proud heritage which our flag represents to all Americans.

The poem follows:

A TOAST TO THE FLAG

Here's to the red of it—
There's not a thread of it,
No, nor a shred of it
In all the spread of it
From foot to head,
But heroes bled for it,
Faced steel and lead for it,
Precious blood shed for it,
Bathing it Red!
Here's to the white of it—
Thrilled by the sight of it,
Who knows the right of it
But feels the might of it
Through day and night?
Womanhood's care for it
Made manhood dare for it,
Purity's prayer for it
Keeps it so white!
Here's to the blue of it—
Beauteous view of it,
Heavenly hue of it,
Star-spangled dew of it
Constant and true;
Diadems gleam for it,
States stand supreme for it,
Liberty's beam for it
Brightens the blue!
Here's to the whole of it—
Stars, stripes and pole of it,
Body and soul of it,
O, and the roll of it,
Sun shining through;
Hearts in accord for it,
Swear by the sword for it,
Thanking the Lord for it,
Red White and Blue!

THE RIPON SOCIETY ON DEMOCRATIC PARTY REFORMS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, with the Democratic National Convention about to convene in Miami Beach, a great deal is being written and said about the new reform procedures under which delegates from each State, territory, and the District of Columbia have been chosen in 1972. Under mandate from the 1968 convention to open its processes to the full participation of all Democrats, the Democratic Party has undergone the most sweeping reform of any political party in at least 100 years, and perhaps ever. Full and meaningful participation by rank-and-file party members has become a reality in the Democratic Party. Over 98 percent of all delegates to the 1972 convention have been elected in processes open to full participation. Democrats have a right to be proud of this amazing achievement.

In this regard, I believe it is worth noting that the Ripon Society, a Republican organization, agrees with this assessment. It is also interesting to note what leaders of that organization have to say about the political processes of both parties in their publication of June 15, 1972. An excerpt from that publication is as follows:

RIPON SOCIETY-DEMOCRATIC PARTY REFORM, JUNE 15, 1972

But Republicans ought not be too smug. For the new rules have opened the Democratic Party in a way that has attracted legions of voters across the country. The Democratic Party has been "where the action is," not merely because it had a real decision to make on its presidential nominee, but also because there was a real opportunity to influence that decision.

Here the caucus system was ingenious. It got people involved in selecting the Democratic presidential candidate at the grassroots level. Even if their name wasn't mentioned in a wire service story covering a precinct caucus in a Des Moines living room, thousands of people across the country felt they were part of the nominating process and, as a result, became committed to the Democratic Party.

In California, between January 1 and April 13, those registering to vote opted for the Democratic Party in nearly a three-to-one ratio. During these three-and-a-half months, 400,000 more people selected the Democratic Party than the GOP, a margin that is nearly double President Nixon's 1968 winning California plurality of 223,000 votes. Clearly, being "where the action is" has not hurt Democratic registration.

Republican delegates watching the Democratic Convention on their televisions in July, will recoil in horror at the disorder the McGovern Commission's reforms have brought. They will go to Miami Beach in August even more determined not to repeat the "mistakes" made by the Democrats.

But the Democrats have not made a mistake. They have been willing to risk the difficulties of diversity and conflict for the benefits of involvement and commitment. If the Republican Party is ever to become the majority party, it must first become an "open party." The 1972 GOP delegates may feel comfortable in the controlled environment of the Republican Convention. But unless these delegates can send a message to the electorate that they welcome grass-roots participation in the GOP and will respond to it, the Party they control will continue to dwindle.

SENATE CUTS POST-SALT FUNDS

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I have continually voiced my support of the SALT agreements, feeling that they mark the commencement of a new dimension in this country's foreign relations. The President took a great step forward in his talks with the Soviet Union, and it is my hope that these measures in arms limitation will not be adversely affected by anything that would demonstrate to the world that America does not have trust and confidence in these agreements. I believe that the appropriation of the $110 million requested by Secretary of Defense Laird to upgrade strategic programs not limited by the talks would do exactly that.

It was for this reason that on June 27 I offered an amendment to the military procurement authorization that would delete these funds. Although the amendment failed, I still hold that the granting of these funds now would weaken the accomplishments of the summit meeting, and was therefore pleased to see that the Senate Armed Services Committee, chaired by Senator STENNIS, deferred action on Secretary Laird's request, declaring that it lacked sufficient justification.

I include in the RECORD an article by George C. Wilson concerning the Senate committee's action which appeared in the Washington Post on June 30, 1972. It is my intention, by inserting the article, to point out to my fellow Members of the House that our distinguished colleagues in the Senate have indeed acted in fine fashion and I commend them for it. The article follows:

SENATE UNIT BALKS AT MISSILE SHIELD FOR WASHINGTON

(By George C. Wilson)

The Senate Armed Services Committee yesterday refused to approve money for a missile defense of Washington until the Pentagon comes up with a more convincing justification, including the cost.

Chairman John C. Stennis (D-Miss.), told reporters that his committee "ran out of time" in waiting for details about the site. It thus approved a military procurement bill authorizing only the Grand Forks, N.D., anti-ballistic-missile (ABM) defense.

President Nixon, on the basis of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks with the Soviet Union, had requested congressional approval of missile protection for both the Washington command center and for the Minuteman ICBM base at Grand Forks.

Also, Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird asked Congress for $110 million to beef up the U.S. offense, linking the need to the arms limits imposed by the SALT agreement. The Stennis committee deferred action on those requests as well.

"Those items were deferred without prejudice, and some may be recommended later as committee-approved amendments, once full justifications are presented," Stennis said.

The committee refusal to rush into new programs may result in the Senate voting on the SALT agreements first and the Pentagon's latest requests for more weapons second. Stennis said he did not know how the legislative calendar would work out.

The Defense Department also came close to being turned down on its request to accelerate the Trident (also called ULMS) jumbo submarine program. Stennis said the committee voted 8 to 8 to deny procurement funds for Trident on a motion by Sen. Lloyd M. Bentsen Jr. (D-Tex.). The tie meant the motion failed.

The Pentagon for the new fiscal year beginning July 1 asked $422 million to buy hardware for the Trident submarine and another $555 million for research and development on it. Opponents argue that the Polaris/Poseidon fleet of missile-carrying submarines is adequate and that speeding into Trident construction might impel the Soviets to follow suit.

The Bentsen amendment, as described by Stennis, would have cut out the $422 million for procurement.

The extra $110 million in research funds Laird requested to offset SALT consists of $60 million to make Minuteman ICBM sites less vulnerable to attack; $20 million to accelerate Navy development of a cruise missile for submarines; $20 million for work on improved warheads, and $10 million for military communications and surveillance.

The Senate committee approved none of that extra $110 million, while the House earlier this week voted for all of it.

All told, the Senate committee approved $20.6 billion to buy weapons and conduct research on advanced ones—an amount $700 million less than the House approved and $2.7 billion less than the Pentagon requested.

While approving most of the big weapons programs, including $445.5 million for the B–1 bomber and $290 million for hardware for the Navy's fourth nuclear-powered aircraft carrier, the committee pared military manpower by 56,000 men.

TO HONOR RETIRED FIRE CHIEF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a column by Alec Kerr, of the Star Tribune, announcing the retirement of Fire Chief Edward Mulder, of Harvey, Ill. In so doing, I wish to pay my compliments to Edward Mulder for his years of service.

I wish to emphasize the point of the dedicated individuals such as Mr. Mulder in communities such as Harvey and across the Nation. I, personally, believe that there should be more publications commending dedicated hard working officials such as Ed Mulder rather than give such attention to the radicals of the day, who are working to destroy rather than preserve the country:

TO HONOR RETIRED FIRE CHIEF

(By Alec Kerr)

Plans are being laid for a retirement party honoring Edward Mulder who retired June 1 as fire marshal of the City of Harvey, a position he held for 16 years. Mulder had been a member of the Fire department for 12 years prior to the promotion which made him its chief officer.

The Harvey man, known for his fire-fighting techniques throughout Illinois, will be honored by his colleagues and friends at a banquet to be held in Harvey's Holiday Inn on Saturday, July 15, at 7 p.m.

The early years of the Harvey Fire department are somewhat confusing concerning the succession of fire marshals.

The History of Harvey, written in 1962, records the formal organization of the Fire department "in 1897 or 1898" under Chief John Ott, who aided in the purchase of Prince and Duke, dapple gray horses, which became widely known as one of the fastest fire "teams" in Illinois. Besides the chief, the department had five regular members.

The document lists one chief, Frank Bartle (1891–92) who preceded Ott, although the latter is recorded as having begun his service with the department in 1892 instead of 1897. We can assume that the first five years of his tenure was as a volunteer.

This record is at odds with another source used by the Fire department as a promotional item in connection with its annual dance in 1948 which listed two Ott predecessors, Frank Bartle (1893–95) and Emmet Boyce (1895–97) with John Ott taking over in 1897. This could, actually, be the more accurate of the documents, but the only effect would be a reduction in the number of years Ott served as chief, from 24 to 19 years.

What we had started out to do was determine whether Mulder held the post longer than any of his predecessors. Apparently, he must settle for runnerup honors, Ott having served for 19 years and Mulder for 17.

That is, of course, relatively unimportant. What is of vastly more consequence is the fact that Mulder served as chief during a much more critical period—when Harvey's business, industrial and residential growths were at their peaks. He commanded the largest staff in the history of the department and supervised the use of far more complicated fire-fighting equipment. His contribution to the safety of the community and its residents has, therefore, been unparalleled in the city's history.

Ed Mulder has been a dedicated fireman and an able leader and as such has earned the admiration and respect of the community. It is appropriate, therefore, that its citizens pay him tribute as he brings a career of unselfish service to a close and make plans to attend the dinner at which he will be honored.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, due to pressing matters in my congressional district I was not present for votes on June 5, and June 12 through June 19. Had I been here, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall numbers 185–189, 196–201, 205, 206, 208, 210, and 211. I would have voted "nay" on rollcall numbers 203, 204 and 207.

BOB PAFFORD OF CALIFORNIA—BEST BUREAU OF RECLAMATION ASSET

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, they say that California enjoys its preeminence in agriculture because of water resource development. We are blessed in California with three major competitive agencies: the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and the California Department of Water Resources.

The Bureau has particularly been managed with distinction over the past decade by a very innovative water development pioneer, Bob Pafford. Bob has accomplished miracles in many projects and is now setting his mind and team to the task of completing the Tehama-Colusa Canal project with a budget of $14 million plus this year.

The Willows Daily Journal, having recognized in the past the work of Engle, Carr, LEGGETT, and others on this authorization, now gives appropriately top honors to Bob Pafford as follows:

PAFFORD AWARDED; CANAL "SPARKPLUG"

SACRAMENTO.—Robert J. Pafford Jr., Regional Director of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and a continuing sparkplug of the Tehama-Colusa Canal, is a recipient of the Interior Department's highest honor—the Distinguished Service Award.

He received it, for one reason, because he planned and carried out the epochal fish-spawning facilities in the Tehama-Colusa Canal below Red Bluff.

Due to his efforts, for the first time in recorded history fish are being spawned in a man-made canal.

At the May 31 dedication of the Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District's fish-screening facility above Hamilton City, L. Edward Perry of Portland, Ore., Deputy Regional Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, said the Tehama-Colusa Canal fish-spawning channel "has exceeded all expectations."

It is expected to add some 2 million pounds of chinook salmon to the Sacramento River fishery each year.

Pafford received the Distinguished Service Award at an Interior Department Honor Awards Convocation in Constitution Hall, Washington, D.C., Thursday.

It recognizes Pafford's "outstanding contributions in engineering and administration" during his 38 years as a career Federal civil-service employee.

Secretary of the Interior Rogers C. E. Morton said of Pafford that "his demonstrated concern over the environmental impact of Bureau facilities" was one of the reasons he received the medal.

He pointed out that several years ago Pafford approved and put into effect the plan to construct the Tehama-Colusa Canal's artificial fish-spawning facilities just below the Red Bluff Diversion Dam.

"Working in close cooperation with State and Federal fishery agencies." Morton said, "Bureau designers solved many highly technical problems which led to the completion of those facilities in October, 1971."

A citation accompanying the award notes that "Mr. Pafford's decision to concentrate the resources of the Region on solving this environmental problem and his leadership in solving it preceded by several years the public awareness of dangers to the environment."

He played a key role in securing full clearance of the canal from an environmental point of view.

Before transferring to the Bureau of Reclamation in Sacramento in January, 1963, as Regional Director, Pafford had spent more than 28 years with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. He was prominently associated with the Pick-Sloan plan, a cooperative program between the Corps of Engineers and the Buerau of Reclamation covering the entire 10-state Missouri River Basin.

Pafford is the author of the "Reservoir" article in the Encyclopedia Britannica and co-author of a paper on "A Disposal System for Agricultural Waste Waters in the San Joaquin Valley of California," which he presented at the Seventh Congress of the International Commission on Irrigation and Drainage in Mexico City in 1969.

He is a member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, California Tomorrow, the U.S. Committee of the International Commission on Irrigation Drainage and Flood Control, the U.S. Committee of the International Commission on Large Dams, the Wilderness Society and the Audubon Society.

His previous awards include Federal Employee of the Year in 1955 in the Nebraska area and the Department of the Army's Meritorious Civil Service Award in 1956. He earned a bachelor of science degree in electrical engineering at Kansas State University, graduating in 1931.

McGOVERN'S CREDIBILITY

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, Tom Wicker, associate editor and columnist for the New York Times, has written an excellent article as of June 22 in the New York Times. He had previously written an article on June 4, entitled, "Redistributing the Wealth in the Nation," in which he tried to explain the McGovern plan to pay every man, woman, and child in the United States, regardless of his or her income or wealth, $1,000 each per year.

Unfortunately, Mr. Wicker was suckered, as were many people this last winter, as to what the McGovern welfare plan would do.

In his June 22 article, entitled, "McGovern's Credibility," he takes the Senator to task for not only a lack of understanding, but a complete misrepresentation of how much money would be required, how taxes would be distributed, and what the average tax increase would be for those earning $12,000 to $20,000 a year. Mr. Wicker points out:

For those above $20,000 the tax increase might average 80 percent or more, if the estimate of $27 billion in additional revenue was to be reached.

Mr. Wicker says:

The road to credibility gap and elsewhere is paved with good intentions, and if George McGovern really wants to restore the faith and trust of the American people in their Government, he has made a bad start of it with this income program.

As is always the case with credibility lapses, he also has called into question some other pledges and calculations.

The articles follow:

[From the New York Times, June 4, 1972]

REDISTRIBUTING THE WEALTH

(By Tom Wicker)

The "fundamental redirection" of the nation proposed by George McGovern in his Presidential campaign depends first on raising billions through tax reform and military reductions. So, in different fashion, does Mr. McGovern's most interesting and controversial proposal—a minimum income guarantee.

Here is the way McGovern spokesmen say the plan would work:

Each year the Federal Government would pay $1,000 to every man, woman and child in the United States, regardless of his or her income or wealth. Each would have to pay Federal income tax on this sum, as if it were earnings; each would earn as much additional money as possible.

The grants would replace the controversial welfare program called aid for dependent children. A mother now on welfare, with three children and no husband, would get $3,000 a year plus anything else she might earn, although there would be no work requirement; but she would pay Federal income tax on her total income.

A family of four with an income of $6,000 would get a $4,000 cash supplement; so would a family of four with an income of $50,000; but each family would be taxed on the total. For families with earnings below a set "break-even" point—say, $12,000 for a family of four—the plan would provide a net income supplement that would decline as their total income neared the break-even point; families with incomes above the demarcation line would have a net increase in their tax payments.

Mr. McGovern has been having difficulty explaining how this vast income program would be paid for, and what it would cost. Spokesmen say this is because it would be more nearly a function of the Internal Revenue system than of ordinary Federal budgeting; and also because policy decisions, such as where to set the break-even point, would sharply affect the cost.

In general, however, they say the main burden of the plan would be borne by eliminating the $750 personal tax exemption to which every citizen is now entitled; these exemptions are estimated by McGovern's staff to cost the Treasury about $63 billion. Eliminating them would have the net effect of a tax increase.

As it works now, however, the personal exemption system favors the well-to-do rather than the poor. Mr. McGovern's example is that a family of four in the 50 per cent tax bracket gets a net benefit of about $1,400 from its exemptions, while the same family in the 14 per cent bracket benefits by only $392.

Mr. McGovern's proposal would mean that a family of four with an annual income of $60,000, now paying income tax on only $57,000 because of its four $750 exemptions, would pay taxes in the future on $64,000—its income, plus its $4,000 in grants, with no exemptions. This obviously would result in a substantially higher tax payment, even without a change in tax rates.

If the income grant program were put into effect, the McGovern men say, there would be an immeidate savings of $8 billion, from the elimination of persent Federal cost of aid to dependent children. The states would save about $5 billion in welfare costs, over and above their $2-billion contribution to the aged, blind and disabled; thus, Mr. McGovern would subtract from his other spending programs—to be paid for with tax reform and defense cuts that he says will total $60.5 billion—the $5 billion he now proposes for revenue sharing with the states.

The minimum income grants would go to Social Security recipients, so Mr. McGovern also could take out of his putative budget

the $10 billion he is now proposing for Social Security benefit increases. With this $23 billion in savings, and by eliminating personal exemptions, Mr. McGovern estimates that a break-even point of $8,500 for a family of four "probably" could be established without further tax increases.

But a break-even point of $12,000 would require $27 billion more revenue, for which a tax-rate increase would be necessary. The McGovern estimate is that this sum could be raised by a combination of increases that would cost an average of about $50 per taxpayer among persons earning $12,000 to $20,000 annually; but above that sum the increases probably would be much larger.

Some will view this as a dole to the poor and many of those to be taxed more heavily will obviously object, but the plan has numerous advantages, too. It would eliminate the welfare bureaucracy and stop migration from one state to another for higher welfare benefits, and instead of taxing low-income people to support the indigent, as at present, it would provide all low-income families with an income supplement.

It would do all those things, that is, if it works the way George McGovern and his economic aides say it will. Among economists and political opponents there is considerable dispute about that—particularly about the accuracy of Mr. McGovern's revenue estimates and the likelihood that he could raise or save the sums that would be necessary. Like the plan's price tag, all that remains to be seen.

[From the New York Times, June 22, 1972]

McGOVERN'S CREDIBILITY

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, June 21.—His victory in the New York primary puts Senator George McGovern on the brink of the Democratic Presidential nomination. That makes it all the more necessary that those who believe the McGovern campaign promises the right directions for the nation should insist that he himself live up to that promise.

Specifically, Mr. McGovern cannot at one and the same time proclaim his intention to restore the "credibility" of the Presidency and at the same time pretend that his program for income redistribution was just a casual idea to which he was never really committed. The fact is that it was only when analysts began to show the economic holes in that program that Mr. McGovern started backing away from it.

In this space on June 4 there appeared an explanation of how the complicated scheme—for an income supplement of $1,000 per person to every American—was supposed to work. That explanation was based on conversations with, and a seven-page document prepared by, the McGovern staff. All this was accepted far too uncritically, with the result that the McGovern income program was made, in this column, to seem more practical and carefully worked out than it is. This was a journalistic sin for which responsibility is hereby accepted; it was also reaffirmation of the cardinal lesson that every political reporter learns and re-learns—that everything said and done by politicians seeking or holding power has to be constantly challenged.

The most obvious distortion concerned the net gain to the Government if the $750 personal tax exemption for every taxpayer were eliminated in favor of the $1,000 McGovern grant. McGovern men put that figure at $63.6 billion; Mr. McGovern himself, in the California primary, repeatedly said it would be either $60 billion or $70 billion; in fact, disinterested tax authorities say, it would be less than half that much—a fact which both aspiring politicians and gullible reporters should have had no difficulty in establishing.

For another example, the McGovern staff document—and consequently the article here—said that a family of four, earning $60,000 a year, would have less income under the McGovern program because they would pay taxes on $64,000 a year (without exemptions) rather than $57,000 a year (with exemptions but no grants). In fact, as many persons have since pointed out, depending somewhat on its deductions, that family's after-tax income—if rates remained the same—would be little changed, and might in some cases be higher.

Again, the McGovern staff document said that to provide income supplements up to a $12,000 income for a family of four, without a net increase in its taxes, would require an average tax increase of $50 per taxpayer on those earnings between $12,000 and $20,000 a year. It did not add, as it should have, that for those above $20,000 the tax increase might average 80 per cent or more, if the estimate of $27 billion in additional needed revenue was to be reached.

Senator McGovern now seems to be disavowing this specific program, so all these errors of omission and commission may not much matter, in a practical sense. What does matter is that expert economic analysis so impugns the program that it was either extremely careless or deceptive to put it forward in that form; and what also matters is that it is not believable that Mr. McGovern himself considered it only an experimental idea.

He discussed the program, for instance, in six pages of text with Elizabeth Drew in a television interview in Los Angeles and never suggested it was a tentative proposal ("Well, actually, Liz," he said at one point, "I don't think it would cost much of anything.") He did suggest the $1,000 figure might have to be adjusted but he consistently referred to "the program that I've recommended."

That, of course, may be what is finally important—George McGovern is thinking of a program of income redistribution, and it may well be that nothing is more vitally needed in a society in which 1 per cent of the population holds 28 per cent of the wealth, and in which the poorest fifth of the people receives only about 4 per cent of the annual national income.

In that sense, Mr. McGovern's errors of specificity are less important than his intensions; but the same could have been said of Richard Nixon's 1968 pledge to "end the war and win the peace." The road to credibility gap and elsewhere is paved with good intentions, and if George McGovern really wants to restore the faith and trust of the American people in their Government, he has made a bad start of it with his income program.

As is always the case with credibility lapses, he also has called into question some other pledges and calculations.

H. H. MORRIS

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed emotions that I note the retirement of my good friend, my fellow Kentuckian, and our distinguished Postmaster of the House of Representatives, the Honorable H. H. Morris.

I am, of course, pleased that "Hap" Morris has served the House of Representatives and his country with distinction and honor for enough years to qualify him for retirement and a well deserved rest.

But at the same time, Mr. Speaker, I must confess to no little sadness in the knowledge that my good friend Hap will no longer be around to give advice, counsel, and encouragement to me and to all Members of this distinguished body.

Having come to the House in the 92d Congress, I do not have the wealth of memories and anecdotes concerning Hap's service which my distinguished colleagues from Kentucky possess by reason of their longer relationship with this gentleman. But, my memories of Hap make up in quality what they might, perhaps, lack in quantity.

He has been a good friend, a thoughtful adviser and a trusted confident during my months in Congress. That I will miss Hap Morris, his smile and his pleasant words goes without saying, Mr. Speaker.

That I wish him every possible happiness, and all good health in many years to come also goes without saying.

Hap Morris has served this House and its Members with unflagging devotion and uncommon dedication, and this House and all of its Members are forever diminished by Hap's retirement.

SIDNEY MARGOLIUS, PIONEER IN CONSUMER JOURNALISM, HONORED BY CONSUMER FEDERATION OF AMERICA

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the Consumer Federation of America, organized in 1967 as an outgrowth of the efforts of Esther Peterson to build a permanent base of consumer organization in this country while she was serving as Special Assistant to President Johnson for Consumer Affairs, has become a powerful force in the consumer movement in only a few short years. A year ago, it initiated annual awards for service to consumers, making its first presentations to Senator PHILIP A. HART of Michigan for public service and to Dr. Colston A. Warne of Consumers Union for leadership in consumer affairs.

On June 9, at the Mayflower Hotel, it was my great honor to receive the second public service award. The second award for leadership in consumer affairs was presented to Sidney Margolius, columnist and author, who was the pioneer in consumer journalism in the United States and is one of its greatest practitioners.

Helen E. Nelson, president of the Consumer Federation of America, is the former head of consumer affairs for the State of California, where she achieved an outstanding record in the administration of former Gov. Edmund G. Brown. The executive director of CFA is Erma Angevine, who has been responsible for building the organization into its present size and influence.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks made by

Mr. Margolius in accepting his award. I am sure it will be of great interest to every Member of Congress who has voted for or worked on consumer issues, for he is one of the outstanding figures in this expanding field of national interest.

Mr. Margolius' remarks were as follows:

I am deeply honored by this award, and I must say, still surprised and a little embarrassed when I think of the many people working hard for consumers who deserve this award as much or more. The Awards Committee must have given a lot of weight to longevity. An award is something I never expected when I became interested in consumer problems some 35 years ago, and my fellow consumer journalists and I held our first convention in a phone booth in a Greenwich Village drug store. Sometimes during those isolated years I used to think that the light you could see in the eyes of the few consumerists of that time really came from the sun shining through the holes in our heads.

I came to consumer work in the depression of the 1930's through my interest in the labor movement where I had been a volunteer organizer for a teamster local in the New York wholesale produce market. I was motivated mainly by a sense of indignation at the cynical exploitation of working people both as workers and consumers in this big market where I myself worked as a business-news reporter. That sense of indignation kept me working on consumer problems even when some of my friends made me feel that I was some kind of kook, who would traipse 25 miles to Harlem to talk to a meeting of even four people about installment credit gyps. I was advised many times that if people stopped buying on installments the whole economy would collapse.

But there were two people who did encourage me over the years, and this award is the one I'd like to share with my wife, and with Gordon Cole, editor of The Machinist.

Without Gordon there would not have been the outspoken, persistent consumer coverage in the labor press that in those years was just about the only consistent consumer reporting available except for Consumers Union's reports. At that time only the labor and the co-op papers would have permitted this kind of candid, name-naming information to be published as a regular feature.

Gordon became editor of The Machinist in 1947 and a few months later got me working on a consumer column which was then made available to other labor, co-op and credit union papers.

Gordon himself had been one of the country's first consumer reporters. When he was on the Washington staff of the newspaper PM in the early years of World War II, he carried on some terrific campaigns for price control including exposing how top officials of the Office of Price Administration, who had come from advertising agencies and food companies, were trying to kill the grade labeling needed for effective price control. Gordon's determined reporting undoubtedly did much to hold down prices during those years of real inflationary pressures, and also helped to keep price control in effect for at least a while after the war.

But if it was Gordon's enterprise and constant promotion that developed broad consumer coverage in labor and other papers, it was my wife's hard work and enthusiasm that made possible the wide ranging research we've done. Not only has Esther actually stayed up all night with me many nights to help finish urgent projects, but we keep motivating each other. If I'm not in a state of indignation about some consumer gouge, she is likely to run across something that makes her indignant, and back to the typewriters we go. I remember one day she came home with a bagful of new kinds of oatmeal with added ingredients like sugar, and bits of dried apple, that raised the prices enormously. We found that one new product which I can only describe as instant instant oatmeal, could be prepared in half a minute instead of one minute. But the housewife paid for the time saving at the rate of $4.50 an hour, while her husband, the average worker, earned $3 an hour. The husband obviously would be better off staying home and stirring oatmeal for his wife, sprinkling sugar on cereal for his children, and so on.

Anyway, since I hate to throw anything out, I ate oatmeal for a long time. Esther's been very patient too. When we were working on The Great American Food Hoax, I gradually accumulated in my office many of the foods from her cupboard, for price comparisons. Finally one afternoon she came down and apologetically asked, "Can I have back either the rice or the noodles so I can make dinner?"

It's especially gratifying for me to be here tonight when Leonor Sullivan is getting an award. I always think of Leonor as a kind of consumer heroine who overcame all kinds of obstacles to get a strong truth in lending law through Congress. Many consumer bills are introduced nowadays but few are enacted and even some of those are not very effective. Leonor not only introduced the most important bill of all but she got it through Congress, using every possible political art, and never giving up when she encountered some temporary setback. She even got me to help her though I was aware that if a truth in lending law ever did get passed I would lose one of my best sources of writing material.

Recently Frank Pollack of Consumers Union was struck by the fact that many of the same consumer issues of 30 years ago exist today. The country still has problems of inflation, price control, high rents, contaminated foods, flammable fabrics, hazardous products, higher living costs in ghetto neighborhoods, and many others.

Does that mean that consumer work doesn't solve any problems? I can hardly believe that.

I think that the fact that the problems continue means that consumer progress is never fully completed. There is some measurable progress as in the enactment of the Truth in Lending law and in alleviation of other consumer credit problems, and some progress in unit pricing, and in making products safer. But at the same time new problems develop. You might get FDA to set standards for peanut butter, after 11 years, and canned orange drinks after 10 years, but meanwhile the manufacturers bring out dozens of other deceptively promoted products. You gradually force some alleviation of product hazards in children's toys and power lawn mowers, for example, but then other hazardous products come on the market.

I've come to believe that you can never expect a final resolution of consumer problems. The consumer movement must be an ongoing activity, a constant guardian on behalf of the public welfare. In actual fact, the consumer movement is the price of free enterprise.

Unless the system itself is changed, we'll have to go on digging out facts, informing the public and prodding the government. A consumer worker is something like a doctor specializing in sinus treatment. His patients never die but they never get well. But to be effective, we are going to have to become increasingly expert and find the financing and the resources to stop some of the tremendous waste of family and national resources now going on in this country.

The current price control fiasco demonstrates again the urgent need for a strong Consumer Federation with its own corps of experts. The Administration's program was hastily conceived, and made no effort to reach the tap roots of inflation, or gave even any indication that the jerry builders of this program knew where the tap roots were. The program was either political hypocrisy or a product of ignorance, and I hope it was merely hypocrisy. I'd be more frightened than ever to think that our country's economic fate is in the hands of officials so unknowing of real-life economics, including that instant instant economist, John Connally of Texas.

I don't think people realize how little many government officials really understand about consumer economics. In 1965, when Helen Nelson and I were serving on Esther Peterson's advisory council, we asked the then chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors what the Administration planned to do about the new inflation that was in the making. On the specific question of food prices, the government's head economist replied that he saw no problem since food, quote, is a highly competitive business.

Well, that comment must rank among the most famous last words of history. The main competition in the food business at that time was in different colors of trading stamps.

Esther Peterson herself foresaw the need for consumer organization. She realized that her role of representing consumers in the White House could change with a new administration or even with a change in the mood of a President, and that a permanent base of consumer organization had to be created. For this reason she devoted some of her office's limited resources to encouraging the development of local consumer groups and of a national organization. This is a work that Betty Furness wisely continued. When Erma and Dave Angevine took on the job of organizing the first Consumer Assembly in 1966, the first broad consumer organization we ever had in this country was launched. I consider the achievements of CFA remarkable even with its modest budget and small staff. For the first time consumers have had consistent and knowledgeable representation of their needs before Congress and government agencies, and a continuing and dependable spokesman to the press for the consumer point of view. Previously, consumers had to rely mainly on the labor unions for representation, and the unions did yeoman service for consumers and still do. Otherwise there was only sporadic and haphazard representation at both the federal and state levels, sometimes by members of the Consumers Union Co-op and credit unions staffs doing double duty, and occasionally by some of the women's organizations. CFA has given consumers more visibility nationally, and the new state consumer organizations have given us more visibility locally, than we have ever had in the 35 years that I've been observing this scene.

There is not going to be any simple or immediate solution to consumer problems. There is no overall gimmick or cureall such as consumer education or a consumer department in government or a sudden awakening of a sense of corporate responsibility.

There is no substitute for an ongoing consumer movement on both the national and local levels that will bargain for consumers as strongly and effectively as the trade unions bargain for workers. Thus, there is no substitute for a strong, expert Consumer Federation. If there is one thing that I've learned in these 35 years, it's what I said before: a well-organized consumer movement is the only force that can make genuine free enterprise operate effectively for the benefit of the entire nation. Those who clamor for the rights of free enterprise and of profit-making business, had better understand this fact for the sake of the system they claim to defend.

I want to thank the organizations and consumer workers that make up the Consumer Federation for this award, and all of you, for this opportunity to offer my own experiences to a tolerant if captive audience.

AGRICULTURAL POLLUTION PROBLEMS

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, a major part of the job to be done in achieving the goal of clean rivers and streams is to cope successfully with the growing problems of pollution control on the farm and ranch lands of our country. The changes in farming and land management techniques which have brought us such a wide variety of nutritious and high quality foods have also brought water pollution problems which were not present to serious degrees under old farming methods.

Agricultural land, because of type and intensity of use and because of its large areas exposed to erosion, supplies the greatest amount of the Nation's sediment yield, perhaps over one-half of the total.

The major sources of agricultural water pollution are sediment, herbicides and pesticides, fertilizers, and livestock wastes. Sediment, of course, is not only a major pollutant in its own right, but it is also a major carrier of all the others, as well as some infectious agents which are now causing serious health hazards. At our 1971 Public Works Subcommittee on Conservation and Watershed Development hearings in Wichita, Kans., Melville W. Gray, Chief Engineer and Director of the Division of Environmental Health, stated:

> It is our contention that there is no way by which Kansas can meet all water quality standards by the control of conventional municipal and industrial wastes . . . It is also our estimate that less than 10 percent of the total phosphate load in Kansas waters are attributable to industries and municipalities. The inference, of course, is that these materials, the remaining percentage, would come from land runoff.

Many diseases that would otherwise die in the soil are transmitted by sediment and water runoff. These include such serious diseases as hog cholera, anthrax, foot-and-mouth disease, brucellosis, and numerous eye, ear, nose, throat, and skin infections. Sediment also carries several types of chemical pollutants that can not be transported by water alone. Some of the most potent and dangerous pesticides and fertilizers have been found to cling to soil particles, and can only drain into waterways in silt-laden runoff from the land. Chlorinated hydrocarbons such as DDT, and phosphorous fertilizers are some of the silt-transported chemicals responsible for severe environmental damage in our waterways. Pollution from animal wastes is another problem that has grown up as a result of technological changes and modern farming techniques. About two-thirds of the U.S. beef output is now finished in feedlots, and problems of waste disposal have increased tremendously with confinement feeding of hogs, dairy cows, and poultry as well. If all the animal wastes produced in the Missouri River basin alone were put through sewage disposal plants, it would be equal to the sewage from 370 million people. The development of plant fertilizer which is less costly and more pleasant to spread has meant that today's animal wastes are not always spread over the land, as they were in the past. The building threat to water purity is increased by the fantastic biochemical oxygen demand of animal waste runoff, sometimes reaching 5,000 parts per million, from 12 to 25 percent greater than that of raw sewage.

In Mr. Gray's testimony at the Wichita hearing, he stated:

> With respect to present and proposed water quality standards, there can be no question regarding the effect of land runoff on water quality, particularly with respect to phosphates, nitrates, turbidities, and the bacterial indices of pollution; the coliform group, with particular emphasis on fecal coliform.

Diseases cause hundreds of millions of dollars in losses each year, as well as inflicting terrible infections upon swimmers and boaters. Fish are poisoned by chemicals and suffocated by lack of oxygen due to animal wastes. Lakes are turned to soup by fantastic growths of algae, which feed on plant fertilizer runoffs. Silt, the carrier of most of these bad tidings, clogs our waterways and fills our reservoirs and ponds—and the problems are either too costly, too time-consuming, or too complex for farmers to solve by themselves.

Developing new technology to stop sedimentation must continuously go on to keep pace with new developments in machines that work the land. In a statement at our 1971 subcommittee hearings in Davenport, Iowa, Dan Cutler, of the University of Iowa's Agricultural Law Center, testified:

> Pesticides and phosphorous fertilizers enter bodies of waste almost exclusively through absorption through eroding sediment particles. . . . Thus, of the five major agricultural sources of water pollution, sediment, pesticides, and phosphorous fertilizers are most susceptible to control through the implementation of land treatment measures. However, as presently constituted, land treatment measures are not progressing satisfactorily.

I have introduced a bill, H.R. 15596, which is intended to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to take steps to see that the watershed program does progress satisfactorily. Since enacted in 1954, the watershed program under Public Law 566 has become so encumbered with problems that many local sponsors have decided further applications for projects are useless. Delays on all levels have resulted in an attitude of pessimism throughout the program, especially for those who are trying hardest to make it work.

My bill would revise the watershed program, and it includes specific changes in five major areas, the first of which is farms and ranches. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make agreements for technical, financial, and engineering assistance for up to 10 years. These agreements should give local sponsors and landowners the solid assurance that their proposals are transformed into responsive projects, and will not be thwarted by the 3.7 years delay which the average proposal now faces. To insure that Federal planning and engineering expenditures are no longer wasted by failures and terminated projects on the local level, the Secretary may require the landowner to agree to: provide for the installation and maintenance of needed works; and install needed works or measures according to the technical specifications of the Secretary.

Anyone concerned about the quality of our environment, and our Nation's water in particular, should be concerned about the failure of our present program to provide resources where they are badly needed. H.R. 15596 would, if passed, turn these dismal failures into encouraging success, of which we could all be proud.

SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I support the legislation before us—H.R. 14896—to expand and strengthen those child nutrition programs which come under the provisions of the National School Lunch Act. However, one aspect of this legislation has me greatly concerned.

There is a provision of this bill, authored by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE), which authorizes the use of vending machines in school lunch programs where the food provided is limited to nutritious food items. Under the list of definitions provided for this legislation we find that:

> Nutritious should be considered as meaning that a food or food produce contains nutrients which in relation to the caloric value will provide a balanced diet when consumed in sufficient quantity to meet the recommended early allowances of calories for school children.

I have been advised that this would not include soft drinks. This, in my view, is unfortunate.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation—H.R. 14390—designed to allow the sale of soft drinks during lunch time in school cafeterias. There has been a great deal of controversy about this bill on the grounds that the nutritious value of soft drinks is questionable. However, through numerous meetings with officials closely connected with the National School Lunch Act as well as from discussions with the students themselves, I have discovered that the Federal regulations against the sale of soft drinks in school cafeterias have actually threatened the future of the federally subsidized lunch programs. These prohibitions are actually working counter to the intent of the law.

It has been found that many students, when the option of selecting a beverage is removed, would rather go elsewhere for their lunch or go without lunch at all. Mr. Speaker, a balanced, nutritious lunch with a soft drink is far preferable to a hot dog or a package of cup cakes purchased down the street, or in some instances, no meal at all.

Some school officials in Maryland have told me they may have to discontinue their lunch programs completely because of lack of participation. Obviously,

Mr. Speaker, if students stay away from the lunchrooms, and do not take advantage of the school lunch program, they cannot benefit from the nutritional benefits the Government is trying to insure. No matter how nutritious that lunch is, it must be consumed to provide any benefit.

My legislation in no way dictates to the school that soft drinks must be sold. It simply allows individual schools or school districts to determine on the basis of local conditions whether they wish to sell soft drinks.

Another objection, removed from the area of nutrition, which has been leveled against the legislation that I introduced, has been the question of vending machines being in competition with federally subsidized lunch programs. I am pleased that the bill before us—H.R. 14896—authorizes the use, for the first time, of vending machines in school cafeterias during the lunch period. These funds may be used to finance local school funds and this is commendable. I applaud this. But why not include soft drink vending machines. Surely this would not constitute a threat to the success of such lunch programs. Students, in a time when 18-year-olds are allowed to vote, should have the right and opportunity to drink a soft drink—with the permission of local school authorities. How will this detract from the lunch service?

As Dr. Homer O. Elseroad, superintendent of schools in Montgomery County, said in a letter to me:

> It is our contention—that by the time students reach senior high school age that some slightly greater options should be available to them at lunch, partly because of their own preferences, and partly because we believe it is good education for them to begin to assume some responsibility for these kinds of decisions themselves.

I most certainly agree, Mr. Speaker.

For these reasons, I urge that hearings be held on my bill, H.R. 14390, as soon as possible so that, in conjunction with the provisions of H.R. 14896, young men and women in our high schools will have the opportunity to exercise their freedom of choice. They are adults and they should be treated as such.

GENERAL WESTMORELAND—A GREAT SOLDIER

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, both in time of war and in time of peace Gen. William C. Westmoreland ranks as one of the great soldiers and citizens of our time. His military performance in Africa, in Europe, in Korea, and in Vietnam have demonstrated his brilliance as a soldier and his preeminence as a leader.

Now, as General Westmoreland leaves his post as Chief of Staff of the Army—where he has made invaluable contributions to our country's national defense—I join with others in this expression of gratitude, congratulations, and best wishes for his continued good health and the rest and enjoyment that one hopes for in retirement.

END THE WAR

HON. MORGAN F. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, many Americans are confused by the actions of an administration which claims it wants to end the Vietnam war yet drops more bombs and mines harbors in direct contradiction to the meaning of the word "peace."

Americans feel helpless and frustrated because they are seemingly powerless to direct their Government to end this wasteful war although they have spoken out many times. The most notable time was in 1968 when a man was elected to the highest office in the land on a pledge that he had a plan to end the war. Well, the war goes on, and all the American people get is doubletalk about "peace without losing face."

I insert into the RECORD at this time a letter sent by two of my constituents, a leaflet and a news article from the Chicago Sun-Times. These items tell of efforts to obtain signatures on a petition to end the war. More than 900 names were gathered at religious services Mother's Day last and sent to the distinguished Senators from Illinois, ADLAI STEVENSON and CHARLES PERCY.

I ask my colleagues to read the remarks of these women and consider that all across the United States there are millions more like them who desire an end to the Vietnamese conflict. Let us not allow their voices to fall on deaf ears any longer.

The letter follows:

MAY 21, 1972.

The Hon. MORGAN MURPHY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MURPHY: We are happy to inform you that many of your constituents applaud the stand which you and both of our senators from Illinois have taken with regard to the immediate withdrawal of our troops from Vietnam.

To attest to this fact we are sending copies of signatures affixed to an open letter addressed to both our junior and senior senators. The original of these was sent to our senior senator, Charles Percy and a copy to our junior senator, Adlai Stevenson.

These signatures were gathered on Mother's Day, May 14, 1972, in the Chicago communities of Beverly Hills, Morgan Park and Mt. Greenwood, primarily in front of different houses of worship.

We would like you to know that we are not a formal organization but a group of women, two or three of which were talking together on Thursday, May 11 about the war and the recently announced blockade.

We felt frustrated and powerless when a phrase in a circular put out by the Women for Peace caught our eye and imagination. It read, "We the mothers who have given life must be dedicated to preserving it."

A few calls to friends indicated that there were others who felt as we did and so we decided to use Mother's Day as our focus to convey some facts about the war particularly to women.

By Sunday morning we had leaflets printed, a sample of which we are enclosing here. About 75 workers passed them out and obtained signatures on the letter to our senators.

These signatures represent about 900 people and we ask that you, as our elected representative, regard them as a token representation of the deep sentiment against this war among the constituents of your district.

Also, please find enclosed a clipping from the Sun-Times which reported on the action which we took.

We ask that you work for a speedy end to this war which is depleting our morale, resources and young men.

Sincerely,

JOSEPHINE STEWART,
MARILYN THIBEAU.

MOTHER'S DAY GREETING FROM MOTHERS AFTER 11 YEARS OF WAR

(1) Our country is divided and our economy is crippled.

(2) Every measure we've taken has failed to win the war or the peace.

(3) We are defending a corrupt dictatorship in South Vietnam.

(4) Our President has said that immediate withdrawal would mean losing face. What about the lives we are losing in a war we cannot win?

(5) Our prisoners will not be released as long as we continue fighting and as we continue there will be more prisoners.

(6) The only sane answer is immediate withdrawal.

(7) Make your views known by writing to: Senator Charles Percy, Senator Adlai Stevenson, Representative Morgan Murphy.

And to the President of the United States.

We, the mothers who have given life must be dedicated to preserving it.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, May 15, 1972]

BEVERLY HILLS MOTHERS PROTEST WAR WITH LEAFLETS ON THEIR DAY

(By Judy Nicol)

About 50 Beverly Hills mothers passed out Mother's Day messages outside six local churches and a synagog Sunday, urging mothers to speak out against the war in Vietnam.

The 50, who are not part of any organized group, said they came together spontaneously last week and decided to pass out leaflets that read: "We the mothers who have given life must be dedicated to preserving it.

"Our President has said that immediate withdrawal would mean losing face—but what about the lives we are losing in a war we cannot win?"

They asked for immediate withdrawal from Vietnam.

REACTION "FAVORABLE"

Most reaction to the group's presence outside churches Sunday was "very favorable," according to a spokeswoman for the group.

But one protesting mother was told "I think the President knows more than you do."

The women passed out "Mother's Day greetings" at the churches where they are members. They were: the Morgan Park Baptist Church of Chicago, Christ the King Church, Friends Religious Society of Chicago, St. Barnabas Church, Queen of Martyrs Church, Beverly Unitarian Church, and Beth Torah Congregation.

The 50 women came together following President Nixon's announcement of the blockade of North Vietnam.

TO SEND PETITIONS

They phoned mutual friends voicing their distress over the blockade, and finally de-

cided to send petitions urging withdrawal from Vietnam to Illinois Senators Charles H. Percy and Adlai E. Stevenson III.

The women asked that their names not be used because they do not want personal publicity. They said they seek, instead, to inform elected representatives of the depth of anti-war sentiment in the country.

The group began passing out leaflets Saturday and continued through Sunday as the various congregations met.

FATHER HESBURGH OF NOTRE DAME

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 20th anniversary of the accession to the presidency of the University of Notre Dame of the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C.

Mr. Speaker, few citizens of our country have done so much for so many with such courage and devotion as has Father Hesburgh.

I am proud to know him as both constituent and friend.

Mr. Speaker, as president of the University of Notre Dame, Father Hesburgh has served as a model for other college and university presidents in his vigorous and imaginative leadership of a great institution of higher learning.

As Chairman of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, he has set another kind of example, in his steadfast and effective dedication to the cause of human rights.

Indeed, in every way, Father Hesburgh has set an example to us all in his commitment to the application of reason in human affairs and to the pursuit of justice for all our citizens as our common obligation.

Mr. Speaker, the June 1972 issue of the journal, Notre Dame magazine, contains an excellent article, by Richard W. Conklin, summarizing the remarkable career—to date—of Father Hesburgh.

As Mr. Conklin says of Father Hesburgh:

He is a contemporary rarity—a national leader with moral impact.

Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in inserting at this point in the RECORD the article to which I have referred:

THE HESBURGH YEARS: THE CHALLENGE OF CHANGE

(By Richard W. Conklin)

As an educator, he has brought Notre Dame from the forefront of the nation's football factories to the forefront of the nation's universities.—The New York Times.

While the man about whom that was written—Theodore Martin Hesburgh, C.S.C.—would be the first to quarrel with the accuracy of "football factory" at any point in Notre Dame's history, he also knows the place he is fond of blessing as his airliner makes its approach over the Golden Dome, is not the same place it was 20 years ago.

There are many reasons why Notre Dame is not the same place. The Church, in which the University was—and is—imbedded, has changed. So, too, have the young people who grow into adulthood on its campus, and to some extent its professors, although one would probably find the thread of continuity strongest there. And to a very real extent, Notre Dame's growth has been tied to a general postwar expansionist period of higher education (as it now faces the problems of a general depression). But there are few who would not admit that the main reason why Notre Dame has changed is because of the uncommon leadership of a man who became its 15th president in 1952 at the age of 35.

Father Hesburgh is a 55-year-old Holy Cross priest, a son of a German-French father of Luxembourg ancestry and an Irish mother with a suspected trace of Spanish, all of which might have something to do with his language facility, which includes six spoken and eight read. Born in Syracuse, N.Y., into a middle-class family (his father was an executive of Pittsburgh Plate Glass), the young Hesburgh learned something about the vagaries of the national economy when he worked 40 hours a week for $8 as a gas station attendant during the Depression. The institution he heads now has a faculty of some 750, a student body of 8,200, an endowment of $67.9 million, an annual budget of $50 million, and more than 75 buildings (a third built in his era) with a replacement value of $167 million.

When he was 12, a friendly priest asked him what he wanted to be, and instead of one of the more popular responses—policeman, fireman, explorer—he said he wanted to be a priest. And if he died today, that is the one word he would want engraved on his tombstone, with the other titles—chairman of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, President of Notre Dame, trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation among them—left to memory.

A PRIEST'S PRIEST

"Hesburgh is a priest's priest," said a close friend. Although he logs up to 150,000 air miles a year visiting as many as 50 countries, the times he has missed saying Mass and reading his breviary can be counted on one hand. He is a contemporary rarity—a national leader with moral impact. Former President Lyndon B. Johnson, who in 1964 presented Father Hesburgh with the nation's highest civilian honor, the Medal of Freedom, has put it this way, "His strong moral resolve, his deep sense of justice and his faith in what our country can be have made his contribution an outstanding one. He has influenced others to join him by his example of love and compassion . . ." Father Hesburgh's sense of compassion is made up of small things—flowers to the hospitalized wife of the Russian ambassador to the International Atomic Energy Agency, a call to the wife of a staff member he caused to be absent on their anniversary—as well as a willingness to leave a crowded desk to fly to the bedside of a nephew critically injured in a car accident or to administer the Sacrament of the Sick to a former assistant stricken with cancer.

A few years ago, a columnist for the campus student paper attacked Father Hesburgh on his priesthood. Privately, the man could not have helped but be hurt, and letters from the campus community indicated that it, too, had sensed a violation of ground rules which had tolerated some rather vitriolic criticisms of University officials. Some months later, the writer, now graduated, wrote Father Hesburgh requesting a letter in support of his claim to conscientious objector status. He got it. "It's called turning the other cheek," commented one of the few persons who knew of the incident.

Like many Notre Dame administrators, Father Hesburgh works the dark side of the clock. "I'll give you all the time you want—between midnight and 4 a.m.," he told a *Time* magazine cover story reporter in 1962. He works in an unpretentious office ("It doesn't compare to Fordham," commented one television cameraman), behind a cluttered desk, within reach of a telephone with a private line, underneath shelves of books (he reads two or three a week, from theology to best-selling fiction), amid a clutter of travel memorabilia, listening to classical music on a Magnavox stereo, smoking a cigar and wearing a copper bracelet to ward off sleep-interfering aches and pains. In an adjoining room is a refrigerator for quick lunches, a small bar for visitors, and the hoods from more than three dozen honorary degrees. Students are occasional visitors to this late-night lair and have been known to serenade their president with Christmas carols from the balcony outside his window.

The future president of Notre Dame was on campus as a student in the days when "the kids wore hobnail boots and threw you in the lake if you did not welcome the football team back on campus." He returned from theological studies in Rome to a postwar campus where, if they were worn at all, the remnants of Army uniforms held the battlefield sweat of their owners. Both campuses were different from today's, and Father Hesburgh's own educational philosophy shows traces of contact with completely different life styles. This is one reason why the cliche of "relevancy" gets little hearing. "I was here at the University as a student in the early 1930's," he said, "and if I had been taught the most relevant thing at that time it would have been how to survive in the Depression, something relevant at that moment but irrelevant for the rest of my life."

THE PRIEST-EDUCATOR

The priest-educator is also fond of reminding audiences that it is foolish to tie one's conception of education to knowledge of facts. "The whole of human knowledge is doubling every 12 to 15 years. You'd better learn how to *think* today, how to cope with new knowledge and with evolving situations, because that's the kind of life you're going to face."

In 1969, a Father Hesburgh letter to Notre Dame students, warning them that disruptive protests would not be tolerated, was met with a media explosion. The general public at the time was increasingly fearful of violence on the once placid American campus, and the news media faithfully reported one-half of the now-famous "15-minute" letter. They neglected the part which supported all non-violent, non-obstructive efforts of students to realign the priorities of the nation. "It seems I'm suddenly everybody's favorite fascist," Notre Dame's president once noted ruefully after glancing at a stack of letters from the student Left and the adult Right. The tightrope on which every major college or university president walked in the late 1960's was drawing tight, and some Notre Dame student leaders predicted high winds. "It's tragic, but Father Hesburgh will be the first to go in the crunch," predicted the leading campus radical. The tension of the campus situation was well-known to Notre Dame's president. Indeed, he was in double jeopardy, as polarization grew in the area of civil rights. As the only surviving member of President Eisenhower's 1957 original appointments, he was now chairman of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission.

"The problem is that you are forced into a series of quick decisions," commented Father Hesburgh. "You can make six good ones in a row, but one bad one will cost you everything." He kept a necrology in his pocket to remind him how many major college presidents—many of whom he admired—had been toppled from leadership at such campuses as the University of California, Columbia and Cornell.

Father Hesburgh's own tightrope grew taut in May of 1970, when the U.S. incursion into Cambodia (and later the Kent State tragedy)

galvanized the nation's campuses, including Notre Dame. In a mass quardangle meeting of students he made what, in retrospect, might have been one of the most important talks of his life. He came down hard against the war in Vietnam (an issue where he was already on record), but advised students that violence was counter-productive. As a result, instead of burning buildings, Notre Dame students took their case to the surrounding community, collecting some 26,000 signatures on an end-the-war petition.

PRACTICES WHAT HE PREACHES

One of the things which aided him in this kind of plea was the fact that he had practiced what he preached. On the issue of civil rights, he had challenged everyone, including four Presidents, to live up to the objective of equal opportunity. "Every kid in the country," he said, "stands up and says, 'One nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. But for the blacks, there is neither liberty nor justice." With each such statement, the hate mail grew in his third-floor office underneath Notre Dame's golden dome. He shrugged it off, noting, "There's a very simple way of getting law and order: work for justice, because justice is the price of law and order." His stand on busing, which is built on the moral principle of equal educational opportunity at the end of the bus ride, has brought a new onslaught of angry letters.

Since Cambodia, the other side of the letter to Notre Dame protesters in 1969 has been given due emphasis. There is, Father Hesburgh has told countless listeners, a "new breed" student. "They've been sensitized to a lot of things that I don't think I was that much sensitized to when I was graduated from here . . . they, in a sense, bear more of the world's burdens and problems and moral crises on their shoulders. Like all young men, hope runs high and idealism runs high, and they haven't really had much of life's acid on them . . . but this is the first generation I've known which is willing to do something about their idealism even to the extent of downward mobility socially and economically."

A third tension point in the life of Theodore Hesburgh—apart from American higher education and civil rights—is the institutional church. He grants that the young Catholics coming into Notre Dame evidence less of the familiar signs—such as Mass attendance—which have been traditionally used as indices to religiosity, but he argues that students are paradoxically more interested than their predecessors in the ultimate questions to which philosophy and theology direct themselves. "As I sit and read some of the things they write nowadays, there's a kind of spiritual perception, a deep-seated Christianity," he notes. At the same time, he sees an irony in the anti-institutionalism of students. "I think if you were to cancel out the whole government and the whole Church and everything else tomorrow morning, you would start reinstitutionalizing them the next day. Institutions are the kinds of structures we all lean against; they glue society together and 'communalize' the kind of actions we have to take." His prediction that young people who stress the social apostolate would come to need prayer and the sacraments as sustenance for a life of Christian risk seems to be borne out in the recent interest on the part of veteran Catholic social activists on the development of a deeper prayer life.

LIBERAL YET CONSERVATIVE

Those who tab Father Hesburgh as a liberal in Church affairs can cite his positions on birth control and coresponsibility in the Church, but they had better be able to explain his unapologetic defense of the advantages of a celibate clergy. "I am a very liberal person as far as achieving justice, which is a question of means and strategies and scenarios," he once explained. "But I'm fairly conservative about what I think is valuable to human life."

On the population question, his is no crisis rhetoric. He opposes abortion and argues that underdeveloped countries, where overpopulation grinds down human dignity, ought to receive more of a share of the globe's resources.

Apart from his own opinions, however, he has staunchly defended academic freedom on campus. His numerous forays in this area—including the defense of the right of his theology chairman to attack a papal encyclical and his calm reiteration of Notre Dame's "open speakers' policy" at a time when radical attorney William Kunstler was banned from other campuses—earned him the prestigious Meiklejohn Award of the American Association of University Professors in 1970.

Today, entering his 20th year at Notre Dame, he is one of the veterans in a job where the life expectancy of incumbents has shrunk from 11 to 4½ years. Many consider him the last of the high-profile presidents, as the trend grows toward lawyer-negotiators who blend nicely into the increasingly committee-type structures of institutions where leadership demands are different. It is interesting to note that the most obvious exception—Yale's Kingman Brewster, Jr.—has been called the "Protestant Hesburgh" only a little less often than Father Hesburgh has been called the "Catholic Brewster." While Father Hesburgh has led the way in campus governance reforms which, by his own admission, have reduced his power to 10 percent of what it was in 1952, he is sometimes impatient with its machinery.

One management study of the contemporary university pointed out that its president, in contrast to his business counterpart, actually has relatively little to say about three crucial aspects of his enterprise—product line (students), personnel (faculty), and future strategy (curriculum planning).

Nonetheless, the two major institutional decisions of the last decade—the changeover to lay governance in 1967 and the more recent decision for co-education—both bear the executive stamp of Notre Dame's President.

BROAD VISION OF NOTRE DAME

While he has, in recent years, cut down somewhat on the more than two dozen committees and commissions and other groups on which he spent almost one-third of the year's 365 days, Father Hesburgh still works a double shift on campus to compensate for outside commitments. "The only difference between Hesburgh and God is that God is everywhere and Hesburgh is everywhere but Notre Dame," runs a time-worn campus observation, but others note that the President's off-campus activities have been directly and indirectly beneficial to the University, often in terms of foundation or federal money. "Most important," one top level administrator pointed out, "is the fact that his outside activities have broadened his vision of the place—what it can be, what it can do."

Each spring, just as the swallows return to Capistrano, rumors reappear on campus predicting the imminent resignation of Notre Dame's President. This year, he shunted them aside at a formal dinner for deans and department chairmen by using Mark Twain's observation that the reports of his death "were greatly exaggerated." He also noted that "if anyone really wants to know if I am going to resign, they can call me up on the telephone." One reporter did, and Father Hesburgh told him he stays on because the trustees ask him to. The reporter did not feel it necessary to ask why.

Mr. Speaker, I also insert at this point in the RECORD a chronology of the major events in the life of Father Hesburgh, and a listing of his most significant achievements.

THE HESBURGH RECORD

Born: May 25, 1917, Syracuse, New York.

EDUCATION

Holy Rosary Grade and High School, Syracuse, N.Y., 1922–34.

University of Notre Dame, 1934–37.

Gregorian University, Rome, Italy, Ph. B., 1940.

Holy Cross College, Washington, D.C., S.T.L., 1943.

Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., S.T.D., 1945.

CAREER

Entered the Congregation of Holy Cross Notre Dame, Indiana, 1934.

Ordained to the priesthood, Notre Dame, June 24, 1943.

Served on Department of Religion faculty and as chaplain to Notre Dame's married veterans and their families, 1945–1947.

Chairman, Department of Religion, 1948–49.

Executive Vice President of the University, 1949–52.

Appointed President of Notre Dame, June 28, 1952.

PUBLIC SERVICE

Member, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights since 1957; Appointed chairman, 1969.

Permanent Vatican City Representative, International Atomic Energy Agency, 1957–70.

Member, National Science Board, 1954–66.

Trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation.

President, International Federation of Catholic Universities, 1963–70.

Member, Carnegie Commission on the Future of Higher Education.

President, Association of American Colleges.

Member, President's General Advisory Committee on Foreign Assistance programs.

Chairman, Overseas Development Council.

Director of the American Council on Education.

Trustee of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Member, American Bar Association Commission on Campus Government and Student Dissent.

Member, President's Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force.

Trustee of the United Negro College Fund, Inc.

Director of the Chase Manhattan Bank.

HONORS

U.S. Medal of Freedom, 1964.

Meiklejohn Award of the American Association of University Professors, 1970.

Cardinal Gibbons Medal of the Catholic University of America, 1969.

Charles Evans Hughes Award of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, 1970.

U.S. Navy Distinguished Public Service Award, 1959.

National Catholic Educational Association Merit Award, 1971.

Fellow, American Academy of Arts and Sciences; Clergyman of the Year, Religious Heritage of America, and Reinhold Niebuhr Award, 1972.

Honorary degrees from 38 colleges and universities including Yale, Princeton, Brandeis, Columbia, Dartmouth, Catholic University, Indiana, Northwestern, Michigan State, Illinois, California, Southern California, Montreal and Vienna.

RUIN IN DETROIT

HON. GEORGE W. COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to serve as a member of the Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs of the House Government Operations Committee and in that capacity have participated fully in the current extensive oversight investigation of the operations of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. In recent months we have concentrated our efforts upon the operations of the Federal Housing Administration due to rapidly mounting reports of unconscionable profiteering in the cities by those who manipulated FHA in a manner that made a mockery of our efforts to insure the opportunity for all to acquire a decent home in a decent environment, the mandate of the 1949 Housing Act.

A number of my constituents in Chicago have been and continue to be victimized as a result of FHA failures. The West-Side Coalition sounded the alarm several years ago. As a consequence the coalition has now evolved into a new national organization composed of representatives of over 300 cities. In testimony before our subcommittee, spokesmen for this organization made a clear and compelling case for the need for immediate and effective reforms from top to bottom of the Federal Housing Administration and called upon the Congress to take action faced with executive branch unwillingness, indifference, and in certain instances incompetency.

I urgently commend to the attention of my colleagues a recent report adopted unanimously by the full Committee on House Government Operations which sets out in painstaking detail the root causes for today's $200,000,000 fiasco in Detroit. The incompetency and indifference of HUD officials and the less than vigorous response by the Justice Department in utilizing its resources to stop widespread criminal activity is a cause for deep concern.

Our distinguished colleague, JOHN S. MONAGAN, subcommittee chairman, is entitled to the highest praise for the objective and fair minded manner in which he conducted these most sensitive hearings. The fact that our recommendations were adopted unanimously in my judgment is a clear indication of the acceptance of the recommendations set forth by the committee. I remind my colleagues that after the Democratic Convention we will be called upon to consider a 3-year housing act. It is incumbent upon us all to analyze HUD operations in our own areas and cities to insure that the needs of the people are in fact being met by the legislation we enact. I have made a number of suggestions to the House Banking and Currency Committee and am hopeful that these suggestions, most of which are based upon our recent report, will be adopted. In our response to the tragic riots of 1968, expediency was the watch word but expediency must give way where abuses such as have been found to exist in Chicago and Detroit and elsewhere occur. I include at this point in the RECORD a recent editorial which appeared in the Bridgeport, Conn., Post which I commend to the reading of my colleagues:

[From the Bridgeport Post, June 27, 1972]

RUIN IN DETROIT

Government bungling and unscrupulous profiteering have helped make a shambles of many neighborhods in Detroit, Michigan. The unsavory details of the extensive housing scandal have been brought to light by a House subcommittee headed by Congressman John S. Monagan of Waterbury.

The specifics seem to be beyond belief, nevertheless, they are fact. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has become the largest property owner in Detroit. Most of its holdings are practically worthless on the real estate market, but the nation's taxpayers will have to make mortgage payments which could total $200 million.

This is what happened. After the riots which racked the city in the mid-1960s, the federal government made a concerted effort to help the poor obtain decent housing. Home ownership was the goal.

Thousands of families purchased residences by making minimal down payments. HUD, through the Federal Housing Administration (FHA), guaranteed the mortgages.

The calamity has arisen because real estate speculators bought up numerous dilapidated buildings, made a few superficial cosmetic improvements, then sold them to the poor at double or triple the original costs. Government inspectors either did not know what was going on or simply did not care.

The new owners quickly discovered that essential repairs costing thousands of dollars were needed to make most of the dwellings livable. They could not afford the bill or sell the properties, so the only choice was abandonment. To date more than 8,000 units have been vacated, and another 20,000 are in danger of being foreclosed.

HUD, stuck with the mortgage guarantees, has to make good to the various creditors.

The monetary loss is only half of a tragic affair. There is no way to measure the frustration and resentment of poor people whose hopes were raised dramatically, only to be bitterly dashed.

To compound matters, Mr. Monagan observes that similar patterns are causing decay in many of the nations large cities.

The programs which spur housing development and home ownership are not to blame. The best laid schemes come to naught if bureaucrats or private businessmen are negligent or worse.

By bringing to light what happened in Detroit, Mr. Monagan has alerted other cities that there is no substitute for sound planning. Desperately needed residences for low and moderate income families, whether in Detroit, Bridgeport or any city, must meet the needs of the people. Expediency only leads to ruin.

SUPPRESSION OF FREEDOMS IN THE BALTIC STATES

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, 32 years ago this month the Soviet Union invaded and occupied the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. Since that time the Baltic people have been denied their freedom. I join my colleagues in denouncing the aggressive Soviet action that has for so long oppressed the peace-loving people of the Baltic nations.

I support House Concurrent Resolution 416, unanimously passed in the 89th Congress, which commemorates the 30th anniversary of the Lithuanian uprising against Soviet tyranny. It is time our Government acted with a new diligent effort to encourage the reinstitution of free government enabling the Baltic countries to once again regain their own self identity and enjoy the fundamental human rights which provide each individual with the opportunity to express himself in a society that is open and free.

Rather than commemorating a sad anniversary for more than three decades, let us work toward a goal that will enable us to commemorate the liberation of the Baltic people from Soviet rule. I call upon this administration to begin a comprehensive effort, through our own diplomacy and in other international forums, to bring an end to the deprivation of the rights of these people, and insure them their inalienable freedom.

THE FARM FAMILY OF THE YEAR

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, one of the highest honors that can come to any American family for outstanding good work and good citizenship is the annual designation as Farm Family of the Year, a selection sponsored by the Farmers Home Administration of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

I am proud that this distinction for 1972 has been conferred on a young family from my district of Arkansas.

Mr. and Mrs. Carlos D. Dixon of Lonoke County, with their three children, were with us in Washington last weekend to receive the honor in a presentation by President Nixon at the White House.

The Dixons and their farm near Austin, Ark., represent a success story in the truest American tradition. As a young couple in their early twenties, Carlos and Shelba Jean Dixon went to work 8 years ago to establish themselves in farming. They had no reserve resources to bank on except their own diligence and determination, and such help as might be available from the credit services of the Farmers Home Administration.

But from this modest beginning, the Dixons have built an outstanding family-size dairy farm over the 8-year span. They have graduated from FHA to conventional credit for financing their current production, and they are well on their way to success in this rigorous but immensely satisfying business of farming. They also are outstanding for their participation and leadership in many organizations and activities of their community.

The Dixons' experience to a very large extent is self-created, through the dedication and hard work they have put into the development of their farm. But their accomplishments prove that opportunity still is present in American agriculture for the new generation of farmers, and for the family-size farm. The progress of their farm also proves the value of Farmers Home Administration services in helping the capable and serious farm family lay the foundation for success in a family farm enterprise.

In his leadership of the Farmers Home Administration, Administrator James V. Smith has done much to emphasize and increase the outreach of these farm credit programs, even while the agency has vastly expanded its services in housing credit and community facilities improvement for both farm and nonfarm rural people. Arkansas today is one of the resurgent rural areas in the United States, thanks in large measure to resources marshaled through FHA and applied through an excellent State FHA organization directed by State Director Robert Hankins.

Mr. Speaker, I salute this outstanding young couple on their tremendous achievement and the example they have set for encouragement of other rural families. I offer for the RECORD further details of the accomplishments that have earned them this award, as summarized in a release by the Department of Agriculture in connection with presentation of the honor to Mr. and Mrs. Dixon last week:

SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE HONORS FHA FARM FAMILY OF THE YEAR

WASHINGTON, June 23.—Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz today presented the Farmers Home Administration Farm Family of the Year—the Carlos D. Dixons of Lonoke County, Ark.—to President Nixon, the press corps and several hundred USDA employees.

The Dixon family has been selected by a panel of judges as the family which represents the attainments possible through the supplemental credit of the Farmers Home Administration, the rural credit service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. FHA has more than 150,000 farmer borrowers.

In introducing the family, Mr. Butz recalled his own farm background with some pleasure. He concluded by saying that the National FHA Farm Family of the Year represents all that is good and sound in our rural areas—and in our entire country.

Mr. and Mrs. Dixon started in 1964 with two acres of land, an old house and some other property. They now own 120 acres and rent 244 more. Their dairy herd has grown to 113 head. They have a new modern Grade "A" dairy barn and a new brick home.

With their three children, the Dixons are in Washington to meet President Nixon, USDA officials and employees and their Congressional delegation. They are guests of New Holland Division of the Sperry Rand Corporation, which joins USDA in honoring this outstanding farm family.

TRIBUTE TO DR. KARL TARGOWNIK

HON. WILLIAM R. ROY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, last month I was privileged to present the Shawnee County, Kans., Law Day Liberty Bell Award to Dr. Karl Targownik of Topeka.

Dr. Targownik was given this honor in recognition of his long and effective years of service at the Kansas State Reception and Diagnostic Center in Topeka. Over and above this, however, Dr. Targownik deserves our consideration and praise because of the adversity he had to overcome in order to achieve his present position.

Of Jewish descent, Dr. Targownik lived in Poland prior to World War II and suffered much because of the Polish biological antisemitism of those years.

He survived Polish ghettos and labor camps during the early part of the war, only to be taken to Ausschwitz in 1943, where he underwent truly inhuman physical and psychological torture.

Dr. Targownik was freed by the forces of Gen. George Patton. Soon after he began the study of medicine at the University of Heidelberg in 1945. After receiving his degree, he came to the United States.

This new member of the American medical profession adjusted quickly to his adopted homeland. Dr. Targownik secured licenses to practice medicine in the States of Kansas and Ohio. He became board certified in 1956 and a fellow of the American Psychiatric Association in 1963.

Dr. Targownik came to Topeka in 1951, and worked as a resident physician at Topeka State Hospital while attending the Menninger School of Psychiatry. He later served as a section chief at Topeka State and helped organize services at the hospital's Eastman Building, which embodies the most modern concept in psychiatric architecture and modern psychiatric treatment concepts.

In 1962, Dr. Targownik was given his most challenging responsibility, that of organizing clinical—medical, neurological and psychiatric—services for the Kansas State Reception and Diagnostic Center. At the time, the center had almost nothing in the way of such services.

Today, after a decade of Dr. Targownik's leadership, the center is nationally recognized for its work in the areas of crime and delinquency.

The center has developed scientific methods for the examination of offenders—last year 800 of them, thus assisting the sentencing courts with the most valuable information about the "why" of a crime. The center's goal is to determine the best method of rehabilitation, taking into consideration both the offender's needs and the community's expectations.

The center has truly marked the beginning of a new era in the treatment of criminal offenders.

Thus Dr. Targownik received the Liberty Bell Award not for one particular act of the past year, but rather for his continuing efforts.

I know that my colleagues join me in extending thanks and best wishes to this man for a past well done and a future yet to come.

AN ESSENTIAL NATIONAL PRIORITY: A FULL COMMITMENT AND INVESTMENT NOW IN WATER QUALITY

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, no matter how we equate or measure our future investment—by whatever standard applied—short of the air we breathe, there is no element more basic or critically essential to the sustenance and life of our people and the economic vitality of our country than the quantity and quality of our water supply.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of you and our colleagues here in the Congress the following magazine article prepared by Mr. Cyril I. Malloy, Jr., director of public affairs of the American Concrete Pipe Association, Arlington, Va., which appeared in the June issue of the association's publication. This article poignantly and succinctly brings into sharp focus the critically desperate need for a full commitment by the Federal Government to respond to the needs of our people and carry out our Government's fundamental responsibility to conserve and protect the estate of our people by making a substantive investment now in our Nation's water quality. The article, which reflects on present programs established under the Federal Water Pollution Control Acts of 1956 and 1966, is a good analysis of the long standing fiscal problem being encountered throughout our Nation in providing water and sewer projects presently eligible under programs now administered by the Federal agencies of EPA, HUD, EDA, and FHA, and should be helpful in alerting us to the hard cold facts of providing the necessary level of public funds that will enable our States and local governments to implement adequate water pollution control measures for the conservation and environmental renewal of our water resources.

The article follows:

A SURVEY OF PRESENT-FUTURE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL NEEDS

(By Cyril I. Malloy, Jr.)

The control of water pollution begins with the proper funding of basic water and sewer systems which are under the jurisdiction of four Federal agencies—Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Economic Development Administration, and Farmers' Home Administration.

The repair of the total environment is the one issue which unites political parties, the rich and the poor, and blacks and whites. A nationwide movement has been propelled by the pending "Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972" (H.R. 11896 and S. 2770). The Federal Water Pollution Control Acts of 1956 and 1966 developed the foundation for water pollution control, but the appropriated funds for environment improvement have yet to match the required needs.

Environmental pollution cannot be acted upon without an intelligent awareness of economic realities. It is mandatory that priorities be established, but isn't the use of water and the disposal of wastes by citizens, industry, and government as essential a pri-

ority as the basic need for clean air and adequate food supplies?

The need for adequate water and sewerage facilities remains one of the most pressing problems facing this nation's urban and rural communities. Local sources of revenue continue to be severely taxed and, although many communities are making efforts to raise needed revenues, the demand for Federal grants-in-aid increases. Communities cannot hope to attract new industries unless they provide ample water and sewer systems.

PRESENT AND FUTURE NEEDS

As far back as 1968, the Joint Economic Committee of Congress estimated a gross investment of $51.8 billion by government would be required to provide supporting water and sewer facilities over a 10-year period, or an average of $5.2 billion. A need survey of the four Federal water and sewer programs appears in Table 1.

PROPOSED FISCAL 1973 BUDGET

In January, President Nixon sent the administration's proposed fiscal 1973 budget to Congress. Table 2 is a comparison between what the President proposed for fiscal 1973, and what the Office of Management and Budget allowed to be obligated during 1971, and what Congres appropriated for fiscal 1972:

SUMMARY OF TABLES 1 AND 2

The four Federal water and sewer programs currently have pending 14,765 applications needing a Federal-aid grant and loan funding of $6.8 billion. During fiscal 1971, the Office of Management and Budget allowed the four agencies to obligate only $1.05 billion. The current proposed fiscal 1973 budget would authorize to these four agencies only $2.6 billion.

INSIDE THE AGENCIES

Environmental Protection Agency

The Office of Water Programs of EPA distributes grant funds up to 55 percent of the total costs to the states for allocation to local governments to construct and expand waste treatment plant facilities, including the interceptor and outfall pipe lines. In July of 1970, a survey conducted by the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors at the request of Senator Muskie, was published in the "Congressional Record." It estimated that public funds needed to control pollution amounted to from $33 to $37 billion. In addition, the survey provided the following breakdown of certain needed funds:

a) For primary and secondary treatment $8.7 billion.

b) For tertiary treatment $4 billion.

c) For interceptor and storm sewer improvement $7.4 billion.

In addition to these needs, many states which prefunded projects under Section 8(c) of the present law are due outstanding reimbursement amounting to about $2 billion.

Department of Housing and Urban Development

HUD provides grants to local governments to finance up to 50 percent of the cost of basic water and sewer projects. In 1970, an official of HUD, in response to inquiries from Capitol Hill stated: "The average Federal grants participation is 31.5 percent," and that the average Federal grant for water and sewer projects is only 30 percent of the total project cost. Of the four Federal water and sewer programs, HUD has been hardest hit by fund impoundments by the Office of Management and Budget in disrespect to congressional appropriations. HUD Secretary Romney is apparently willing to not recommend new needed funding for his water and sewer program during fiscal 1973 in the chance that Congress will enact the President's urban special revenue sharing proposal. Congressman Roe of New Jersey has been an outspoken advocate for adequate funding and more coordination between the collection system program of HUD and EPA's mission for adequate treatment. The U.S. House of Representatives overwhelmingly agreed with Congressman Roe when it passed H.R. 11896 on March 29, 1972.

Economic Development Administration

The EDA of the U.S. Department of Commerce provides grants of up to 50 percent of the total project cost in areas designated as "economic redevelopment areas." In addition, supplemental grants up to 80 percent are available for depressed economic areas which cannot meet the required matching share. Historically, congressional appropriations for community development grants have averaged $160 million per fiscal year with about 70 percent funding water and sewer projects. OMB has favorably allowed EDA to obligate the full amount appropriated by Congress.

Farmers' Home Administration

The FHA of the U.S. Department of Agriculture offers aid to rural areas which do not include part of a city or town with a population in excess of 5,500. If a rural area has less than 5,500 population, it qualifies to apply for loans to finance the development of water and sewer systems.

In December of 1969, FHA conducted a survey of the needs in its program area. Water and sewer facility needs amounted to $11.3 billion. There are approximately 34,763 communities that do not have adequate central water systems and about 44,507 communities that lack adequate sewerage facilities.

SUMMARY

At the bare minimum, the credibility of the existing Federal commitment must be reestablished by backing words of authorization and realized needs with appropriation funding without customary OMB impoundments. The will of the people as translated by their congressional representatives is being ignored.

The construction of adequate water and sewerage facilities is "step one" in water pollution control priorities. Local communities and state governments cannot afford this expense without the financial assistance of the Federal government either through existing categorical grant programs or through revenue sharing—block grant proposals. The time for Congress to react is rapidly passing.

TABLE 1.—AS OF DECEMBER 1971

Federal agencies	Number of pending applications	Federal grant-loan amounts (millions)
EPA	3,326	$2,731
HUD	5,925	3,184
EDA	85	40
FHA	5,329	838
Total	14,665	6,793

TABLE 2

[In millions of dollars]

Federal agencies	Proposed fiscal 1973 budget (millions)	OMB allowed for fiscal 1971	Congress appropriated for fiscal 1972
EPA	2,000	478	2,150
HUD	(1)	121	500
EDA	160	155	160
FHA	342	303	400

[1] None. Only fiscal 1972 carryover funds will be made available at a fiscal 1971 level.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 416

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1972

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1966, the House of Representatives and the Senate unanimously passed a concurrent resolution urging the President to draw international attention to the plight of the Baltic people and to bring world opinion to bear upon the U.S.S.R. to restore self determination to the Baltic lands.

Now, 6 years later, matters have only worsened for the inhabitants of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. Natives of these regions continue to be deported to all parts of Russia in the Soviets' effort to liquidate their cultural identity.

Freedom continues to be denied to the people of the Baltic states, and Balts around the world decry Soviet domination of their compatriots? who have remained in their homelands.

June is a particularly historic month for the Baltic people, for it was in June of 1940 that the Soviets overcame Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia by force, and a year later—in June of 1941—the massive deportations to slave and labor camps in Siberia began. Later that same month, Lithuania succeeded in regaining its independence, though the free government lasted only 6 weeks before the Nazis overran the new nation.

Mr. Speaker, this month is the 32d anniversary of the Russian invasion of the Baltic states, and I believe we should reaffirm our commitment to the cause of the peoples as expressed in the 1966 resolution. In a period when relations with the Soviet Union appear to be improving, the time seems to be ripe for focusing again on the right of self determination for the Baltic people. It is time for the captivity of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia to end.

For the interest of my colleagues, I insert a copy of the 1966 concurrent resolution in the RECORD:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 416

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

AND "POP" GOES THE VILLAGE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday is the Fourth of July, Independence Day. Unfortunately, many individuals still feel that they must celebrate the day by discharging fireworks. In many States, including Illinois, fireworks are illegal since statistics show a great loss of life, limbs, and property damage. As a former member of the Illinois State Legislature, I voted to keep fireworks illegal in the State.

A very timely article in the Suburban Life of La Grange, Ill., encourages residents of the community to surrender illegal fireworks. I insert this article hoping that some individual will decide not to celebrate the 4th of July and run the risk of serious injuries:

AND "POP" GOES THE VILLAGE

(By Bill Presecky)

Things have been popping in Oak Brook . . . illegally . . . and R. L. Sizemore, police chief, says he hopes the "celebration" will be stopped voluntarily.

The popping has been caused by discharge of illegal fireworks throughout the village and has led to the "voluntary" confiscation of a large cache of fireworks estimated at hundreds of dollars.

Sizemore told The Suburban Life that an investigation into reports of illegal fireworks resulted in knowledge that many resident have large private stores of the material in their homes.

"What we want more than anything is to make these people aware of the great danger involved in possessing the fireworks aside from the fact that they are illegal," Sizemore said.

"We know that there are large amounts of fireworks in the village," the chief said.

"We would like the residents to voluntarily give up the material for their own safety or we will be forced to issue citations to persons charged with discharging the fireworks," the chief said.

"What has to be kept in mind is the reality that these are highly combustible explosives and don't have to be ignited with a match to explode," he said.

Sizemore indicated that he will be contacting the village's homeowner associations to elicit cooperation from residents.

"We are willing to go out and pick the material up and dispose of it," the chief said, adding that "there will be no arrests and no questions asked."

While fireworks of all kinds are illegal in Illinois, Sizemore urged parents to refrain from buying the materials and bringing them home from states where the explosives are legal.

A determination of just how much life and property will be saved as the result of the Oak Brook project cannot be determined.

Information on the number of fireworks accidents is very incomplete but, according to R. J. Peszek, statistician for the National Safety Council, headquartered in Chicago, "conservative estimates indicate that at least 5,000 casualties and 1,400 fires are caused by fireworks each year."

The Safety Council's statistics are based on a national survey conducted in 1969 by the National Fire Protection Association which examined a total of 2009 incidents that resulted in injury to 1,330 persons and caused property damage in 774 cases.

It is estimated, on the basis of an American Medical Association survey, "that there have been about as many persons killed in fireworks accidents in the last 50 years as there were American soldiers killed in the Revolutionary War, a total of approximately 4,000.

While deaths due to the discharge of fireworks appear to be minimal, accidents resulting in serious injury due to "small" fireworks are significant.

An analysis of the primary injuries outlined in the 1969 study indicates that 54 per cent of all first degree burns, 55 per cent of all second degree burns and 40 per cent of all third degree burns were attributable to firecrackers, sparklers, Roman candles, bottle rockets and smoke bombs.

Lacerations and eye injuries numbering 372 were also the result of the so-called "harmless" firecracker.

Of the 33 reported cases of dismemberment, 19 were caused by the M-80 or cherry bomb variety of firecracker.

According to the council report, 72 per cent of the injured victims of fireworks accidents were 20 years of age or under. An estimated 58 per cent of those injured were 15 years of age with the greatest casualty rate in the 11 to 15 year old age bracket.

The 1969 study notes that the "majority of the victims injured are at the age level where they are too young to comprehend the specific directions which might be printed on the packaging material for the fireworks or are in the age group where they are curious enough to experiment with pyrotechnic devices and are not going to realize the serious consequence which could result from mishandling or misuse."

Firecrackers and sparklers head the list of devices that most commonly ended in property loss and personal injury.

Burns were responsible for 75 per cent of the injuries caused by sparklers and 40 per cent of the victims had not yet reached their tenth birthday when the mishap occurred.

Combined, firecrackers and sparklers were blamed for 42 per cent of the reported property damage cases with sparklers leading the statistics with 112 cases, 49 of which were in one or two family residences.

Firecrackers resulted in 65 property damage accidents.

Safety campaigns, fireworks bans and a trend toward professional displays have minimized the extent of injuries and damage caused by larger fireworks.

The American Medical Association which has also studied the problem of injuries from fireworks and other explosives used in the celebration of the Fourth of July in several years and bear out the decrease by using hospital reports and newspaper clippings.

The first year in which a study was made, 1903, the Association recorded 466 deaths and 3,983 injuries. During the next six years deaths ranged from 158 to 215 and injuries from 3,986 to 5,460.

In 1910, however, the death toll went down to 131 and the injury list to 2,792. In the years that followed, the decrease in fireworks mishaps decreased rapidly with 30 deaths and 820 injuries reported in 1916.

THE PALATABILITY OF H.R. 15495

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the SALT agreements will not halt the arms race; if anything, a peace in strategic weapons between the United States and Russia will be the result, but there will be no end to the competition for the control of and for the influence of space. The arms race will go on.

With the passage of H.R. 15494, the American people will be forced to pay for the building of weapons of the past, not of the future. The big strategic weapons provided for in this bill are like the obsolete battleships which continued to be built in World War II after the bombing of Pearl Harbor. There were too many vested interests in building these ships to warrant the halt of their construction. A lot of money was wasted, and such will be the case with the building of the Triton submarine, the B–1 bomber, and the ABM complex around Washington, D.C.

There is a price on everything in the political bargain basement, but it is too bad that the cost of the SALT agreements will be so high. However, it is somewhat of a consolation to realize that $8.8 billion a year is a lot more palatable than a nuclear war:

THE WRONG WAR?

Judging from the lopsided vote in the House of Representatives in Washington this week (334–59) the aerospace industry on the Pacific Coast and the submarine building people at Groton, Connecticut, need have no serious worry about staying in business for the years ahead.

True, the Senate is likely to be a little more skeptical about the needs for all the extra nuclear weapons than was the House. And there may be a bit of trimming in the program before the weapons program gets to the President's desk. But it seems reasonably certain now that the deal which has been concluded between the Nixon administration and the "industrial-military complex" will be honored.

The "deal" calls for acceptance of SALT (strategic arms limitation) agreements with the Russians by the weaponeers. In return they get $8.8 billion in the new arms program for going ahead on Triton (the new supersubmarine with longer-range nuclear weapons), the B–1 (a supersonic manned bomber) and an ABM (anti-ballistic missile) complex to be set up around Washington, D.C.

We watch all this with resignation. The commitment in Washington to a new generation of nuclear weapons means that the Russians will do the same. The arms race will go on. It's the price Mr. Nixon has agreed to pay for the SALT agreement which has the merit of channeling the race. It is practical politics to buy off the weaponeers for the sake of SALT.

But the price is high because, as so often after wars, the taxpayers are asked to go on

building the weapons of the past, not of the future.

If Richard Nixon's diplomacy is successful, and to date it is remarkably successful, there is not going to be any nuclear war during the next generation. If the Nixon agreements mean anything at all they mean a peace in strategic weapons between the United States and Russia. But they do not at all mean an end to competition for influence and for control of space.

In the world ahead a lot of influence and space control will be brought with fairly cheap weapons: gunboats, helicopters, light infantry. This sort of thing might gain control over the oil of the Middle East which, in turn, could mean decisive influence in Western Europe.

There will be little influence and no space control gained in the foreseeable future from the new super strategic weapons. There can be enormous influence and space gained from being ahead in the quality and efficiency of conventional tactical weapons.

In other words the big strategic weapons in the current Nixon budget are like the battleships which the Americans went on building after Pearl Harbor. The weapons which won "victory at sea" in World War II was the aircraft carrier. But a lot of money had to be wasted on obsolete battleships before the lesson was cranked into American weaponeering. There were too many vested interests in building the obsolete weapons.

It would seem to us that Mr. Nixon might have tried to get his SALT agreement at less than $8.8 billion a year in obsolete weapons, but there is a price for everything in politics. We console ourselves with the thought that if this is the price for avoiding a nuclear war with Russia—then it's the best and cheapest bargain in American history.

TENANT'S ONLY WEAPON

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the plight of approximately one out of every three Americans, those who rent their homes, is becoming painfully clear. Most of these 23.5 million families deliberately decide to rent an apartment or house, yet many others have no choice. This latter group is comprised largely of the elderly and the poor—people who are so often the victims of situations over which they have no control. When things go wrong or there are problems with their landlord, these people are left with little financial or legal recourse.

An article in this week's Village Voice points this out admirably. The situation described by Joanna Mermey is duplicated far too often, not only in New York City, but across the Nation.

It is time we stop treating tenants as second-class citizens. We must develop ways for these persons to gain redress of their grievances. I am inserting Mrs. Mermey's article in the RECORD to illustrate the incredible difficulties now so prevalent:

MACDOUGAL STREET VICTORY: TENANTS' ONLY WEAPON: THE RENT STRIKE

(By Joanna Mermey)

A 68-year-old woman whose toilet had been broken for five months was defecating in milk cartons. An 84-year-old man complained that his ceiling was caving in. But Daniel Zager, owner of 103–105 MacDougal Street, kept saying, "I'm doing the best I can."

Last July, after vacancy decontrol went into effect, 103–105 MacDougal, a double seven-story building, began to crumble. The hot water went off. Toilets ceased to flush, ceilings fell down, roaches and rats ran rampant, and the garbage piled so high that postmen refused to climb over the refuse to deliver the mail.

Yet rents began to skyrocket. Apartments that had gone for $57 were up as high as $225, and some controlled apartments that should have gone up 7½ per cent were being over-charged.

Decontrol was Rockefeller's scheme to ease the housing crisis. Supposedly free-market rents would provide landlords with the funds to repair deteriorating buildings. In addition, the new rent control laws now guarantee the landlord an 8½ per cent profit based on the equalized assessed valuation of the property. According to the Metropolitan Council on Housing, since slum properties and buildings like the World Trade Center are lumped together for assessment, the profit for slumlords doubles. As long as landlords can get huge profits from substandard housing, they have no incentive to make repairs.

Neither decontrol nor the 7½ per cent yearly rent increase for all rent-controlled apartments guarantees that the landlord will use the increase properly to maintain the building. Although the city says he should, there are no provisions to insure that the landlord will put his rent increases into maintenance.

Landlords are forcing tenants out of controlled apartments by shutting off such basic services as heat and hot water. The apartment is then automatically decontrolled, an exorbitant rent is charged, and the landlord pockets the difference. The unlucky person who rents the decontrolled apartment must grin and bear the conditions. If he complains, he may find himself out on the street since decontrol does not provide the tenant with any security. Renewal of the lease is at the decretion of the landlord, and if the tenant doesn't have a lease he can be evicted on 30 days notice. Met Council says about 50 per cent of decontrolled tenants are being given month-to-month leases.

In respond to landlord harassment, tenant organizations are cropping up all over the city. Even though a rent strike is the tenants' most effective weapon, it is the last to be used. Most people just cannot conceive of themselves as lawbreakers and fear eviction. However, especially in poverty neighborhoods, like the Lower East Side and the South Bronx, tenants who have been pushed to the limit are willing to risk a rent strike in order to live like human beings.

The tenants of 103–105 MacDougal took that risk. Before organizing, they had been just a mixture of elderly Italians, students, and welfare clients with nothing in common. Their problems forced them into a close-knit fighting group and their story is typical of many others.

When the cold weather came, the heat in 103–105 MacDougal went off. Old women, looking like refugees from Auschwitz, huddled together in the hallways to keep warm.

One of the tenants, Vittorio Farentino, was at his wits' end. He made daily calls to the landlord to complain, but to no avail. Then one of his friends suggested he enlist the help of politicians and pressure groups. He called Bella Abzug, Assemblyman Bill Passannante, Village Democratic District Leaders John Lo Cicero and Miriam Bockman, and since the building had a number of elderly Italians, the Italian-American Civil Rights League. Everyone jumped on the bandwagon. Abzug's office took a tour, the Village Independent Democrats took a tour, the Italian-American Civil Rights League took a tour. Abzug's office said it would arrange inspections and expedite matters with city agencies, the VID offered support and cooperation, and the Italian-American Civil Rights League said it would demonstrate and take care of things.

The evening after the tours, the heat mysteriously went on. All the groups immediately took credit. At 2 a.m. the heat went off.

Farentino, who looks like Jean-Paul Belmondo, again approached Zager on the building's disrepair and the over-charging of his rent. Vic says, "He says to me, 'Gee you're a pretty classy guy. What are you doing in a building like this?' He asks me to sign a statement that he'll pay me the money he owes me if I cease all activity in the building. He also accused me of having a Swiss bank account and being Clifford Irving's partner. I told him where to go." Landlords often try the buy-off strategy to keep tenants quiet.

Building inspectors came and found 14 violations. Zager was served with two summonses to appear in criminal court. The tenants now had a wedge. Abzug's office arranged a meeting with Zager and an ombudsman from the Department of Rent and Housing. A contract was drawn up and Zager agreed to sign and fix up the building. Since the tenants did not sign this contract, they had no say on how the repairs were to be done. Zager sent in painters who threw the paint down the toilets and allegedly made off with a television set and typewriter.

The tenants became hysterical. They didn't know whether it was worse to live in misery or to be ripped off by the repairmen. There were no locks on the outside door and street junkies were taking over the hallways and bathrooms and using them as shooting galleries.

A few tenants got together and decided to hire a lawyer and organize a rent strike. Len Lerner, a West Side district leader, took the case as a labor of love. His father had run a cleaning store on MacDougal Street for over 30 years. When Zager took over the building last year, he raised the rent from $250 to $850 and forced Lerner's father out. The only type of businesses that can afford these types of rents are the franchise operations. Greedy landlords force out neighborhood businesses to make room for Blimpies and pizza parlors.

A small group of tenants began to organize. "Getting these elderly Italians to join was a miracle," Farentino said. "They were brought up on the 'padrone' theory. The land-owner got paid no matter what. Faces turned white and the people began to shake with the fear of eviction. Both the young and old were frightened to commit themselves. We fed them coffee and wine. We listened to stories about their great-grandsons in Vietnam, love affairs, and operations. I knew if we didn't go through this we weren't going to reach them."

A tenants' newsletter went out. "If you missed the last tenants meeting, you missed a moving experience. Young and old could see the light of change, but together, strangers became a community." The tenants committee began receiving the rent checks instead of Zager. A sign hung from the third floor: "Rent Strike."

On March 1, 40 tenants, ranging from eight to 80 years old, went to court armed with pictures of their apartments. The case was scheduled for 10, but by noon the tenants hadn't been called. Landlords often keep the tenants waiting to break down their organizational strength. Once the tenants leave, the landlord has a stronger case. But the tenants voted to stay. At 2 they were called to the bench. Attorney Lewis Katz, representing Zager, told Judge O'Hare that the violations would be repaired. One of the tenants said, "The judge refused to look at our pictures. He said he knew Zager's lawyer and knew he wouldn't lie about the conditions. He then adjourned the case."

The tenants did not give up. Three weeks later they again trooped down en masse to

the court. As soon as their attorney left for lunch, the case was called. The tenants stood up one by one to defend themselves. Judge Walter Bayer was appalled. He asked where Zager lived and he was told New Jersey. "Maybe we'll get him to move in there" (the tenement), Bayer said. He called for an inspection and adjourned the case.

The inspectors came and found approximately 200 new violations. Zager was getting hot under the collar as the tenants grew stronger and the pols and press breathed down his neck. He began to cave as the rent strike strangled his cash flow. He finally signed a contract with the tenants that states he will correct the violations in the next six months. The agreement covers the "proper" repair of such items as holes, painting, broken windows, plumbing, and locks. The tenants also got him to agree to some "extras" like allowing them to choose the paint colors and new linoleum on the floors. The rent strike will continue, and the money will be held in escrow for the next six months by representatives of both the landlord and tenants. Money will be dispersed only to pay for repair.

Repairs have begun in the building. However, Zager must appear in court monthly, since the tenants have refused to dismiss the criminal charges until all the violations are fixed. On Monday, June 19, Zager did not appear for a scheduled court appearance and a warrant was issued for his arrest.

The reign of terror has begun again at 103–105 MacDougal. Although the repairmen have started to work, they have disappeared for days on end. Last week, I walked through the unlocked front door and found an elderly woman choking on plaster dust piled all over her apartment.

The Hudson Towers Tenants Association in the West Village signed a similar contract, after a rent strike that went on for a year and a half. These contracts are necessary because no leases or New York State laws release a tenant from the obligation to pay rent if the landlord lets the building crumble. This is one of the reasons decontrol and the 7½ per cent increase are such frauds on the public.

Rent strikes are costly and risky. It is outrageous that tenants should be pushed to that extreme to get what is rightfully theirs. Assemblyman Antonio Olivieri has introduced a bill which provides a statutory lease for all tenants. It includes both the right to withhold rent for lack of services and the right to repair if the landlord does not do so in a reasonable amount of time and allows the tenant to deduct the costs from the rent.

Although this is not the answer to the housing crisis, it at least puts tenants in a bargaining position from the start. In the meantime, rents continue to go sky high while the level of maintenance and repairs remains low. The landlord keeps the change while tenants huddle in doorways to keep warm.

WASHINGTON NEWS NOTES

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, there follows the July edition of my Washington News Notes:

WASHINGTON NEWS NOTES

(By Congressman Craig Hosmer)

FAW DOWN AND GO BOOM

The Department of Health Education and Welfare is considering a $23,000 research program on "The Evaluation and Parameterization of Stability and Safety Performance Characteristics of Two-and-Three Wheel Vehicular Toys for Riding." In other words, HEW feels the Federal Government needs to know why tots fall off their tricycles. George Wallace ought to have fun with that one.

THE LEGISLATIVE STEAMROLLER

What would you think of a football team that won three games in one week by scores of 314–0, 317–0, and 318–2? That's about what Congressman Craig Hosmer accomplished recently when he ramrodded three major bills through the House of Representatives by those lopsided votes. The first (314–0) was his bill to establish the Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge. Later that same day, as a member of the Interior Committee, he had his Water Resources Planning Act passed. Later the same week, the House passed the $2.3 billion Atomic Energy Commission authorization bill, which Craig sponsored and amended as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

WHERE YOUR TAX DOLLARS GO

According to the Tax Foundation, Inc., the average American family pays $3227 per year in Federal taxes—income, Social Security, excise, etc. Of that total, Uncle Sam spends over ⅓ ($1150) on health and welfare programs, including Social Security. Another ⅓ goes to national defense ($1026).

The remainder is dispersed to a broad range of Federal programs and functions. For example, the average family's contribution to the interest on the National Debt is $277. Only $42 goes toward the space program, and $32 for natural resources such as parks. Education and manpower training costs the family $148 a year.

CHAUVANISM, HOSMER STYLE

Getting caught in debate with the colorful and bellicose Congresswoman from New York, Bella Abzug, is something few enjoy, Congressman Hosmer included. During such a debate on the AEC authorization bill, the two were locked in verbal combat when Hosmer's time for speaking expired.

Following Congressional tradition and courtesy, Mrs. Abzug asked the Speaker to permit Hosmer to continue. Again, following standard practice, the Speaker announced that unless some member objected, Mr. Hosmer would be permitted additional time.

"Mr. Speaker," Hosmer boomed, "I object." Thus ended the debate.

MORTON ON YOUTH

Interior Secretary Rogers C. B. Morton says of the "generation gap": "A nation that listens only to its youth is decaying. A nation that doesn't listen to its youth has decayed. And a nation that doesn't make its youth listen will decay."

BEWARE OF FOREIGN DRUG LAWS

Many young Americans will go abroad this summer to discover that foreign countries have very tough drug laws. There are 919 young Americans now languishing in foreign jails for such violations. Most are serving 2-to-7 year terms. Our State Department can't be expected to help. Waits for trial are up to four months, not subtracted from sentences.

So beware: possession of drugs is regarded as a serious crime in most countries. Peddlers are subjected to severe penalties in deplorable prisons. Anyone contemplating a summer trip abroad should be aware that they cannot expect any deference in treatment because they are tourists or expect Uncle Sam to bail them out.

IS AMERICA RUNNING OUT OF SPACE?

A careful analysis seems to belie those who claim that America is in danger of overpopulation and running out of land. It seems that 75% of our population lives on only 1.5% of our land area. In other words, our urban population of 149.3 million (out of a total 203.3 million) lives in an area roughly the size of Florida. In that light, the issue of revitalizing rural America and building "new towns" takes on dramatic new proportions.

SUMMER INTERNS IN WASHINGTON

Congressman Hosmer has given Congressional summer internships to three college students from the 32nd District. Working with the Congressman are Bill Newkirk from Long Beach, a law student at Southwestern University Law School; Toni Whitesell from Long Beach, a student at USC; and John Hutton from Huntington Beach, who attends the U.S. International University in San Diego.

IS PHASE II WORKING

Labor Secretary J. D. Hodgson says that the Phase II wage and price controls are having a real impact where it counts most—in purchasing power. Hodgson says that since the start of the wage-price freeze last summer the average weekly earnings of the American worker have risen at an annual rate of 8%. The inflation rate has been kept under 4%.

"And that," the Secretary says, "is a real, solid supermarket purchasing power type wage gain. It's not the kind of phony dollar gain the worker made in the late 1960s when every cent per hour raise . . . was wiped out by inflation."

CAUSES OF INFANTILE AUTISM

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr Speaker, throughout this Congress I have used this medium as a means of informing my colleagues on the needs of mentally ill children and particularly autistic children. Today I wish to relay to my colleagues and other interested readers an article that appeared in the first issue of the Journal of Autism and Childhood Schizophrenia in January 1971. The article by Michael Rutter and Lawrence Bartak is entitled, "Causes of Infantile Autism: Some Considerations from Recent Research." It is an extremely well-written article that discusses various aspects of autism. However, because of the recent rule change regarding the Extentions of Remarks which restricts inserts to 2 pages, this article will be cut short.

It is a shame that autistic children are neglected but when the problems concerning them cannot be discussed in this congressional forum, there is something seriously wrong with this body.

It is requested by the publishers that if reprints of the article are to be made, permission should be requested from the copyright holder before reprinting same.

The article follows:

CAUSES OF INFANTILE AUTISM: SOME CONSIDERATIONS FROM RECENT RESEARCH

(By Michael Rutter and Lawrence Bartak)

"Since 1938 there have come to our attention a number of children whose condition differs markedly and uniquely from anything reported so far." So began Kanner's epoch-making first account of the condition now know as infantile autism. After a brilliant clinical description—which could scarcely be bettered today—he went on to end the paper by stating that "we must, then, assume that these children have come into the

world with innate inability to form the usual, biologically provided affective contact with people, just as other children come into the world with innate physical or intellectual handicaps" (Kanner, 1943).

Since then, from many different centers in all parts of the world, there have come numerous other reports of similar children (Rimland, 1964; Bender, 1969). There is no doubt now that such a condition can be recognized and that in their behavior and development, children with infantile autism do differ from children with other psychiatric disorders. However, there has been dispute on the question of whether autistic children differ qualitatively, or merely quantitatively, from the normal. There has also been a proliferation of hypotheses on the nature of autism and on its causation. The basic cause of infantile autism still remains unknown; but experimental, clinical and longitudinal studies carried out over the last 10 years have gone a long way toward the elucidation of the mechanisms involved. This paper briefly surveys the findings of this research in order to arrive at some appraisal of what is known about causes.

Before appraising causes, it is necessary to define the condition we are to consider. As the name "autism" implies, one of the key features consists of an autistic-type abnormality in interpersonal relationships. This may be shown in early childhood by a relative lack of eye-to-eye gaze, limited emotional attachments to parents, little variation in facial expression, and an appearance of aloofness and distance together with an apparent lack of interest in people. Autistic children often fail to cuddle and do not come to parents for comfort when hurt or upset. They do not join in group play activities or form friendships; they show little emotion, little sympathy or empathy for other people. However, these social abnormalities are not (and were not in Kanner's first description) the only features of the syndrome. In the present state of knowledge it appears that the diagnosis of infantile autism should be restricted to children who show the three groups of abnormalities autism (as already described), delays in speech and language development, and ritualistic and compulsive phenomena (Rutter, 1970a). Speech and language delay is usually accompanied by at least some reduction in response to sounds; and when language develops it is usually abnormal in quality—pronominal reversal and echolalia being the most striking features. The ritualistic and compulsive phenomena may take any of four forms: a morbid attachment to unusual objects; peculiar preoccupations, a resistance to change or quasi-obsessive rituals.

Hand and finger mannerisms and complex whole body movements of a stereotyped kind are also common but should not be included as diagnostic criteria in view of their frequency in the (nonautistic) inmates of long-stay institutions, in mentally subnormal children, and in blind children. It should be emphasized that the clinical picture changes somewhat as they grow older; some of these diagnostic features may not be apparent in the older child.

One further diagnostic criterion is necessary and that is onset in infancy—or at least by the age of 30 months. The majority of autistic children have shown abnormalities from the first year of life; but in a minority of cases—probably about a fifth—there does seem to have been a period of normal development before the onset of autism. Whether these cases differ in pathogenesis from the others is not yet known.

Let us now turn to the first major issue: does autism differ *qualitatively* from normality? That some features of autism may occur in other conditions or even, as transient features, in normal children is generally accepted. However, some writers have gone further. O'Gorman (1970) observed that dissociation and social withdrawal are normal phenomena. All of us show this when concentrating on work or a book. He suggests that autistic children withdraw from auditory stimuli in infancy and continue to do so until it becomes a habit. Thus, he sees autism as a defense mechanism and the syndrome as merely an exaggeration of normal phenomena. The crucial feature in this view is that the social withdrawal in autism is similar in kind to that shown in normal people. That autistic children are seriously impaired in their social relationships in early childhood is obviously true, but O'Gorman's suggestion that this is the same type of selective withdrawal found at times in normal people has no empirical support. The hypothesis fails to account for the other features of the syndrome, it does not explain why autism is four times as common in boys as in girls, and it by-passes the evidence of organic impairment in autistic children.

Selective social withdrawal and avoidance of speech does, of course, occur in the condition known as "elective mutism." However, the clinical features and outcome are quite different from autism and, unlike autism, elective mutism is found in girls as often as in boys. On the available evidence to date, the hypothesis that autism is due to selective social withdrawal may be rejected. Others have suggested that although the social withdrawal may differ in kind from that in the general population, nevertheless, such withdrawal, however caused, is the basic handicap. On the face of it, this seems more plausible in that impaired relationships are certainly a cardinal feature of autism. However, social withdrawal is one of the first symptoms to improve in autism, and some autistic children cease to show the symptom in adult life (Rutter, Greenfeld, & Lockyer, 1967). The finding that even after they cease to be withdrawn, they may still remain retarded in language, have a low I.Q., and show obsessive-like symptoms argues strongly against social withdrawal (of any type) being the cause of the other handicaps (Rutter, 1968).

Ounsted and the Hutts at Oxford, noting the importance of gaze aversion, have suggested that autism consists of a genetically determined extreme degree of introversion associated with high arousal in social situations (Hutt & Ounsted, 1966; Hutt, C., & Hutt, S. J., 1970). This hypothesis requires serious attention. Ounsted (1970) has marshalled the arguments in a recent review of the subject and ends by listing 11 predictions stemming from his theory. Some of these have received support and some have still to be tested. However, one crucial prediction has failed the test. Ounsted (1970) argued that if his view was correct, the parents of autistic children should be markedly more introverted than normal. Kolvin (1971) has recently shown that this is not so. Mothers of autistic children are actually slightly (but not significantly) more extroverted than the general population. Another facet of Ounsted's theory—that of high arousal (Hutt, S. J., Hutt, C., Lee, & Ounsted, 1965)—has also been called in question by recent work. Hermelin and O'Connor (1968; 1970) found that in the resting state autistic children do not differ from normal or subnormal controls in their cortical aroused state, at least as measured by alpha blocking. Complex results were obtained with regard to arousal in conditions of sensory stimulation. In intermittent (but not continuous) light stimulation, autistic children became less aroused than normal people, whereas in continuous (but not intermittent) sound stimulation, they were more highly aroused. Arousal is a multifaceted concept, and different measures of arousal do not always agree with one another. Exactly what is the correct explanation of the two sets of findings on arousal is uncertain. It may be that in some circumstances autistic children are overaroused as a response to certain types of stimulation but clearly they cannot be regarded as generally showing high arousal as a basic handicap.

The Oxford group found that autistic children's stereotypes increased in complex environments which, they argued, suggested high arousal (Hutt, C., & Hutt, S. J., 1965; 1966); but preliminary findings from Ornitz, Brown, Sorosky, Ritvo, and Dietrich (1970) in Los Angeles failed to confirm this. Finally, the introversion theory cannot account for the heavy male preponderance among autistic children. In the general population, there is no evidence that introversion is more common to either sex (Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. CE (1969). In view of these recent findings, one must conclude that Ounsted's theory will not stand without serious modification. It still poses some important research questions but it cannot account for the causation of autism.

Before turning to what might be the causes of autism it is necesary first to consider a few other hypotheses which have been influential but which now appear mistaken. For many years autism was regarded as a particularly early manifestation of schizophrenia, intellectual level, cognitive pattern, this view is wrong. Autism and schizophrenia differ in terms of sex distribution, social background, family history of schizophrenia, intellectual level, cognitive pattern, presence of delusions and hallucinations, and course of disorder (Rutter, 1968). Kolvin's important series of studies comparing infantile and late onset psychoses now provide the most decisive evidence that the two conditions are quite different (Kolvin, 1971).

Until recently some workers have regarded autism as a psychogenically determined disorder. Autism has been thought to represent the child's response to parental detachment, lack of warmth and obsessionality. This theory also now seems most unlikely. A recent study of ours (Rutter, Bartak, & Newman, 1971) has shown that the parents of autistic children do not differ in these characteristics from the parents of children with other language disorders. Kolvin (1971) found that the mothers were not at all unusual in terms of either neuroticism or introversion and that both clinical and questionnaire studies have failed to show any personality stereotype in the parents (Rutter, 1967).

Yet others have suggested that there may be parental pathology which is specifically concerned with the child who becomes autistic, but again supportive evidence is lacking. Furthermore, such parental abnormalities as do occur are at least as likely to result from pathology in the child as the other way around. It is relevant in this connection that Schopler and Loftin (1969) found that parental qualities differ according to the setting in which they are assessed.

It may be concluded that autism almost certainly is not due solely to psychogenic influences, although, as in any other child, environmental circumstances may well be influential in the development of secondary handicaps.

In similar fashion it has been suggested that autism develops because of a lack of adequate social stimulation and personal contact. It is well known, of course, that social deprivation can lead to social withdrawal and language retardation; but it probably affects boys and girls equally and the pattern of symptoms is different from that in autistic children. In particular, there is usually little defect in language comprehension (almost always seriously impaired in autistic children) and ritualistic and compulsive activities are not a characteristic feature (Rutter, 1971). In any case, autistic children do not usually have a history of depriving experiences. It may be concluded that it is most unlikely that social deprivation is a cause of autism.

Genetic studies have been disappointingly limited and inconclusive so far, and there is a need for a well-conducted twin study on adequate numbers (Rutter, 1967; 1968). The rate of autism in siblings (less than 2%) is low, which is rather against a decisive hereditary element. On the other hand, the rate is considerably above that in the general population (4 to 5 per 10,000) and it may be that there is a genetically determined type of autism that constitutes a small subgroup of autistic disorders. Several investigations have shown that autistic children have the normal chromosome complement (Biesele, Schmid, & Lawlis, 1968; Böök, Nichtern, & Gruenberg 1963; Judd & Mandell, 1968); but Judd and Mandell reported that some autistic children as well as some fathers had an unusually long arm to the Y chromosome. The significance of this, if any, is quite unknown at present.

In the past it has occasionally been suggested that autism is merely an unusual type of mental subnormality, but there are two main reasons why this is an inadequate explanation.

1. Even on standard intelligence tests, about a quarter of autistic children can be shown to have an I.Q. in the normal range (Rutter & Lockyer, 1967).

2. To some extent the autistic child's poor level of intellectual function appears to be related to specific defects in language rather than to a global deficiency of intelligence (Lockyer & Rutter, 1970).

Yet on the other hand, there can be little doubt that intellectual retardation is an important aspect of autism. The majority of autistic children obtain scores in the mental subnormal range, and the IQ scores in early childhood have been found to be reasonably stable and a quite good predictor of intellectual functioning later (Lockyer & Rutter, 1969). Moreover, the IQ level remains much the same even in those autistic children who recover or greatly improve (Rutter, 1966). Many autistic children are mentally subnormal as well as being autistic, and the mental subnormality is just as "real" as in any other child who is mentally retarded.

So far our conclusions on etiological factors in autism have been largely negative, so let us now turn to more positive findings.

In a review of concepts of autism (Rutter, 1968) it was concluded that autistic children had a central disorder of language involving both the comprehension of language and the utilization of language or conceptual skills in thinking. It was suggested that this disorder of language constituted the basic handicap to which the other symptoms of autism were secondary. Work since then, particularly the systematic experimental studies of Hermelin, O'Connor and Frith (Frith, 1971; Hermelin, 1971; Hermelin & O'Connor, 1970; O'Connor, 1971) have largely confirmed this view, but have also shown that the cognitive defect is rather wider than suggested in 1968.

The evidence in favor of this hypothesis may be summarized as follows: Retardation of speech and language is an almost invariable manifestation in infantile autism, and a lack of response to sounds is frequently the first symptom to be noted. Apart from the level of IQ, language is also the most important prognostic factor (Rutter, 1967). The pattern of cognitive abilities in autism shows that the children are deficient in language skills even on tests that do not require speech (Lockyer & Rutter, 1970). These results show that the failure to speak results from a basic impairment in language function, not just from an absence of motivation to speak. Not only is the autistic child retarded in language, but also his *pattern* of linguistic abilities is significantly different from that exhibited by either normal or mentally retarded children (Tubbs, 1966). The autistic child is particularly poor in his transfer of information from one sensory modality to another, in his understanding of the meaning of the spoken word, and in his use of gesture. The last feature also differentiates the autistic child from the child with so-called developmental aphasia (Rutter, Bartak, & Newman, 1971). Pronominal reversal and echolalia, which probably reflect defects in comprehension, are also much more common in autistic than "aphasic" children. Thus, autistic children differ from aphasic children in having both a more severe and a more widespread language handicap.

The experimental studies of Hermelin, O'Connor, and Frith carry the issue much further. They have shown that autistic children are particularly unresponsive to verbal stimuli and that they make little use of concepts in memorizing. The verbal recall of autistic children is relatively independent of the meaning of what they hear. More recent experiments have shown that, compared with normal and mentally subnormal children of the same mental age, autistic children not only are impaired in their appreciation of the grammatically structured aspects of language but also lack the ability to associate words semantically. However, this defect is not confined to auditory material. Autistic children also have difficulties in perceiving temporal patterns in visually presented stimuli, suggesting a central defect in the processing of any sort of coded, meaningful, or temporally patterned stimuli. Such a deficit is likely to impair severely the infant's and young child's interaction with the environment. It is suggested as a working hypothesis that these specific cognitive defects are the cause of the social and behavior differences in most cases of autism (Rutter, Bartak, & Newman, 1971).

Other workers, while agreeing that autism is based on some form of central cognitive disorder, have laid most emphasis on slightly different central functions (DeMyer, 1971). For example, Ornitz (1971) has suggested that there is a disorder of sensory motor integration; Martin (1971), a central sensory disorder; and Wing (1971), a disorder involving multiple language, cognitive and perceptual handicaps. The fact of the matter is that autistic children usually exhibit multiple central defects. At the present time it is uncertain which of these are necessary and sufficient causes of the disorder. We have suggested that a central defect in the processing of symbolic or sequence information is likely to prove the basic defect but the evidence is not yet available to decide conclusively between the different types of cognitive or sensory disorders which have been postulated for autism.

The cause of the language/cognitive defect is still to be considered. Among young autistic children it is usual to find no abnormalities on neurological examination other than immaturities in developmental functions. In addition, metabolic investigations generally show no specific abnormality (Rutter, 1967; Sankar, 1970). These negative findings have led to the assumption that there is no organic brain dysfunction in autism. However, long term followup studies have now shown that this assumption is frequently wrong. Autistic children first seen at the Maudsley Hospital in early childhood have now been followed through to adult (a mean age of 22 years) life (Rutter, 1970b). Of these 64 children, no less than 18 (29% of those not epileptic in early childhood) have developed epileptic fits during adolescence. These findings inevitably raise the question of whether autism can be divided into those cases due to organic brain disease and those not due to this disease. The most obvious difference between those who did and those who did not develop fits in adolescence was the initial level of measured intelligence. Of the nine children whose IQ was untestable, and, therefore presumably untestably low (Lockyer & Rutter, 1969), no less than seven have begun to have fits by the 1970 follow-up.[1] Furthermore, of the 18 children who developed fits, only 2 had an initial IQ of 65 or more. Put the other way around, of the 27 children who were untestable or had an IQ of 50 or less, 15 developed fits in adolescence, another 2 had had fits since early childhood, and a further 4 had indications of possible brain disorder. These findings strongly suggest that most, if not all, autistic children with severe "intellectual retardation" develop their disorder as a result of organic brain dysfunction.

A further pointer to the probability of neurological disorder in some autistic children is provided by the small proportion (7 out of 64 in the follow-up study) who deteriorate in adolescence. In three cases with an IQ below 50, deterioration occurred from an already low level; but in four, where the IQ was in the 59 to 69 range, the decline followed a period of progress and general improvement. The deterioration usually began with a loss of language skills associated with inertia and decreasing activity and was followed by general intellectual decline. In four out of the seven cases the deterioration was accompanied by the development of fits. Investigations of these children are only just beginning; therefore, the cause remains unknown. However, one child not in the followup study, who showed the same clinical picture, was found to have histidinaemia.

The situation is rather different with respect to those autistic children who had normal intelligence. Of the 12 in the follow-up study with a performance IQ of at least 80 in adolescence, only 4 showed evidence of probable "brain damage".[2] But unlike the intellectually retarded, the majority showed no clear indication of organic brain dysfunction.

A further possibility in these children is that the autism developed in relation to a particularly severe developmental language disorder, possibly genetically determined. This is suggested by findings from the comparative study of autistic and developmental "aphasic" children already mentioned (Rutter, Bartak, & Newman, 1971). In the autistic children, 5 out of 14 had a history of language delay in close relatives, as did 5 out of 11 "aphasic" children. Although this study showed important differences between autistic and aphasic children, it had also been found that the two conditions may occur in the same sibship, suggesting a possible link in a subgroup of cases. In these families, autism developed in the intellectually retarded siblings who also had the most severe and global language impairment.

Although we are still far from knowing the cause of infantile autism, the nature of the disorder is becoming more clearly understood. Clinical, comparative, and experimental studies of autistic children at all levels of intelligence have demonstrated the presence of a severe and extensive defect in language comprehension and in central functions associated with language and with the processing of symbolic or sequenced information. Circumstantial evidence suggests (but does not prove) that the language and cognitive defect constitutes the primary handicap in autism, the social and behavioral abnormalities arising as secondary consequences.

The cause of this language and cognitive defect remains unknown. The high rate of fits in intellectually retarded autistic children suggests the existence of some kind of

---

[1] This includes one who had a few fits in infancy and therefore excluded from the 18 children with developing fits for the first time in adolescence.

[2] One case each of fits developing in adolescence, a persistent, temporal lobe spike focus on the EEG, toxoplasmosis, and congenital lues.

organic brain damage or disorder. In the few cases where some specific brain disease has been found, the type of disease has been far from uniform. It seems that the type of physiological dysfunction caused by the disease is more important than the type of tissue pathology. Among the intelligent autistic children the evidence for structural brain pathology is less striking, and it remains possible that few cases arise on the basis of a maturational disorder. The rate of genetic factors remains quite uncertain. This is an area of research requiring further exploration.

It is not yet possible to be sure whether the language/cognitive defect is a *sufficient* cause for autism or whether some interaction with particular personality attributes or family environment is necessary. However, the consistent finding of gross language and cognitive deficits associated with autism and the consistent failure to find deviant factors in the environmental situation suggest that the language/cognitive impairment is the *main* factor involved in the pathogenesis of autism.

BILL OF RIGHTS FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED

HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, upon reviewing the findings of a special HEW action team of Federal and outside consultant experts on the conditions at the Willowbrook State School, I am introducing legislation to provide a bill of rights for the mentally retarded. Included herewith is a section-by-section analysis of this legislation to assist my colleagues in understanding the necessity for this measure:

BILL OF RIGHTS FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED—SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

The opening section of the bill states the overall general aims of the bill—to provide for the human care, treatment, habilitation and protection of the mentally retarded in residential facilities through the establishment of strict quality operation and control standards and the support of the implementation of such standards by Federal assistance; to establish State plans requiring a survey of need for assistance to facilities to enable them to be in compliance with such standards, seek to minimize inappropriate admission to residential facilities and develop strategies to stimulate the development of regional and community programs for the mentally retarded which include integration of such residential facilities.

Section 2 of the bill presents the findings of the Congress concerning the mentally retarded in the United States and the care that is provided them in residential facilities. These findings are concerned with such matters as:

(1) the numbers of mentally retarded currently living in residential facilities for the retarded,

(2) the prime purpose of residential services,

(3) the basic obligation of residential services,

(4) the considerations on which admissions to a residential facility should be based,

(5) the importance of legal guardians for both adult and minor residents of institutions,

(6) the need for residential facilities to be humane and safe, to provide basic human needs, and to be located in the community served and provide normal contacts within the community life.

(7) the realization that the first consideration in research and planning for the retarded must be the protection of the human dignity, the integrity and the life of the mentally retarded, and

(8) the necessity for both an upgrading of existing facilities for the retarded and the establishment of new, small, homelike units integrated into community living situations.

Part (b) of Sec. 2 states that the purpose of the Act is to establish standards for the operation of residential facilities, to improve the provision of services to the retarded by encouraging and supporting the planning and development of strategies to implement these standards, to minimize inappropriate admissions to residential facilities, and to stimulate the development of regional and community programs integrating the facilities conforming to these standards. A further purpose of the Act is to encourage and support planning and development of strategies to survey and analyze residential facilities and their compliance with the standards established under the Act and to stimulate regional and community programs and services for the retarded which integrate such residential facilities.

TITLE XI OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT—SUPPORT OF RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED

Sec. 3 of the bill creates a new title XI in the Public Health Service Act entitled Support of Residential Facilities for the Mentally Retarded.

Part A—State Strategy Planning

Part A of this title, entitled "State Strategy Planning" authorizes two programs of grants, each totalling $15 million a year for fiscal year 1973 and the next two succeeding fiscal years.

The first program of grants, described in sec. 1101(a), will be used to help the States conduct comprehensive surveys and analyses of the cost of bringing existing residential facilities into compliance with the standards established under this Act, to review existing State plans and develop strategies including implementation and monitoring mechanisms to fulfill the overall stated purposes of the Act, such as to minimize inappropriate placement in residential facilities particularly by providing alternative programs of care, and to coordinate and integrate existing residential facilities with existing and future regional and community mental retardation programs and services. The bill provides that this be done in cooperation with the National Advisory Council on Standards for Residential Facilities for the Mentally Retarded which is established by a later section of the Act, section 1109. This first grant program will also be used to study administrative relationships, including the identification of legal, economic, social, and other barriers to compliance with the standards established under this Act, as well as the involvement of public and private sources in programs and services for the mentally retarded, with recommendations for improvement.

The second program of grants, described in section 1101(b), will be uesd to assist the States in improving the services provided by existing residential facilities for the mentally retarded. These grants will not exceed $300,000 per institution and will cover costs of administering and operating demonstration facilities and training programs. These grants awards will be evaluated for effectiveness in improving residential care for the mentally retarded.

Part B—Delivery of Mental Retardation Programs and Services

Part B of the new title is entitled "Delivery of Mental Retardation Programs and Services". Section 1102 of this part authorizes such sums as are necessary in grants to assist the States in meeting direct and indirect expenses for bringing residential facilities into conformity with the standards established under this Act. Priority in awarding these grants will be given to those applicants whose facilities are in the greatest need of assistance.

A State desiring to receive a grant must submit a plan:

(1) setting forth a schedule for compliance with the established standards for each facility;

(2) designating a State planning and advisory council, with a membership drawn from local agencies and nongovernmental organizations concerned with services for the mentally retarded, and with at least one-third representing consumers of such services;

(3) assuring reasonable State financial participation in the cost of carrying out the plan and how the facility will complement and augment rather than duplicate or replace other community services for the retarded;

(4) setting forth a schedule of costs to achieve compliance with the standards;

(5) designating how placement in residential facilities will be minimized through alternative regional and community programs and services.

Sec. 1103(b) provides for approval of plans which set forth a reasonable time for compliance and provides that plans will not be disapproved without reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

Sec. 1104 provides that individual project grants will not exceed 75 percent of the cost of the project and that payments will be made in advance or by reimbursement.

Sec. 1105 assures maintenance of effort by the States; that is, that grants to the States will not result in any decrease in the level of already existing funds, but will be used to supplement and increase the level of such funds.

Sec. 1106 establishes procedures for the withholding of grants if there has been a failure to comply with the State plan or if any program assisted fails to comply with any applicable provision of the Act. Payments will be withheld until the Secretary is satisfied that there is no longer any failure to comply or that the noncompliance will be promptly corrected. When a State has received a grant under sec. 1102 and has not complied with the standards of the Act within a reasonable period of time, that State will not be eligible for any further funds on behalf of any person who is a resident of any residential facility for the retarded which does not meet the standards described in part C of the title. The section provides that any funds to which a person would otherwise be entitled to have paid on his behalf to a residential facility will be reserved for him and administered by the Social Security Administration in the same manner as benefits under title II of the Social Security Act would be administered on his behalf if he were entitled to them. Five years after the enactment of this Act, no residential facility that does not comply to the standards established by this Act will be eligible to receive any direct or indirect payments under any Federal law.

Sec. 1107 provides for an extension of time for grantees and other residential facilities for the retarded to meet the established standards if appropriations for grants under sec. 1102 do not meet authorizations.

Section 1108 authorizes such sums as may be necessary for three years beginning in fiscal year 1973 for a program of grants to public or private nonprofit agencies, organizations, or institutions to meet the costs of development, improvement, extension, or expansion of community resources and community living situations for the mentally retarded other than living-in residential facilities for the mentally retarded. The section authorizes the Secretary to prescribe regulations describing the applications that will

be used to apply for grants, and directs the Secretary to give priority to those applicants whose proposals he determines are of special significance because they demonstrate new or relatively effective or efficient methods of delivery of services to the mentally retarded.

Sec. 1109 provides for the establishment of a fifteen-member National Advisory Council on Standards for Residential Facilities for the Mentally Retarded. Members will be appointed from representatives of professional and voluntary organizations concerned with the mentally retarded, consumers of services from residential facilities for the retarded (for example, parents of the mentally retarded), and leaders in the fields of service to the mentally retarded. A majority of the membership will represent the interests of consumers of services.

The Council will advise the Secretary on regulations implementing standards, will study and evaluate such standards through site visits and other methods to determine their effectiveness, and will recommend any changes or improvements in the standards.

Council members will be compensated.

Part C—Standards for Mental Retardation Facilities for the Mentally Retarded

The major proportion of the bill is contained in Part C, which is entitled "Standards for Residential Facilities for the Mentally Retarded" and which consists of a comprehensive and detailed description of the standards a residential facility for the mentally retarded must comply with in order to qualify for assistance under this Act, and eventually for assistance and funds under any Federal program. This part is divided into eight chapters and each chapter is broken down into subchapter.

CHAPTER I—ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES AND PRACTICES

The first subchapter of Chapter I describes the standards for the philosophy under which a residential facility should operate, and the standards under which such a facility should be located and operated. These standards stress the fostering of humanization of mentally retarded residents and the importance of providing as normal an atmosphere as possible. The standards deemphasize the use of institutional terms in dealing with the retarded and their problems. Under these standards, the residential facility will be integrated into the community and the general population as much as possible. The residents will use community resources such as schools, religious facilities, medical and other professional services, recreation facilities, stores, and employment facilities as extensively as possible. The facility will be designed and operated to help residents to move from structured, dehumanized, institutional living to a less structured, more individualized, and independent life. Facilities will emphasize groupings of program and residential units designed to meet residents' needs and integrated into, instead of segregated from, community life.

The second subchapter of Chapter I outlines general policies and practices under which a residential facility shall operate. It requires a facility to have generally available a written outline of the philosophy, objectives, and goals it is striving to achieve. The facility will also have a manual of policies and procedures describing what it is doing to achieve its objectives and goals. In addition, a statement of policies and procedures concerning the rights of residents will be required.

The facility is required to have a statement of policies and procedures that protect the financial interests of residents, manuals describing procedures in the major operating units of the facility, a summary of laws and regulations relevant to mental retardation and to the function of the facility, and a plan for a continuing management audit.

Public facilities will have documents describing their statutory basis of existence and the administration of the governmental department in which they operate. Private facilities will have documentation, including charters, constitutions and bylaws, and State licenses.

This subchapter describes the general duties of the governing body of a facility and the responsibilities of the chief executive officer and other persons responsible for the operation of the facility.

The subchapter also describes the general overall management, organization, and administration of the facility, including such matters as delegation of authority and responsibility, decisionmaking, proper utilization of staff, and effective channels of communications. There will be a plan for improvement of staff and services.

There will be provisions for effective staff and resident participation and communication, including use of staff meetings and standing committees. The facility will use a percentage of operating budget for self-renewal purposes. The findings of these activities will be disseminated to staff and consumer representatives. There will be a system of collection and recording of data describing the population of the facility.

The facility will have a publicly available description of services for residents. The facility will provide, by various means, for meaningful and extensive participation in the policymaking and operation of the facility by consumer representatives and the public.

The facility will establish an extensive public education and information program to develop understanding and acceptance of the mentally retarded in all aspects of community living.

Subchapter III of Chapter I describes standards for admission and release of mentally retarded residents of facilities. These provide that only those who can be helped by the facility's programs will be admitted, and that numbers of admissions will not exceed the facility's capacity and provisions for adequate programming.

Laws, regulations, and procedures for admission, readmission, and release will be summarized and available for distribution. The matter of legal incompetence will be separate from the matter of the need for residential services, and admission to a facility will not automatically imply legal incompetence.

Before admission, a resident must have a complete physical, emotional, social and cognitive evaluation. Service need for each resident will be defined without regard to the actual availability of all the desirable options. A retarded person will be admitted to a facility only when it can be determined that this would be the best measure for him. When admission is not the best idea, but cannot be avoided, this must be acknowledged clearly and plans must be made to explore alternatives. The primary beneficiary of the admission to a facility must be clearly specified as the resident, his family, his community, society, and several of these. All admissions are to be regarded as temporary.

A medical evaluation by a physician will be made within a week of admission. Provision is made for continuing and regular evaluations of the resident and his progress in the facility.

Provision is made for physical inspection of the resident for signs of injury or disease prior to and following temporary or permanent release from the facility. Procedures are described for reporting on the resident's status at the time of permanent release or transfer from the facility.

In the event of serious illness or accident, impending death, or death, provision is made for informing next of kin or guardian, and the following of the wishes of that person concerning religious matters. In case of death of a resident, provision is made for autopsy, with permission, for suitable religious services and burial, if wished, and for informing coroner or medical examiner, in accordance with law.

Subchapter IV of Chapter I outlines the personnel policies a resident facility for the mentally retarded must follow in order to comply with this law. It provides for a personnel director if warranted, for a written description of current personnel policies and practices to be available to all employees and for initial screening and regular evaluation of all personnel.

The subchapter provides that staffing should be sufficient so that the facility is not dependent upon residents or volunteers for the performance of productive services. It describes procedures under which residents can be involved in such services. The subchapter describes procedures for the establishment of an appropriate staff training program and the qualifications of the person responsible for this program. Also described are provisions for creating relations with nearby colleges and universities for advance training of the facility's staff, for the use of facility resources for training and research by the colleges and universities, and for exchange of staff between the facility and the colleges and universities.

CHAPTER II—RESIDENT LIVING

The first subchapter of Chapter II describes staff-resident relationships and activities. Staff of the facility's living units will devote their attention to the care and development of residents in the atmosphere of the living units as follows:

(1) by providing sufficient attention to each resident each day;

(2) by training residents in activities of daily living and in development of self-help and social skills;

(3) by providing a warm, family- or home-like environment;

(4) by not being diverted by housekeeping, clerical, and other non-resident-care activities; and

(5) by maintaining stability and consistent interpersonal relationships.

Living unit staff will participate with an interdisciplinary team in the overall care and development of the resident. Provision is made for evaluation and program plans for each resident to be available to living unit staff and to be reviewed regularly by the interdisciplinary team.

Activity schedules for each resident free of "dead time" of more than one hour and allowing for individual and group free activities will be available to living unit staff and implemented daily. Life in the living unit will resemble as much as is possible the cultural norm of nonretarded age peers. Residents will be assigned responsibilities in the living unit, and an effort will be made to enhance self-respect and to develop independent living skills. Provision must be made for appropriate out-of-bed and bedroom activities for multiple handicapped and nonambulatory residents. Residents will have planned periods of time out doors and will be instructed on how to use freedom of movement both within and without the facility's grounds. Special events, such as birthdays, will be observed and provisions will be made for appropriate heterosexual interaction. Residents' view and opinions on matters concerning them will be elicited and considered. They will be instructed in the use of and will have appropriate access to communication processes, such as telephones and mail. They will be permitted appropriate personal possessions and the possession and the use of money.

There will be provision for the recognition and management of behavioral problems in the living unit. There will be a written statement of appropriate policies and procedures for the control and discipline of residents. Corporal punishment will not be

permitted and residents will not discipline other residents, except as part of an organized self-government program. Seclusion in a locked room will not be employed. Physical restraint will be used only when necessary to protect the resident from injury to himself or to others, and not for punishment, convenience of the staff, or as a substitute for program. Policies for the use of restraint will be in writing and will follow certain guidelines. Procedures are described for the appropriate use of mechanical supports, chemical restraints, and behavior modification programs.

The second subchapter of Chapter II describes the standards for food services in the resident facility. It provides that food services meet the needs of each resident and be professionally planned and nutritionally adequate. It provides for a written statement of goals, policies, and procedures of the facility's food service. A qualified nutritionist or dietitian will be employed or consulted regularly. The standards require that well-balanced meals be served to residents three times a day at appropriate intervals in dining rooms which are suitably designed and equipped. The food service of the facility, like all other services, must be designed and operated to meet the needs of the residents. Suitable supervision and systematic training in the development of appropriate eating skills will be provided. Provision must be made for cleaning equipment and for handwashing facilities.

Subchapter III of the second Chapter is concerned with provisions for clothing of the residents. Each resident will be provided an adequate supply of clothing comparable to the clothing worn in the community. Provision is made for the supplying of appropriate clothing to residents with special needs, such as the multiply handicapped, the nonambulatory, and the incontinent. Residents will be trained and encouraged to choose their own clothing, select their daily clothing, dress themselves, and maintain their clothing as independently as possible.

Subchapter IV describes provisions for the health, hygiene, and grooming of residents. Residents will be trained to become as independent as possible in these matters of personal care, such as daily bathing, brushing teeth, etc. Staff assistance will be provided where appropriate, such as helping female residents in caring for menstrual needs, or in providing toilet training where needed.

Each living unit will have a properly adapted drinking unit and residents will be taught the proper use of such units.

Procedures will be established for regular weighing and height measurement of residents and for the maintenance of suitable records. Care of infections and contagious diseases will conform to State and local health regulations. A physician will review regularly all orders prescribing bed rest and prohibition of outdoor activities. Such devices as dentures, eyeglasses, hearing aids, and braces will be furnished and maintained by appropriate specialists.

Subchapter V describes standards for grouping and organization of living units. These living units will be small enough to insure proper development of interpersonal relationships among residents and between residents and staff. A single unit, including sleeping, dining, and activity areas, should provide for the housing of not more than sixteen residents, and program groups within the unit should not exceed eight.

DR. JAMES C. TUMBLIN

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, at its 75th annual congress the American Optometric Association—AOA—which represents the overwhelming majority of this country's 18,000 optometrists, installed Dr. James C. Tumblin from Knoxville, Tenn., as its president. It is my privilege to represent the district in which this progressive city is located. This city is progressive because of citizens such as Dr. Tumblin whose contributions extend beyond his private office.

After receiving his doctor of optometry from the Northern Illinois College of Optometry in 1948, Dr. Tumblin went into private practice and, except for a brief tour of duty in the Armed Forces, has continued to serve his community's vision-care needs, as have optometrists in some 6,300 localities around the Nation.

During the last 10 years, Dr. Tumblin, known by his colleagues as the "Southern Gentleman," has established what could be considered a "decade of dedication": He has been the Tennessee Optometric Association's president; and he has served in a leadership capacity on several of his national association's panels, including trustee of the AOA and the Council on Optometric Education. He ascended to his present office with AOA after having been its secretary-treasurer, vice president, and president-elect.

His membership in other professional organizations includes the American Optometric Foundation, Optometric Extension Program Foundation, Armed Forces Optometric Society, Better Vision Institute, and a Fellow, Tennessee Academy of Optometry.

Newly installed AOA president Tumblin is also active in religious and civic activities.

Dr. Tumblin's leadership qualities have been exhibited on many occasions, among them his coordination in the preparation of a "Manual on Membership Development," a collection of the methods successfully used in various States in gaining membership.

During the remainder of this decade, when health-care will undoubtedly be one of the largest issues to confront the American people and the U.S. Congress, it is encouraging to know that professional associations, such as the American Optometric Association—the spokesman for the third largest independently prescribing health-care profession—has shown the wisdom to install Dr. J. C. Tumblin as its leader for the coming year. This will be a challenging year and Dr. Tumblin has demonstrated that he is prepared to meet this challenge. I am sure you all join me in wishing a fellow Tennessean best wishes in his new and important role.

LETTER TO RALPH NADER

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, most of our colleagues have already been visited, as I have, by agents of a self-styled expert on just about everything, with demands that we complete a questionnaire of over 600 questions then grant a personal interview to a volunteer questioner in order to help his organization research a paper critical of the Congress and its operations.

I am today returning the questionnaire and advising the head of the organization that I consider assigning members of my staff the task of completing it would be an unwarranted intrusion on their duties and responsibilities. As I believe many of our colleagues share my views, I insert the text of the letter I addressed today to Mr. Ralph Nader at this point in the RECORD:

JUNE 30, 1972.

Mr. RALPH NADER,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. NADER: Reference is made to a very lengthy questionnaire containing over 600 questions which was left at my Capitol Hill office by a member of your staff, who also requested an interview.

First of all, I would like to call to your attention that my Congressional District is immediately across the Potomac River from the Nation's Capital and is, therefore, within easy commuting and communicating distance to all my constituents. In addition, a large percentage of them are involved and very conversant with governmental affairs. Needless to say, service to my constituents taxes the capabilities of my office to a considerable extent. Moreover, I am also a member of the House Committees on Ways and Means and the District of Columbia. These official duties leave me virtually no time to take on other projects.

I think it is also important to note that agents of your so-called Task Force to investigate the Congress have already visited my office on one occasion and interviewed my Administrative Assistant for two hours on the subject. On another occasion, your agents interviewed my Campaign Manager for four hours. These were valuable hours which should have been devoted to my constituents who rightly have first priority on my time.

It should also be pointed out that my staff seriously questioned the knowledge your agents claim to have on the functions and problems of the Congress, as well as the relevancy of their questions to either Tenth Congressional District business or the needs of my constituents.

Furthermore, I question the necessity of any organization, however zealous or honest in their intentions, to force documents of this length on busy Congressmen and their staff aides. Such action borders on arrogance, in addition to raising questions about the validity and eventual use of their findings.

Therefore, I can only conclude that the time required to complete such a lengthy questionnaire or the granting of yet another interview to one of your agents must be considered as an unwarranted intrusion on the duties and responsibilities that a Congressman and his staff owes to the constituency he represents.

I must also note that a cursory examination of your questionnaire leads me to believe that you might find all the information you seek in the Library of Congress or the Bureau of the Census.

Nonetheless, since you personally want this information, I will grant a reasonable period of time for an interview with you as your schedule of duties is no greater or more important than mine. A mutual time, convenient to both our schedules, can be worked out between you and my personal secretary, Mrs. Harmon, at 225–5136.

Sincerely,

JOEL T. BROYHILL,
Member of Congress.

GARRETT COUNTY CELEBRATES CENTENNIAL

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, this year Garrett County celebrates its centennial birthday and many of its citizens are now taking the time to reflect back on the past so that they may face the future with continued vision and wisdom. I submit to you now a brief piece on this beautiful county and the concern its citizens are showing for the legacy they will leave to future generations.

"Legacy: Past and Future" was the lead editorial published in the centennial issue of the Republican and I think you will agree that its message is an apt one which could apply to thousands of other rural counties throughout our Nation.

The article follows:

LEGACY: PAST AND FUTURE

Garrett County, as an individual county, is 100 years old. Its centennial birthday is an appropriate time to assess its history, take a look at today, and perhaps, profiting by past mistakes, plan for the future.

In the context of time, a century is only a moment. While evidence recently unearthed at Friendsville indicates habitation of the area for several thousand years, the burst of activity that radically changed the landscape has occurred within the last 100 years. Ingenuity of man with both its promise and decimation has had more impact in these past 100 years than in all previous history. Results have both good and bad aspects.

Among the bad aspects are these: What were once virgin forests no longer exist, nor do the Indians who once inhabitated them. Coal lands have been, and still are, being consumed. Rivers once teeming with fish are devoid of life and unbalanced by human and industrial wastes. Farm and forest have been inundated. Air once pure is contaminated. Untouched primitive highlands are laced with highways, railways, and power lines.

Man calls this progress. It has provided him with a livelihood, a means to a "better" life, the convenience of mechanics to do the more back-breaking chores, and time to devote to things other than the daily struggle for food, clothing and shelter. It has helped free him of the age-old chains of poverty, but its price tag at best is depletion of natural resources; at worst, destruction of environment.

Much of this decimation occurred more than 70 years ago; some goes on today. Corrective measures, however, are already underway.

Today's picture is really not so grim. Man is now giving nature a hand in reforesting woodlands, managing timber growth and productivity. Water quality is being restored through filtration plants. Air contamination is being corrected through the use of precipitators. Strip and deep mining are revitalizing soil and water disturbed in the mining process. The inundation of land has developed into beautiful lakes whose potential is just now being realized. Above all, and this is possibly the main contribution of critics, man is aware of the problems progress brings. The land is no longer being raped, but tenderly seduced. The outlook for the future, therefore, is both promising and challenging.

Garrett County is the last primitive frontier of Maryland. To natives it is a beautiful, uncomplicated home. To vacationers from the city it is the place to return to nature. Once here, and having invested in a plot of land, "flatlanders" often become more protective than natives in maintaining the status quo.

The natives. themselves, are particularly unique. History shows that they have been God-fearing, inherently individualistic, more often than not making do with what they have through ingenuity, but willing to try a new course if it shows promise. They are proud of the community in which they live, sensitive to beauties of the county, and have a strong sense of right and wrong. They cope with disaster and personal tragedy. They help neighbors, not through a sense of obligation, but through a sense of response to a situation which needs correcting. They vote for the man, rather than be bound by strong party politics, showing no hesitation in dumping elected officials with whom they have become disenchanted.

To lump them together and label them "Garrett Countains" would be incorrect. They are individuals . . . with Garrett County especially at heart. Most of them, particulary those who farm, realize that implicit in the ownership of land is the wisdom to conserve it, nourish it, protect it, year after year. They know that through the span of time they are merely tenants of God's green and productive earth and that He's not making any more of it. To pass it along to the next generation in something less than good condition violates all the good principles of farming and stewardship. It is a lesson of which all residents may well take note.

The legacy we leave those who will celebrate Garrett County's bi-centennial in 2072 is already being developed. There are those of today who would advocate erecting barricades at the county line to avoid people pollution. There are some who would remove all restrictions, both moral and legal, and let "nature" take its course. Neither attitude, we feel, is realistic nor beneficial to the county's future health and well-being. Reasons for the demise of downeast counties should not be lost on officials we elect to guide this county. To prepare and plan for what might be is perhaps visionary and at times painful, it is becoming an essential ingredient to good government and orderly growth. To simply lock the barn door after the horse has run away is sheer stupidity.

Among the things we would hope to leave those of the next century are not only the uncontaminated basics of life: pure air and water, fertile land, and a place to live and work, but also a few of the extras so dear to Garrett County. These would include a place to relax and commune with nature, a sanctuary of primitive forests and wildlife, the preservation of arts and crafts, an appreciation of the history and creative efforts of past generations, a participation in our cultural heritage, a sugar maple grove, and the hope that they would have the wisdom to cope with the myriad of problems which they, not we, may create.

With vision today, perhaps we shall be praised, not damned, 100 years hence.—R.B.S.

TOWING VESSEL LICENSE ACT—H.R. 6479

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, although the House has concurred with the Senate amendment to the bill, conversations with officials of the Coast Guard reveal concern that the language of the amendment is cast in terms which might be construed to go beyond the intent of the amendment as expressed in the Senate report on the bill. I share that concern.

Without going into the language of the amendment, I would like to iterate that as noted in the Senate report, the amendment is intended to exempt towing vessels engaged in servicing the offshore oil and mineral exploitation industry, primarily in the Gulf of Mexico. The report stresses that these vessels differ substantially in their operations from the inland water towboats by operating in waters having relatively little vessel congestion. I would assume, and indeed insist, that in administering H.R. 6479, the Coast Guard will be guided by the principles mentioned above with respect to the exemption clause and will be very careful that the amendment language is not misconstrued so as to provide such a broad exemption that the purposes of this legislation might be defeated in promoting safety upon our waterways.

I would like to point out that in the past several years my committee held extensive hearings on the entire subject of towing vessel safety before laying H.R. 6479 before the House in April 1971 for passage.

The House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee did not find any compelling reason to exempt any specific segment of the towing vessel industry from the general safety operation requirements of H.R. 6479. However, in recommending concurrence in the Senate amendment on June 29, 1972, I was persuaded by the knowledge of a special study of offshore operations being conducted by the Coast Guard also noted in the Senate report. I am sure that the Commandant of the Coast Guard will keep my committee advised during the course of this study as to further Coast Guard recommendations with respect to the amendment in the event the exemption proves to be too broad or is otherwise insufficient from the standpoint of maritime safety for our waterways.

THE TEAKWOOD CURTAIN

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, Americans have lived for more than two decades facing the Iron Curtain and the Bamboo Curtain. As these two curtains are now lifting, a new curtain is banging shut elsewhere in the world. It is the Teakwood Curtain in Thailand.

Although a massive American air buildup is occurring in Thailand, no newsmen—American or foreign—are being permitted access to airbases either built or vastly improved by the United States. The long runways are paved with American taxpayer dollars but they are off limits to the American press who want to tell their fellow Americans what is going on there without violating any valid

military security rules. In short, although the United States is supposed to be a full-fledged partner in defending Thailand from possible Communist attack, it is being treated like an unwanted roomer. In this case, the "enemy" is the press—not the Communists. Mr. Speaker, the Teakwood Curtain in Thailand should be raised or we should get out now. And when we leave we should take every ounce of concrete and every sliver of wood from those airbases with us.

CLEVELAND INTRODUCES LEGISLATION TO PROMOTE PRIVATE CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing two pieces of legislation to help preserve the private charitable institutions which are so important to America. One of these bills is designed to rescue the privately endowed homes providing long-term care to the aged, the disabled, and children. The second bill will firmly establish the principle that private foundations are not to be taxed for revenue raising purposes, by renaming the levy on them from "excise tax" to "service charge," and reducing it from 4 percent to 1½ percent.

During recent years, Congress has passed quite a bit of legislation designed to benefit a multitude of deserving groups and desirable purposes. In particular, in addition to legislation to benefit our senior citizens, we have enacted legislation and appropriated significant sums of money for improved hospital and extended-care facilities across this land. Many of these programs, all of which must be paid for by the taxpayers of this country, have been quite expensive.

In view of this situation, it seems somewhat ironic that a major threat to the very existence of private homes providing needed long-term care for the aged should be a result of action by Congress in another field. In enacting the Tax Reform Act of 1969, one of the intentions of Congress was to close some of the so-called tax loopholes.

At the present time, we are hearing a lot of noise from Democratic presidential candidates about tax reform. In view of the fact that it has been 18 years since the Republicans have controlled either House of Congress, it is fair to point out that these Senators who are running for another office are running against their own handiwork. The fact is that all "loopholes" are in the tax laws in order to encourage people to do what Congress has determined to be socially desirable. Some of these exemptions, deductions, and credits may have outlived their usefulness, and ought to be abolished or modified. But we ought not forget that they were originally created to accomplish desirable goals—like encouraging private universities and hospitals; encouraging homeownership; encouraging people to make charitable contributions; encouraging exploration for oil; and so forth.

Because foundations were in some cases being used as a rather blatant tax dodge by the wealthy, and because some legitimate foundations were using their money in ways of questionable propriety and even outright partisan political action, Congress in 1969 enacted a number of provisions regulating them. For one thing, all "private foundations," as defined by the Internal Revenue Code, must pay an excise tax of 4 percent on their income. The stated purpose of this excise tax is that its revenues should approximate the cost of a stepped-up program of IRS audits of private foundations. In addition to the excise tax, a number of other provisions were enacted to regulate the operation of the foundations to eliminate certain questionable practices.

Mr. Speaker, the present definition of "private foundations" excludes hospitals and educational institutions. It also excludes churches and their affiliated organizations. So why do we discriminate against homes providing care to the elderly, the disabled, and children. It makes no sense whatever.

These nonsectarian organizations, by and large have been in existence for many many years and are able to offer long-term care services at a reduced cost because of the existence of an endowment, the income from which is used to offset operating costs; thereby reducing the cost of care to the residents/recipients. If they were church affiliated—performing the same function—they would not be classified as a private foundation, and would not be subject to these deleterious tax provisions. Why discriminate when we are talking about care for the aged?

At a time, Mr. Speaker, when the Congress is laboring to increase social security benefits, increase medicaid and medicare benefits, increase Federal retirement benefits, and increase the number of subsidized housing units for the elderly, we cannot permit these organizations to be penalized under our tax laws. The dissipation of resources dedicated to such a social good must be terminated. Certainly we do not want to foist upon the taxpayers burdens heretofore borne by eleemosynary organizations. We must eliminate this "penalty" imposed upon those organizations. In all likelihood, Mr. Speaker, these are the only organizations which provide an absolutely necessary community service—which I might add, has been hit the hardest by rising costs—that of providing long-term care of the aged at a reduced fee for those who are least able to pay.

Mr. Speaker, in order to correct this serious situation, I am today introducing legislation to amend section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code to include homes for the aged, handicapped, and children. The result will be to exclude them from the definition of private foundations.

Mr. Speaker, I am also introducing legislation to amend section 4940 of the Internal Revenue Code to change the levy on all private foundations "excise tax" to a "service charge," and reducing it from 4 percent to 1½ percent. One purpose of these changes is to firmly establish the principle that this levy is intended only to cover the cost of audits, and is not a revenue producing device. The threats facing our charitable institutions, which are a major strength of the United States, are great enough without the added threat of being slowly devoured by taxation.

Certainly we do realize that private charitable institutions are a major force for good in this country, and worth preserving and encouraging. The ever growing role of government in our society is too often accompanied by distressing conformity, and lack of initiative. Lest we destroy all diversity in this country, and levy ever higher taxes on our citizens in the process, we should recognize the great value of our private and charitable institutions.

In addition to establishing the proper role of the section 4940 levy as only to cover the cost of audits, the reduction of it to 1½ percent is justified by the fact that at the present, the cost of audits is running far below the amount being raised by this section. According to the Department of the Treasury, in its first full year the 4 percent tax produced $33.9 million, while related IRS expenses totaled only $19.3 million. Since these figures do not include the amount of penalties assessed, or additional income produced by the audits, it seems entirely consistent with the purpose of section 4940 to reduce it to 1½ percent, which is the actual cost of auditing.

Mr. Speaker, to some people this will appear as a "tax loophole." Well, as it is used, that label which often comes with sinister connotations—is appropriate. But, as with many other exemptions, exclusions, deductions, and credits in our tax laws, there is a sound purpose for this tax-free status. In addition to doing something that government by its nature cannot do, namely assure diversity in our country, these private institutions also fill needs of our society much more cheaply than government could ever do. And, in the process, they do it in a self-reliant, compassionate way that government seldom evidences.

SALT AND AFTERWARD

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the historic SALT accords signed by the President in Moscow a little more than a month ago will shortly be before this body for approval. Much to my dismay these SALT agreements have not resulted in decreased defense spending, but rather the Defense Department is attempting to accelerate our weapons production under the SALT umbrella.

The administration has rationalized this increase in defense spending by calling it a necessary "bargaining chip" for

future SALT talks. I however find such an argument to be unconvincing. Both sides now have more than enough nuclear weapons to serve as bargaining chips for future arms limitation agreements. The way to limit weapons is not to build more of them.

I would like to call attention to a report entitled "Salt and Afterward" written by the Center for Defense Information and which appears in the June 30, 1972, edition of their publication, the Defense Monitor. This report is required reading for all those who are still under the misperception that the United States gave away too much in the SALT agreement or who share the administration's belief that the way to limit nuclear weapons is to build more of them.

The report follows:

SALT AND AFTERWARD

The SALT accords, signed May 26th in Moscow and now before the US Congress for approval, were written in the face of a rapidly moving nuclear arms race.

At the time of the signing the United States was installing multiple independently targetable warheads (MIRV) on its land and sea-based missiles. It was going forward with a program to greatly expand the destructive power of its strategic bombers by equipping them with short range attack missiles (SRAM). Together these steps would increase the US strategic nuclear warhead and bomb total from about 5700 in 1972 to more than 10,000 in 1976. On top of this the United States was developing a new strategic submarine called Trident, with new missiles to go with it, and a new strategic bomber, the B–1.

Meanwhile, the Soviet Union was building new intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) launchers at a rate of 250 per year. These included silos for the huge SS9 missile, capable of carrying 25 megatons (a US Minuteman II carries about 1 to 2 megatons). The Soviets had dug 25 silos possibly for a new missile even larger than the SS9. They were building new nuclear-powered strategic ballistic missile submarines at a rate of 7 to 9 per year, and could at this rate have twice as many such submarines as the United States in five years. The Russians were, however, years behind in MIRV. They were working on MIRV technology but had yet to test what US technicians considered to be a MIRV system.

Thus, the two superpowers were running their nuclear race in different ways. The United States was concentrating on MIRV, while holding its missile totals constant and reducing megatons. The Soviet Union was increasing numbers of missile launchers and deploying larger vehicles to carry fewer warheads but with greater megatonnage. Both sides were developing anti-ballistic missile (ABM) systems.

For the question "Who's ahead?" there were as many answers as there were ways to measure the strategic arms balance.

In numbers of ICBM launchers, the Soviet Union had come from behind and passed the United States.

In numbers of submarine missile launch tubes the Soviets were catching up, and would in a few years pass the United States.

In numbers of heavy bombers the United States had a 3 to 1 lead.

In numbers of separately targetable nuclear weapons, the United States had a 2 to 1 lead, and because of this country's head start in MIRV, this lead was rapidly widening in favor of the United States.

In total megatons the Soviets had about a 2 or 3 to 1 lead.

When all these measures were considered together the Soviet Union clearly had come from a position of nuclear inferiority at the time of the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis to a position which many weapons experts saw as parity, and which some viewed with alarm as indicating future Soviet superiority unless the United States speeded up its weapons programs.

THE ACCORDS

The SALT accords consist of a treaty limiting ABMs, a five-year Interim Agreement which puts certain partial limits on offensive weapons development pending further arms talks, a protocol to this Interim Agreement, and a number of statements of "interpretation" some agreed and some unilateral. Based on all these documents, the following is a summary of the main provisions of the accords:

ABM TREATY

Each country agrees not to build an ABM system for defense of its entire territory or major region. This amounts to a pledge that neither will try to upset the present deterrent balance by deploying ABMs to protect its general population and industry.

Each will limit ABM systems to two sites—one in defense of its national capital, the other in defense of an ICBM field. These must be at least 1300 kilometers (800 miles) apart, which means the Soviet ICBM field to be protected must be east of the Ural Mountains, away from the major western USSR population centers.

No more than 100 ABM launchers and 100 intercepter missiles may be deployed at each site.

Restrictions are set on numbers, types and placement of ABM radars to foreclose a radar capability for nationwide defense of either country.

In addition to these basic provisions, the two countries agree to ban sea-based, air-based, space-based or mobile land-based ABMs; not to deploy ABM systems of new kinds without prior discussion; not to convert air-defense or other systems to an ABM role; not to build radars for early warning of strategic ballistic missiles except along the edges of the country facing out; not to transfer ABM systems to other states or deploy them overseas.

There is no on-site inspection. Each side will use its own technical means of verification and each pledges not to interfere with these means or resort to deliberate concealment.

A Standing Consultative Commission will be established to implement the treaty and consider questions involving it.

The ABM treaty is of unlimited duration but either side can withdraw for supreme interest.

The treaty would require the United States to cut back its 12-site ABM program (of which four sites have been approved by Congress) to a maximum of 2. The Administration plans to complete the ABM site on which construction is farthest ahead—at the ICBM field at Grand Forks, N.D. It will halt work on three other sites at ICBM fields and has asked Congress to approve an ABM site at Washington, D.C. The treaty permits Russia to continue its ABM site already under construction at Moscow and to start a second site at an ICBM field.

INTERIM AGREEMENT AND PROTOCOL

These deal with offensive nuclear weapons. In general they limit the numbers of ICBMs, ballistic missile submarines, and submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs) to levels which each side agrees are presently deployed or under construction. These limitations are for five years, pending further SALT talks. With agreed "interpretations" the limitations are as follows:

No additional fixed, land-based ICBM launchers may be started during the freeze above the numbers deployed and "under active construction" at the time of signing—1054 for the United States, and about 1618 for the Soviet Union.

Launchers for so-called "light" ICBMs (the US Minuteman and Soviet SS11 and 13) and "older" ICBMs (the US Titan and Soviet SS7 and 8) may not be replaced by "modern heavy ICBMs" (the Soviet SS9). The SS9 class missiles may, however, be made heavier. Russia has 288 SS9s now and 25 apparently larger silos dug. It could therefore end up with 313 "modern heavy" ICBMs of SS9 size or larger. The United States has no "modern heavy" ICBMs and plans none.

Within these restrictions, ICBMs may be replaced with more modern ones—for example with MIRV. But in the process of modernization, launchers may not be increased in size more than 10–15%.

The number of launchers for submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs) each side presently had deployed or under construction was stipulated to be 656 US and 740 USSR. These numbers can be increased subject to two provisions:

Additional SLBM launchers may become operational only as replacements for an equal number of "older" ICBM launchers (first deployed prior to 1964) or for launchers on older nuclear-powered submarines or for modern SLBM launchers on any type of submarines.

During the five year freeze the US is limited to 44 modern ballistic missile submarines and 710 SLBM launchers. The Soviet Union is limited to 62 modern ballistic missile submarines and 950 SLBM launchers.

As in the case of ICBMs, submarine missile systems can be modernized. Single-warhead missiles can be replaced by MIRVed missiles. New submarines can be substituted for old.

Destruction or dismantling of old ICBMs or submarine missiles must begin by the start of sea trials of a replacement ballistic missile submarine.

Each side agrees not to significantly increase its number of test and training launchers for ICBMs or SLBMs.

There were several unresolved points of *disagreement* in the accords:

The Soviet Union stated unilaterally that if US allies in NATO should increase their numbers of ballistic missile submarines beyond those presently in operation or under construction the Soviet Union would have the right to make a corresponding increase in its number of submarines.

The United States was unable to get agreement on a common definition of "heavy" ICBMs. The US considers it to be any missile bigger than the largest existing "light" ICBM which is the Soviet SS11.

The United States was unable to get agreement to include mobile ICBMs in the freeze. (Mobile ABMs are banned.) The United States declared unilaterally that deployment of mobile ICBMs during the freeze would be considered "inconsistent with the objectives" of the agreement.

WHAT THE ACCORDS MEAN: FROM AN ARMS CONTROL VIEW

The SALT accords can be examined from several viewpoints. One of these is the viewpoint of international arms control—that is, in terms of what effect the accords will have on the arms race.

Among the achievements in this regard:

The SALT accords represent the first—even though partial—limitations by the United States and Soviet Union dealing with the fundamentals of their arms race. Previously, the two countries had agreed to bar nuclear weapons from the Antarctic, from outer space, and from the sea bed. They had agreed not to test them in the atmosphere, underwater or in space and not to give them to other countries. But never had the two superpowers reached agreement on the nuclear weapons targeted at each other.

The ABM treaty bans the kind of ABM system which could be most de-stabilizing—a nation-wide or major regional defense of population and industry. Such a system,

undertaken by either country, could threaten the other's deterrent and cause it to respond with additional offensive buildup. The complex restrictions of ABM sites should convince each side the other is not developing an ABM for defense of large areas. The treaty rules out a US ABM for population defense against China, which this country once planned but later abandoned.

Freezing ICBMs, SLBMs, and ballistic missile submarines at levels deployed and under construction is a first step in limiting offensive nuclear weapons, a step on which future SALT talks can build. Broadly speaking, the accords accommodate themselves to the different kinds of offensive weapons buildup which each side now has underway—Soviet construction of more and bigger missiles and US MIRV. They allow each side to substantially complete the round it now has in progress. The new levels become the starting point for attempting to freeze the arms race.

Among the debits from an arms control viewpoint:

Except for ABMs the accords do not stop any of the major weapons programs now in progress. This is because numerical limits are set high, qualitative improvements are allowed, and many weapons systems—including bombers, air-defense, anti-submarine warfare, air-breathing strategic missiles and tactical nuclear weapons—are not covered. Under SALT the United States can continue conversion of Minuteman and Polaris to MIRV, development of Trident submarines with new missiles, the B–1 bomber, research on "site defense" for ICBMs, submarine launched cruise (air breathing) missiles and new submarines in which to carry them. The Soviet Union can continue, up to a point, building additional land and sea-based missile launchers, and could develop and deploy MIRV.

Because all these programs are allowed, and because numerical limits are set so high, military planners on each side will still point to future possibilities rather than existing or likely forces to justify their own building programs.

FROM A U.S. SECURITY VIEW

The accords can also be looked at from a much narrower view of US military security:

Advantages:

Since only the Soviet Union is presently building up its numbers of offensive weapons launchers, it is to the advantage of the United States to put ceilings on these numbers. Within the totals the number of "heavy" ICBMs Russia can have is limited to 313. Without SALT, the Soviet Union could, at present rates of construction, exceed the freeze ceiling. Instead of 62 modern ballistic missile submarines it could have 80 or 90. The US has had no plans to add to its numbers of ICBMs or build "heavy" ones. It could, under the freeze, build 13 Trident submarines. Defense Secretary Laird has said only ten are planned. Actually the first Tridents would not become operational until after the 5-year freeze, and are therefore more related to future rounds of SALT than the first.

Freezing the number of ICBM launchers, especially "heavy" ones will leave only one route for the Soviet Union to develop increased "counterforce" capability to knock out US ICBMs—qualitative improvements such as increased accuracy, MIRVing, and throw weight.

The ABM limit plus the limits on ICBM numbers lessen the chance that the Soviet Union could develop the capability for a successful "first strike"—that is, the ability to knock out enough US missiles to suffer no or substantially less damage in return.

Criticisms:

A number of criticisms have been made against the treaty on US security grounds:

The accords allow the Soviet Union to have more ICBM launchers, SLBMs and ballistic missile submarines than the United States.

Only the Soviet Union can have "modern heavy" ICBMs, with capacity to carry more megatons or more MIRVs than US missiles.

The Soviet Union will retain advantage in total megatonnage and throw weight.

Though ICBM numbers are frozen at levels deployed and under active construction, the Russians did not specify exactly how many they have under construction. The United States considers the freeze level to be 1618 for the Soviet Union.

In reply to these criticisms, Administration officials have said that without the SALT ceilings, assuming recent Soviet construction rates were to continue, the Russians could have, in 1977, more than 2000 ICBMs instead of the 1618 permitted; 1200 SLBMs instead of the 950 permitted and 80 to 100 modern ballistic missile submarines instead of the 62 permitted. As to Russia's refusal to specify its ICBM total, U.S. officials said that if the Russians were to significantly add to the number 1618, the United States would quickly know about it and would have the right to withdraw from the treaty.

An important factor in the security controversy is MIRV. If the Soviet Union does not develop MIRV, it will still have little more than 2500 warheads five years from now when the United States will, under presently planned programs, have more than 10,000.

If the Soviets do develop MIRV, two key questions will be: How fast? And how much?

The Soviet Union appears to be years behind this country in MIRV. The United States began MIRV tests in August, 1968. The first squadron of Minuteman III missiles became operational Jan. 8, 1971; the first wing of 150, on Dec. 13, 1971. The Soviet Union has also been working on multiple warhead technology since about August, 1968, but according to U.S. officials it has yet to test a MIRV system as the United States knows the term. The Russians tested a triple warhead system in which the warheads may or may not have been independently targetable. (U.S. analysts differed on this point.) But these tests stopped in late 1970, suggesting that the Russians might have decided to start over on a new tack.

Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird said June 5 that Russia "could have a MIRV capability in 24 months." But he did not say how many they might have by then.

Senator Henry Jackson (D-Wash.) has said that when the Soviets achieve MIRV ". . . the combination of their vastly superior payload and modern MIRV technology will give them superiority in warheads." There have been published reports that Soviet missiles larger than SS9s could hold up to 20 MIRVs each. (A U.S. Minuteman holds up to 3; a Poseidon, 10 to 14.) But other defense analysts believe this overstates what Russia could realistically achieve in MIRV during the next five years.

Table V shows the Center for Defense Information's calculation of what the Soviet Union probably could achieve in MIRV during the five years of the Interim Agreement, if it develops MIRV. At the end of five years it would have some 3800 warheads compared to more than 10,000 for the United States.

Assuming Russia could MIRV its missiles to the maximum figures indicated in public print, it could have more than 14,000 warheads. It is doubtful Russia could achieve this level in five years. The United States could also have 14,000 warheads by MIRVing all its Minutemen and building the B–1 and Trident. This would be permitted by the SALT Interim Agreement.

However, such calculations of marginal advantages for the United States or Soviet Union—whether they be in warheads, launchers or megatons—overlook one important point: Both countries have the power to destroy each other several times over, and this will remain the case during the five years of the Interim Agreement.

Gerard Smith, director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, when asked during hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee June 19 whether Russia would get ahead of the United States during the five year agreement, replied: "Nothing the Soviets can do within the five year agreement will offset the present strategic balance between the US and USSR."

COST

The immediate cost impact of the SALT accords on the fiscal 1973 defense budget has been listed by the Defense Department as follows:

Reducing ABM program to two sites, minus $711 million.

Increases in other strategic programs:

Accelerate and complete development of Site Defense, plus 60 million.

Develop submarine-based cruise missile, plus 20 million.

Accelerate bomber rebasing, plus 45 million.

Augment verification capabilities, plus 13 million.

Develop improved reentry vehicles for ICBMs and SLBMs, plus 20 million.

Improved command, control and communications, plus 10 million.

Net change, minus $543 million.

Secretary Laird has testified that the total ABM saving through 1981 as a result of SALT would be $9.9 billion, figured in 1968 prices. (The 1968 estimate for a 12-site ABM was $18.4 billion, of which $13.4 billion remains to be spent. The 1968 estimate for a two-site program was $8.5 billion, of which $3.5 billion remains to be spent. The SALT saving is $13.4 billion minus $3.5 billion.)

Further savings could come from the first round of SALT if the United States decided that, as a result of the recent accords, it could safely stop or slow down some of its other major nuclear weapons programs, such as Trident, the B–1, or air defense. The Administration wants to go ahead with these programs. The question of what this country's pace in nuclear weapons building should be following the first round of SALT has become a major issue.

POLICY FOLLOWING SALT

Secretary Laird told newsmen June 6: "I could not support the (SALT) agreements if Congress fails to act on the movement forward of the Trident system, on the B–1 bomber, and the other programs that we have outlined to improve our strategic offensive systems during this five year period." Admiral Moorer said the Joint Chiefs were in accord with the SALT agreements provided the other programs went ahead.

In a briefing for Senators and Congressmen June 15, Dr. Henry Kissinger, assistant to the President for national security, considerably moderated this stand. He said the Administration wants Congressional approval of both SALT and the new weapons programs but: "We are not making them conditional. We are saying that the treaty is justified on its merits, but we are also saying that the requirements of national security impel us in the direction of the strategic programs . . ."

Laird told the House Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations June 5 that "Just as the Moscow agreements were made possible by our successful action in such programs as Safeguard, Poseidon and Minuteman III, these future negotiations to which we are pledged can only succeed if we are equally successful in implementing such programs as the Trident system, the B–1 bomber, NCA defense, Site Defense, SLCM, and accelerated satellite basing of strategic bombers. We must also initiate certain other measures in areas such as intelligence, verification, and command, control, and communications."

Transmitting the SALT agreements to Congress, President Nixon said: "Just as the

maintenance of a strong strategic posture was an essential element in the success of these negotiations, it is now equally essential that we carry forward a sound strategic modernization program to maintain our security and to ensure that more permanent and comprehensive arms limitation agreements can be reached."

The Administration's argument is that if the United States had not been deploying MIRVs and going forward with other programs it would have lacked the bargaining power to obtain a ceiling on Soviet building of SS9s and other systems.

Others have challenged this "bargaining chip" approach. Sen George McGovern told the Priorities Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee June 16 that if the United States had followed a policy of restraint in weapons building, both American and Soviet MIRVs could have been stopped. He said building weapons for bargaining purposes "can only push up the terms of ultimate arms control agreements."

The Arms Control Association said: "The US should review its unilateral weapons programs and pursue only those that have a security need in light of the new strategic situation." Thus, a fundamental issue has been raised—whether the way to ultimately curb the nuclear arms race is to build more weapons for "negotiating strength" or whether it is to exercise more restraint in weapons building.

It is an issue which, no doubt, both the United States and Russia face as they contemplate the next round of SALT in October.

CONCLUSIONS: ARMS CONTROL

The ABM treaty bans the kind of ABM systems which would be most de-stabilizing and is therefore a significant step in limiting the arms race.

The five-year agreement on offensive weapons allows the United States and Soviet Union each to continue its present round of nuclear buildup, and then establishes a partial, quantitative freeze at the resulting new levels. This is a start which can be followed up in future SALT negotiations.

U.S. SECURITY

The accords place ceilings on numbers of offensive weapon launchers at a time when only the Soviet Union is increasing these numbers. Without the accords, Soviet construction could be greater. The offensive freeze plus the ABM limitation lessen the chances of Russia ever becoming able to launch a preemptive nuclear strike against this country without being destroyed in return.

While Russia will continue to lead the United States in numbers of launchers and total megatonnage under the accords, the United States is expected to retain its lead in numbers of warheads. These differences, however, are less important than the fact that each country has the power to destroy the other several times over.

WEAPONS POLICY

The Administration should reconsider its present policy which says that the way to limit nuclear weapons is to build more of them. Both the United States and Russia appear to have approached the recent round of SALT determined to "negotiate through strength." Each had nuclear buildups in progress. But somehow these bargaining chips didn't get bargained. They are being built. The initial round of SALT has made the US deterrent more secure. The United States now does not need to build Trident submarines and B–1 bombers and submarine cruise missiles to convince the Soviet Union that both countries have good reason to bring their arms race under control and eventually reduce nuclear arms. Each side already has more than sufficient nuclear power to bargain toward this end.

OPEN LETTER ON THE ELECTION PROCESS

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my distinguished colleagues and especially to the people of America an open letter which appeared on Friday, June 30, 1972, in the New York Times.

This letter is a warning to all Americans who believe in the direct election of their public officials, and unless we as Americans become more involved and more articulate, a small minority will threaten not only our election process but will destroy the free institutions that exist in America.

I want to ask that every American read carefully the following open letter which appeared in newspapers throughout the country including the Chicago newspapers, the New York Times, and the Wall Street Journal:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE DELEGATES OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION FROM ELECTED NONCOMMITTED DELEGATES FROM COOK COUNTY, ILL.

The basic McGovern Commission recommendation was to eliminate the convention system of selecting delegates. The Democratic Party of Illinois became one of the first in the Union to change the method of delegate selection from convention to popular election. This provided that the Democratic voters themselves would decide who would represent them at the Democratic National Convention.

An election was held on March 21, 1972. It was an open election. Anyone who wanted to run could run by filing a nomination petition containing 600 signatures. There were as many as 15 to 36 candidates in each district competing for six to eight convention delegate seats.

Fifty-nine uncommitted delegates were elected. It is inconceivable that hundreds of thousands of voters should be disenfranchised after having cast their votes in accordance with the statutes of the State of Illinois and the Constitution of the United States.

The uncommitted delegates endorse the McGovern Rules providing there should be proper representation of all elements in society, but in an open election it is *impossible* to guarantee established quotas of blacks, women, young people and other categories. The laws of the United States provide that the voter alone has the right to decide who shall hold office.

The motives of the challengers who are seeking to disenfranchise the hundreds of thousands of voters are highly questionable. It is significant that some of the challengers who now seek to become delegates did not offer themselves to the people as candidates in the March 21 election. Instead, they organized caucuses after the election to select themselves and their friends and those who were defeated by the voters.

In the caucuses the challengers violated almost every rule of the state party and the McGovern Commission. They closed the doors to everyone but themselves and the defeated candidates. They are asking the Convention to disenfranchise the hundreds of thousands of voters who went to the polls and cast their votes for the delegates of their choice. The challengers have substituted for the voter's choice the very candidates who were defeated in a regular, legal election and those who never stood for election.

It is a shocking commentary on our democratic process that the credentials committee of the National Democratic Convention is being asked seriously to consider the action of a self-appointed group of individuals who decided to select themselves as representatives of hundreds of thousands of citizens of Cook County for the selection of a nominee for President of the United States.

Since we were legally elected, we are entitled to be part of the Illinois delegation at the National Convention.

(NOTE.—This advertisement prepared and paid for by Elected Non-Committed Delegates of Cook County: Claire Roddewig, Janie Bailey, Co-Chairmen; Information Committee.)

U.S. FOREIGN INVESTMENT POLICY AND THE MULTINATIONAL ENTERPRISE

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 21, 1972, Prof. Robert B. Stobaugh of the Harvard Business School appeared before the Republican task force on international economic policy, of which I have recently become a member. Following this seminar on "Foreign Economic Policy in the 1970's" I had the occasion to discuss further, at length with Professor Stobaugh, the implications of his testimony and those of the other participants. These included representatives from the administration, the business community, the labor unions, and the League of Women Voters. In what was a very illuminating and candid dialog, the focal issue became more and more that of labor's views of international finance, trade, and the multinational U.S. enterprise, as evidenced in the Hartke-Burke legislation now before the Congress.

And as regards these considerations, the presentation of Dr. Stobaugh was extremely timely and thought provoking. Dr. Stobaugh is eminently well qualified to speak on such matters having worked first as head of the International Division of Monsanto Corp., and then having taught for several years in the international business area at the Harvard Business School. He recently was responsible for a study of "U.S. Multinational Enterprises and the U.S. Economy," under contract with the U.S. Department of Commerce.

This study, published by Commerce in "The Multinational Corporation: Studies on U.S. Foreign Investment," vol. I, sought to shed new light on what effects foreign direct investment has on employment with a specific focus on the effects of foreign direct investments by U.S. multinational enterprises. As of the date of this study's publication, despite this interest, no previous study had provided a relevant basis for policy formulation.

Dr. Stobaugh's research revealed that investments in factories abroad by the large U.S. firms usually have a favorable effect on both U.S. employment and on the U.S. balance of payments.

As my colleagues are aware, there is today in many quarters, widespread interest in, and general confusion concerning what role multinational enterprises have now and can have in the future, vis-a-vis U.S. foreign investment policy. I thus strongly recommend to my colleagues the following provocative testimony of Dr. Stobaugh on this question. I am sure my colleagues will want to consider as especially pertinent Dr. Stobaugh's proposals concerning first, an international agreement on trade in services, analogous to the GATT on trade in goods; and second, an adequate program to retrain workers who lose their jobs because of imports.

These and other considerations raised in Dr. Stobaugh's presentation are issues of importance to us all regardless of politics. The Congress cannot waste any time in giving serious attention to such matters on their merit.

Dr. Stobaugh's experience and knowledge in this field dictates that just such a consideration be given the following presentation:

U.S. FOREIGN INVESTMENT POLICY AND THE MULTINATIONAL ENTERPRISE

(Statement of Prof. Robert B. Stobaugh, Harvard Business School)

There are two types of foreign investments—portfolio and direct. In a portfolio investment the investor owns shares in a company but does not control its operations. In direct investment the investor not only owns part or all of the company but also controls its operations. Our discussion this morning deals only with foreign direct investment, since by definition a firm must control its foreign affiliates to be called a multinational enterprise.

Other criteria used to define multinational enterprises, such as size of sales or spread of foreign operations, are quite arbitrary. In order to obtain a list of firms to study, we at Harvard Business School arbitrarily took *Fortune* magazine's annual list of the 500 largest U.S. firms and their annual list of the 200 largest foreign firms and selected those companies manufacturing in six or more foreign countries. These firms account for a substantial part of all foreign direct investment; for example, the 187 U.S. firms that met our criteria account for three-fourths of all U.S. foreign direct investment in manufacturing.[1]

Foreign direct investment, and this is largely investment by multinational enterprises, has been growing faster than either world production or world trade. From 1950 to 1970, the output from facilities owned by foreign direct investors grew at an annual rate of 10 per cent, compared with annual growth rates of slightly less than 8 per cent for the non-communist world's Gross National Product and slightly more than 8 per cent for the non-communist world's trade. As a result, by 1970 the output from the facilities owned by foreign direct investors was 6 per cent of the non-communist world's GNP and about the same size as the non-communist world's trade.[2]

About 60 per cent of all foreign direct investment is owned by American companies, and another 10 per cent is invested in the United States by foreign companies. Thus, the United States is involved in 70 per cent of all foreign direct investment.[3]

By the end of this year the book value of U.S. foreign direct investment will approximate $100 billion. About 90 per cent of this investment is equally distributed among three major geographical areas: Europe, Canada, and the less developed countries as a group. Manufacturing is the largest industrial sector, followed by petroleum.

This prelude, I hope, has sketched the outlines of the subject. For those of you interested in more data, I recommend Part III of a recent Department of Commerce publication entitled "The Multinational Corporation."[4]

Even though these figures are impressive, they still understate the importance of multinational enterprises, for these enterprises dominate many of the advanced-technology industries, such as computers, pharmaceuticals, and chemicals, as well as certain other important manufacturing industries, such as petroleum products, automobiles, and farm machinery. To an important extent, the economic health of the United States depends upon the economic health of its multinational enterprises. They account for one-third of total sales of U.S. manufacturing firms.[5] They do two-thirds of the nation's privately funded industrial research and development.[6]

I am sure that you are aware of some of the criticisms aimed at multinational enterprises, especially the charge of exporting jobs. However, a number of studies, including one recently completed under my direction, have concluded that foreign investments by U.S. enterprises have a positive effect on both U.S. employment and the U.S. balance of payments. We estimate that if there were no U.S. foreign direct investment, some 600,000 jobs in the United States would be lost; and continuing research indicates that the 600,000 is a very conservative figure.

The reason why U.S. foreign direct investment creates rather than destroys American jobs is that such investment is primarily defensive, in the sense that the investor is trying to maintain his place in the world market.[7] Over 90 percent of the output of the foreign plants of American firms is sold abroad. The amount imported into the United States is less than one-quarter of our total imports of manufactured goods, and a substantial portion of this quarter is a result of one special arrangement: the U.S.-Canadian Automobile Agreement.

Given a choice, the U.S. enterprise had rather produce in the United States than go abroad. But in most cases it does not have this alternative—if it does not expand abroad, it would lose its market to foreign companies, usually large ones from Europe or Japan. This applies to its U.S. markets that it serves from its foreign plants as well as to its foreign markets. The retention of these markets by U.S. enterprises provides U.S. jobs in the home office and in research and development laboratories. Further, it provides U.S. jobs for production workers manufacturing components, finished products, and capital equipment for export to the foreign operations.

These exports of goods, of course, not only have a favorable effect on employment, but also on the U.S. balance of payments. In addition to these exports, multinational enterprises have another favorable effect on the U.S. balance of payments; they are major exporters of services. In fact, one way to view the multinational enterprise is that it is an exporter of management and technology rather than primarily an exporter of capital. Indeed, most of the funds invested abroad by U.S. firms are obtained abroad through depreciation allowances, retained earnings, and borrowings. This point is underscored by the relatively small impact that the U.S. capital export control program has had on total U.S. foreign direct investment. The health of the U.S. balance of payments depends now to an important extent, and will depend even more in the future, on the dividends, management fees, and royalties received by its multinational enterprises.

Against this background of information, let us consider what arrangements exist to facilitate international trade in goods and services. To facilitate the flow of goods, we have the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), to which most of the trading nations of the world subscribe. This agreement lays down rules of the game aimed at four goals: (1) a reduction in import restrictions; (2) non-discrimination among countries; (3) the settlement of trade disputes; and (4) the grant of waivers from any GATT commitment upon the basis of an international consensus. GATT has been an important vehicle in increasing world trade.

In stark contrast to GATT, there is a vacuum on the international scene when we consider trade in services. There is no international agreement to facilitate the flow of services, such as management and technology. Foreign countries are taking a variety of actions to reduce U.S. income received from the export of such services. In some cases after an indigenous firm has reached agreement with an American firm on the size of a royalty fee, a foreign government has intervened to reduce the royalty below the agreed fee. And, of course, a number of countries restrict the amount of dividends, management fees and royalties that can be paid by a subsidiary to its parent; and in some cases the payment of management fees is not allowed at all. Furthermore, the restrictions on ownership of local subsidiaries at times have the effect of reducing exports of American management. Finally, in some countries there is the ultimate threat—that of nationalization.

A new international agreement is becoming necessary to facilitate continued increases of trade in services. It could be part of GATT, or perhaps a separate organization, one we might call a General Agreement on Foreign Direct Investment. Whatever route is taken, the establishment of such an agreement should be a major goal of U.S. foreign economic policy.

Now I have put forward this suggestion from the viewpoint of the United States, yet I think that it also would be welcomed by foreign countries. Most nations welcome foreign direct investment because it brings petition, and access to export markets. Indeed, the goals of multinational enterprises typically are similar to the goals of nations, such as increased output, greater efficiency, and greater exports. But government officials tend to be uneasy about multinational enterprises because these firms are so big. Although the size of any one enterprise's operations might be quite small in relation to the nation's revenues, the governmental official knows that he is dealing with an enterprise which in many cases is more powerful economically than his nation.

Although multinational enterprises are willing to abide by the laws of a nation, the governmental official cannot predict an enterprise's behavior, since this behavior in any one country is dependent on the firm's worldwide situation. Sometimes this behavior helps a nation and sometimes hurts it. For any given nation, the enterprise's behavior at times can help it and at other times hurt it. Governments naturally do not like the randomness of the outcome. For example, they would prefer a less favorable, but relatively stable, balance of payments rather than a more favorable balance with large random swings. The situation is much like that of the elephant keeper and the elephant. The keeper likes the benefits of having an elephant, but he doesn't want to get squashed inadvertently when the elephant rolls over in his sleep.

A reduction of the uncertainty surrounding the operations of the multinational enterprise would surely reduce tensions and increase the receptivity of host nations to foreign direct investment. Most of these tensions have been discussed by others, but several deserve special highlighting now.

Footnotes at end of article.

Perhaps the most pressing problem is that of short-term capital flows. Because multinational enterprises and the amount of trade controlled by them have grown much more rapidly than the currency reserves of nations, it is now possible for relatively routine short-term capital movements by multinational enterprises to cause severe balance-of-payments problems to a nation. It is only good business for a firm to borrow in countries with low rather than high interest rates and conversely to invest any "excess" funds in countries with high rather than low interest rates. Further, it is only good business to delay sending funds into, and to move funds out of, nations whose currency is expected to be devalued; a multinational enterprise can accomplish this quite easily by delaying or speeding up the payments of intercompany accounts.

To determine the effect of such actions on both the firms and the governments, we developed a computer model of a simple multinational enterprise system.[8] When our model was programmed to operate as a number of independent units dealing with one another on an arm's-length basis, the countries in our model experienced little variation in their balances of payments. In contrast, when the model was programmed for the enterprise to adopt a financial policy to maximize its profits, all countries in all years experienced widely varying balance-of-payment positions. In some countries the span of oscillations was over 40 times that experienced under the arm's-length policy. Of course, the massive changes in the balances of payments of the countries in our model may exaggerate the result that would occur in the real world. Nevertheless, the model results are likenesses of reality and there is evidence to believe that the policies of multinational enterprises have a potential of bringing about major adjustments in currency relationships.

The importance in the real world of the multinational enterprises' financial policies to the balances of payments may be seen in several ways: One is the size of the enterprises' holdings of liquid assets relative to the currency reserves of central banks. We estimate that the amount of cash and marketable securities held by the 100 largest U.S. multinational enterprises exceeds the central reserves of any nation in the world. Second, the size of the intercompany accounts are substantial. For example, if all debts owed the U.S. parents by foreign affiliates were paid immediately, the currency reserves of the United States would triple; such flows would deplete a considerable portion of the currency reserves of many countries.

For another example, we take the case of Britain and make reasonable assumptions about the size of imports and exports of multinational enterprises. We estimate that a three-month change in credit terms on both imports and exports of all multinational enterprises, both U.S. and foreign, could wipe out all of Britain's reserves. Although it is unlikely that all multinational enterprises would act in concert, it is equally clear that their potential actions can have a real effect on a nation's currency reserves. This is an area that is ripe for international agreement.

Governmental revenues are another point of tension between enterprises and nations. The pricing of goods and services sold from one unit in a corporate network to another affect governmental revenues by locating profits in one tax jurisdiction rather than another; also, of course, custom duties are determined by these prices. Some national tax collectors, such as the U.S. Internal Revenue Service, have been aggressive in collecting taxes on the basis of arm's-length prices for goods and services sold between units of a system. The problem is that most goods and services sold between units of a system do not have a true arm's-length price, because they are never sold to the public in the quantity or quality sold within the system. For example, when Ford imported hundreds of thousands of parts from abroad to put into the Ford Pinto, there was no comparable sale of goods anywhere in the world and hence no perfect method of obtaining a "true" arm's-length price.

Multinational enterprises have at times paid taxes to two national governments on the same profits. This has occurred when the IRS increased the enterprises' taxes by adjusting intercompany transfer prices to show greater U.S. profit and a lower foreign profit on sales that took place several years prior to the adjustment. In many cases, the companies were not able to obtain a tax rate from the foreign government for taxes already paid. As more governments become sensitive to the question of intercompany transfer prices—partially because of training received from our Treasury Department—multinational enterprises are likely to be caught between two national governments, each demanding a tax on the same profit. The U.S. Revenue Act of 1971 was a major advance in solving this problem, for the law allows a U.S. company to choose one of several standard methods in determining the price of goods sold to an affiliated export corporation. A major tension point would be removed if an agreement on allowing standard methods of pricing intercompany accounts could be reached among a number of nations. Of course, it is possible to reach such agreements bilaterally, but the multilateral approach would be much more efficient.

Other points of tension are differing antitrust standards in different countries, the attempt by the U.S. government to force foreign corporations controlled by American firms to adhere to American laws in shipping to Communist countries, the allocation of export markets by an enterprise among various of its affiliates, and inadequate reporting by enterprise to governments.

In addition to these oft-mentioned tensions, new problems will emerge and the multinational enterprise when properly guided can be an important instrument in solving them. Take pollution, for example, the adoption and maintenance of worldwide pollution standards by multinational enterprises would be an important contributor to clean air and water.

What would be the view of the multinational enterprises to a General Agreement on Foreign Direct Investment? I believe that as long as they are treated equally with their competitors, they would welcome such an agreement. It would reduce their uncertainty. Over the long run most of these enterprises foresee a chaotic growth of national controls, some of which would place them at a disadvantage with their competitors. For example, current proposals in the United States to tax the earnings of American-controlled subsidiaries abroad as soon as they earn a profit rather than when they remit dividends to the United States would place the Americans at a serious disadvantage vis-a-vis some of their foreign competitors.

Another advantage of the enterprises of such an agreement is that management would be spared from worrying over many tension-laden points and could then concentrate on their special expertise of developing, producing, and distributing a wide range of new products in a highly efficient manner.

Regardless of any action taken to facilitate trade in services, there is another problem crying for immediate action. Adequate assistance should be provided to U.S. workers who lose their jobs because of imports. Although most U.S. imports are not by multinational enterprises, such enterprises will be affected by any legislation passed to protect workers. There is little doubt that U.S. efforts under the 1962 Trade Expansion Act to aid worker adjustment have not been sufficient, although such efforts have been increased substantially in recent years. Sufficient research has not been performed to indicate the amount of funds needed to facilitate worker adjustment nor the methods most appropriate, but successful efforts in Europe have involved the expenditure of several billions of dollars. Any such program should aim at moving workers out of the mature industries that are not competitive internationally into the newer high-technology industries in which the U.S. has a comparative advantage; these industries, of course, generate larger exports of goods and services, are more profitable, and pay higher wages than the more mature industries. Such an adjustment assistance program, perhaps with the advice of labor leaders, would be more appropriate than proposals aiming at isolation of the United States from the rest of the world.

A SUMMARY

The United States Government should encourage the continued growth in the number and size of U.S. multinational enterprises for the economic health of the United States depends to an important extent on the economic health of these enterprises. Especially the balance-of-payments position of the United States is becoming increasingly dependent on these enterprises' exports of services in the form of management and technology. GATT exists to facilitate a continuing increase in world trade in goods, whereas no comparable organization exists to facilitate a continuing increase in world trade in services.

Two major steps are needed in U.S. foreign investment policy: first, we should begin negotiation of an international agreement to increase trade in services and to remove the tensions until now associated with the activities of multinational enterprises. Such an agreement would not only serve the interests of the U.S. Government, but also the interests of foreign governments as well as multinational enterprises.

The second major step needed is an adequate program to retrain workers who lose their jobs because of imports. The program should emphasize the retraining for jobs in industries in which the U.S. is competitive internationally, for these industries are faster growing, more profitable, and higher paying than the more mature industries that suffer from import competition.

FOOTNOTES

[1] See Raymond Vernon, *Sovereignty at Bay: The Multinational Spread of U.S. Enterprises* (New York: Basic Books, 1971), Chapter 1.

[2] In this calculation the output of the enterprises was placed on a "value added" basis for comparison with GNP. The total output was used for comparison with trade flows.

[3] See Christopher Tugendhat, *The Multinationals* (New York: Random House, 1972), pp. 1–6; and Bureau of International Commerce, U.S. Department of Commerce, *The Multinational Corporation* (Washington: Superintendent of Documents, 1972), Part III.

[4] Bureau of International Commerce, *op. cit.*

[5] Vernon, *op. cit.*

[6] Vernon, *op. cit.*, and National Science Foundation, *Research and Development in Industry* (Washington, D.C.), various issues.

[7] Robert B. Stobaugh and Associates, "U.S. Multinational Enterprises and the U.S. Economy," in Bureau of International Commerce, *op. cit.*

[8] Sidney M. Robbins and Robert B. Stobaugh, *Money in the Multinational Enterprise: A Study of Financial Policy* (New York: Basic Books, forthcoming).

EFFORT TO COLLECT PAST DUE DEBTS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a House concurrent resolution, with the support of Mr. MILLS of Arkansas and Mr. MORGAN of Pennsylvania, which calls upon the Treasury Department to provide to the Congress within 90 days of its passage an exact accounting of all moneys owed to the United States by foreign governments.

Our resolution specifically requires that the Department of the Treasury list those moneys owed and presently in a state of default. In addition, Mr. Speaker, the resolution directs the Treasury Department to inform the Congress as to what measures they intend to take to collect those debts known to be past due, including some $18 billion from World War I.

According to Treasury Department figures the United States is currently owed some $46 billion by other nations, of which the $18 billion from World War I is obviously delinquent, but due to a failure by the Treasury Department to age their figures, we have no way of knowing how much additional moneys may be in default.

I think it is important that we in the Congress find out how much is owed and how much is past due and what the Treasury Department plans to do about all of this. Accordingly, Mr. MILLS, Mr. MORGAN, and myself have introduced our resolution designed to produce these ends.

I further believe, Mr. Speaker, that this particular action is necessary because the Government Operations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations under the able leadership of Mr. MOORHEAD, has tried repeatedly to get the Treasury Department to provide Congress with a detailed accounting of moneys owed the United States. While progress has been realized, it has been slow and painful. I think the time has now come for the Treasury Department to realize that we in the Congress are serious about his matter and would like something done about it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I allow for the fact that the Treasury Department does not know how much money is owed the United States and that is all the more reason why they need to find out what amounts are involved and to then inform the Congress and the people of this Nation.

Confronted as we are with a very serious economic crisis of our own, we are no longer in a position where we can afford to carry these vast sums outstanding—much of which is past due and long since payable to the United States.

We as a people have been most fortunate through most of our history to have been in a position of helping other nations less fortunate than we, but the time has now come for some of these countries to recognize that they now have an obligation to pay back those moneys owed to the United States. Particularly, Mr. Speaker, since these contracts were reached in solemn agreements and remain true and just debts.

I have no quarrel with the principle of foreign aid, nor do I fault those nations current in their obligations and thus living up to the terms of their agreements, but I do think we should insist that those nations now delinquent in moneys owed pay up.

It is a simple fact, Mr. Speaker, that the United States needs money. Our debt limit has just been raised to $465 billion. The third largest item in the budget this year is for servicing the debt. If those nations owing us money from World War I were to pay up we could take some steps toward balancing our budget this year.

One could cite ad infinitum what we could do as a nation in terms of our domestic needs if these moneys past due were to be paid. The gains we could make in the areas of education, mass transit, slum clearance, pollution control, improved medical facilities; needs that are going unmet through a lack of funding because the money just is not there.

Of the $18 billion unpaid from World War I, Mr. Speaker, Great Britain alone owes over $8.5 billion; France in excess of $6 billion; the socialist states of Eastern Europe $1.5 billion, including over $800 million from the Soviet Union; and no apparent effort by any of these countries to make good their obligations.

Only Cuba, Finland, Liberia, and Nicaragua among the nations owing us money from World War I have eliminated their debts.

In addition to the World War I debts, money is still owed the United States from World War II and the American "lend-lease" program. Many nations simply stand in default on their payments and again one has to wonder whether these moneys will ever be collected.

With our own serious economic situation, with the debt limit at an all time high, with a terrible balance-of-payment problem, with deficit spending; the United States cannot idly stand by without coming to some understanding as to these funds due our Nation.

It is imperative, Mr. Speaker, that we find out what is owed to us and by whom and begin making the necessary arrangements to be paid. It is for these reasons I believe our resolution bears serious consideration by every Member of this body.

THE DURABILITY OF OUR GOVERNMENT

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, since the House of Representatives will be recessed when our country celebrates its 196th birthday, I think it is fitting that a few words be said today in commemoration of the Fourth of July, 1972.

When viewing our Nation through the lens of history, we often think of America as a young nation. But author James Michener has pointed out that the United States has the oldest existing form of government in the world. All other nations have seen their form of government interrupted or radically changed since 1776. I raise this fact to stress the durability of our governmental process, to point out how the American way of life has stood the test of time as compared with other governments.

The Fourth of July in any year is a day in which we take special pride in being Americans, in being free, in being shoppers at the greatest opportunity marketplace in the world. But July 4, 1972, should be a day for pledging to nurture that pride we feel in our Nation and to dedicate ourselves to expressing it in every aspect of our lives on every day of the year.

Like all birthdays, this is a time to reflect on the accomplishments of the past and the challenges of the future. America is not perfect, perhaps, but it still has the greatest potential for perfection in the world. There are more avenues available for change than in any other nation. There are also adequate means of safeguarding our cherished ideals. At times we forget these facts and fail to put our mistakes in perspective. The important thing is that we live in a country where mistakes can be openly discussed and then corrected.

There are undisciplined dissidents in our country who allow the rush of present events to blur their view of America's history to such an extent that the basic values on which our Nation was founded become obscured. Perhaps one of the greatest functions of Independence Day is to bring back into proper focus what America stands for. It gives each citizen an opportunity to reflect on his or her own responsibilities and obligations as well as the rights and privileges which are part of the American system.

Mr. Speaker, may July 4, 1972, be a day of special pride for all Americans and may that pride and rededication sustain our efforts throughout the year.

TRIBUTE OF THE HONORABLE BRADFORD MORSE, UNDER SECRETARY GENERAL, POLITICAL AND GENERAL ASSEMBLY AFFAIRS, OF THE UNITED NATIONS, TO THE LATE CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, United Nations Under Secretary General Bradford Morse, our former colleague here, recently expressed a most moving tribute to his long and dear friend, the late U.S. Representative, Philip J. Phil-

bin, of Massachusetts, with whom Under Secretary Morse had served for several years in the national legislature, and I am pleased to include his remarks at this point in the RECORD:

TRIBUTE TO FORMER CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN

Mr. MORSE. It was with great sorrow and a deep sense of loss that I learned of the untimely death of my former colleague, the Honorable Philip J. Philbin.

Phil was an outstanding legislator and a fine man. It was my privilege to work closely with him both as a member of the House of Representatives and as a member of the Massachusetts Congressional Delegation, and I shall always cherish the memories of his warmth and friendship. Throughout his public career, from the days as personal representative to former Senator David L. Walsh, as Special Counsel to the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, as an appointed referee of the Department of Labor, as a member of the Advisory Board of the Massachusetts Unemployment Compensation Commission, and as a highly respected member of Congress for some twenty-eight years, Phil served his constituency, his State and the Nation with devotion and marked distinction. Committed to the principles upon which this Nation was founded, he worked diligently for a more peaceful world, and his kindness, wisdom and compassion for others will long be remembered.

Phil Philbin was a learned and cultured man, and a truly dedicated public servant. His fine qualities won him the lasting affection and respect of all who knew him, and his loss is shared by many. I join the many others in extending my deepest sympathies to his family.

MR. HOWARD CULLMAN PASSES

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, I rise in sorrow and with a deep sense of loss at the parting of Howard S. Cullman.

Howard Cullman was a neighbor and a friend. To know him was a privilege. His interest and commitment to our country never faltered, but seemed to grow with the years. He cared deeply about the arts and the theater; he loved his battles for and on behalf of the Port Authority of New York, and he presided as commissioner and chairman over one of the most successful authorities of our time—a time that has witnessed the development of LaGuardia, Kennedy, Newark, and Teterboro airports and the world's largest bus terminal, on Manhattan's West Side.

He thoroughly enjoyed his service under President Eisenhower as U.S. Commissioner General with the rank of Ambassador at the Brussels World's Fair.

The Beekman Downtown Hospital was a special and devoted interest of Howard Cullman which he sustained from the very beginning—and his commitment was extended to the need for private hospitals which could provide quality care for all.

Howard Cullman is perhaps best remembered by many for his championship of the worker, exemplified in his promotion of fairness in the administration of workmen's compensation laws, though not the least of his activities were his jousts with Congressman ROONEY.

Howard will be missed by countless friends, but many of them will be sustained by his memory and the constant reminder of his projects, his spirit, and the twinkle in his eye which never left him.

Mrs. Reid and I extend our deepest sympathies—sympathies which I am sure that all Members of the House share—to his wonderful wife and creative partner, Peggy Cullman, and his four children, Hugh, Paul Thomas, Brian and Marguerite, his 11 grandchildren, and all other members of the family.

GEN. WILLIAM C. WESTMORELAND

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed emotions that I stand here and pay honor to the Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, Gen. William Childs Westmoreland, who retires today.

I feel a deep sense of pride in the fact that this country has produced such an able and dedicated soldier. For 40 years, from the Citadel to West Point and throughout his 36 years of commissioned service, "Westy" has served his country with honor, with dignity, with strength and with courage. He has attained his place in the long line of great military leaders which this country has produced and to whom we owe so much.

All Americans can take pride in his accomplishments as a battlefield commander. He has been a combat commander and faced the enemy in North Africa, Europe, Korea, and, most recently, in Vietnam.

For four long and frustrating years, General Westmoreland led the U.S. military forces during the peak of the involvement in Vietnam. Faced with the task of preventing a Communist takeover of that country, and burdened by restrictions which we had previously levied only on our opponents, he succeeded. Denied the full use of vastly superior air, sea, and ground forces, denied the tactics which had been recommended by the foremost military strategists, and scrutinized and criticized at every step, he succeeded. The independence of South Vietnam remained viable. The Communists did not take over. And, from recent reports, it seems unlikely that such a takeover will occur.

At a time when the goals of the United States in Vietnam were at best unclear and at worst unknown, General Westmoreland performed his duties with the distinction, dedication, and courage which he and his predecessors have led the American people to expect from their combat leaders.

Upon his appointment 4 years ago as Chief of Staff, "Westy" was faced with the task of rebuilding an Army which suffered innumerable problems resulting from the conduct of the war in Vietnam. Unduly stripped of the prestige which had been afforded a military career since World War II, demoralized by the personnel turbulence caused by the decision to wage a war without the use of Reserve forces, degraded by a small but vocal minority who confused the man in uniform with the policymaker, and forced to reduce its size in a short period of time, the Army faced an acute crisis.

Insufficient numbers of young American men were enlisting and literally thousands of career soldiers were turning in their uniforms. It was obvious that dramatic change was required.

The general has effected those changes. Throwing his whole support behind the effort for a modern Volunteer Army, demonstrating a willingness to test any theory which might improve recruiting or retention, and having the courage and the wisdom to rescind those changes which proved unsuccessful, "Westy" has brought the Army to a point where it has had to rely on fewer draftees than at any time in the past 20 years. And retention rates have also shown encouraging increases as a result of some of his innovations.

Mr. Speaker, we can all share the pride which the general so deservedly must feel in these accomplishments. But I am certain we also share the sense of loss which I feel at this time. "Westy" has earned his retirement just as he has earned the honor which the Members pay him today. He will be missed. But the indelible mark he has left on the annals of U.S. Army history will insure that he will not be forgotten.

To the general I extend my sincere gratitude for his past service. I wish for him, his dedicated wife "Kitsy" and his family, all the best of luck and happiness for the future.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS INCREASE URGENTLY NEEDED BY OUR OLDER PEOPLE

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Senate has approved a 20-percent increase in social security benefits as a rider to the debt ceiling legislation which must be passed by June 30 next.

We all know that the decision in the conference committee will be the determining factor in this matter because of the imminent deadline, and I have contacted the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and chief House conferee, advising him of my position and urging support for the larger increase and recommending that the House concur in the Senate position.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important matter, I ask to place a copy of my letter to Chairman MILLS in the RECORD setting forth my position and support for the larger social security increase.

A copy of my letter to Chairman MILLS follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 28, 1972.

Hon. WILBUR MILLS,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MILLS: The House, as you know, has voted a 5 percent increase in Social Security benefits and the Senate has approved a 20 percent increase as an amendment to debt ceiling legislation.

In this connection I wanted to urge that the House concur in the Senate position on this matter because of the urgent need by our older people for a substantial increase in Social Security benefits to cope with the continuing inflationary spiral and increased cost of living.

It is my understanding that there are forces making an effort to reduce the 20 percent increase and others contend that even the 20 percent increase is inadequate.

We know, of course, that with June 30 next the deadline for the approval of the debt ceiling that any Conference recommendation will be accepted, and I again strongly urge and recommend that the House Conferees accept the 20 percent increase.

Your favorable consideration of this appeal on behalf of our elder citizens will be most appreciated.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am

Sincerely your friend,
JOE L. EVINS,
Member of Congress.

THE 22D BIENNIAL CONVENTION OF THE JAPANESE AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, it is, indeed, a pleasure to welcome to Washington the delegates of the Japanese American Citizens League during their 22d biennial convention. This occasion offers a rare opportunity to celebrate the contributions made by citizens of Japanese descent to the everyday life and diversified culture we enjoy in the United States. For it has taken this country far too long to appreciate the industry and loyalty demonstrated by Japanese Americans. Many of us live with the haunting memory of the disgraceful treatment afforded Japanese-Americans during World War II when they were interned and branded as aliens to our cause. This prejudiced attitude lingered long after the hostilities were settled. In fact, only this year was legislation introduced to compensate Japanese Americans who were interned during the Second World War. This legislation is designed to provide civil service and social security retirement benefits based on time including the period of internment.

It is a hopeful sign that the delegates to this convention are representing more than 100 chapters in 32 States, perhaps an indication of a long overdue recognition and acceptance of Japanese Americans as people who have demonstrated a great pride in their country while retaining the spirit of their own ancient heritage. We owe them our gratitude. They have contributed to this Nation their toil, intelligence, and artistic accomplishments. And, more important, they lend a respectful tone for tradition and loyalty from which we all can benefit from time to time.

PEOPLE HELPING PEOPLE IN CARROLL COUNTY

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, one cannot help but marvel at the basic goodness in man in times of great stress. Such was the case during the recent floods that wrought severe damage in several communities of my district. One particular area was Carroll County where "people helping people" was the rule of the day. I submit the lead editorial from the June 29 Carroll County Times as an example of what I mean, and also as a sincere tribute to all Carroll Countians who unselfishly and courageously rose to the occasion:

FLOODS BRING OUT BEST IN CARROLL COUNTIANS

It was a time of unselfish sacrifices, unabashed neighborliness and quiet courage in Carroll county last week. If it sometimes takes a disaster to bring out the best in people, many here passed that test.

There was State Police Cpl. Raymond Beaumont, who again risked his life to rescue flood victims (getting swept downstream and nearly away in the process). Only last year Governor Mandel commended him for a similar flood rescue along the Gunpowder east of Baltimore. To appreciate the danger, take a look at the Times picture of a railroad car from the Congoleum Nairn plant that was powered by the savage water a couple of miles into the Liberty Reservoir. The water was swift on the surface, but the real menace lay beneath—in the turbulent, powerful undertow.

There were the unnamed heroes. In Detour, a state trooper and a neighbor in motor boat came to the rescue of the Randolph Rollison family, who crawled out of a second floor window to get to the boat and safety. The boat also fought the rapid waters to rescue Carroll F. Dougherty, whose house also serves as post office for the hamlet. The water was so powerful that ropes had to be used to get the boat to stiller waters—the motor alone couldn't power against the rushing water.

There was Mr. and Mrs. Charles Trout, who walked down the one safe passage into Detour—the railroad track—with boxes of food for the few families on higher ground who could still stay there.

There was the National Guard soldiers who left their jobs to help everywhere they were needed. And the Red Cross, the telephone and electric repairmen, the policemen. And individuals and other organizations too numerous to mention but all of whom shared the same virtue—sacrifice to help their fellow human beings at a time of crisis.

Perhaps the most unsung heroes—unsung perhaps because sometimes we too often take them for granted—were the volunteer firemen, those men who get up at a moment's notice to extinguish a minor electrical fire or a building blaze throughout the year and who worked hour upon hour without sleep to meet the flood crisis last week, and their wives.

Call after call they pumped flooded basements, helped evacuate people, set up emergency evacuation centers, acted wherever they were needed. One woman told of seeing her husband for one hour during that critical 48-hour period and of how, even on Sunday, he was still out again to help pump basements. And would you believe it? He took vacation time from work to do it. He was, she said, only one of many firemen who sacrificed.

The list of those who deserve accolades for their part during the crisis undoubtedly could go on. But among those are those people who helped—are still helping—their neighbors in the exasperating, demoralizing task of cleaning up the terrible damage that ruined many homes. And, of course, special public thanks also should go to those families who opened their homes (One evacuated family was invited to a neighbor's house: "Do you have room?" the family asked. "We'll make room," the neighbor said.) and the churches which opened their doors to temporarily house those without shelter and food.

Much is yet to be done in the cleanup and Carroll countians are sure to continue helping their neighbors in this time of need. But their work and sacrifice during the worst crises deserve our special gratitude.

WELCOME JAPANESE AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE OF JAPANESE DESCENT

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I join my colleagues in praise of our citizens of Japanese descent. I welcome this opportunity because I realize the contributions that this group has made to American life.

Most of these citizens live in Hawaii or California, and yet their contributions are not limited geographically. They have made truly national contributions in all areas of American life. Japanese-American participation in the arts has not only produced fine music, sculpture, and architecture, but it has inspired other American artists to draw on the artistic and cultural motifs of their work; individual members of this group have labored long and well in the name of science and medicine; the Imperial Valley is a monument to their efforts in irrigation and land development; and Japanese Americans have served valiantly and loyally with other American servicemen, in World War II, the Korean war, and Vietnam.

I welcome the Japanese American Citizens League to Washington. The Japanese experience in the United States provides a lesson in perseverance and dedication from which all Americans can benefit. They have overcome the racial, religious, and language differences that have confronted them. But their presence in Washington also indicated a continuing concern with representing the inter-

ests of their members—interests that remain vital today. Drawing upon the cultural strengths of a proud past, they have set an example for all Americans. I know that the contributions to American life will continue.

SUPREME COURT DECISIONS AFFECTING CONGRESS

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Supreme Court handed down two decisions of vital interest to Congress. Both involved the speech or debate clause, article I, section 6 of the U.S. Constitution.

In United States against Brewster, the Court reversed the decision of U.S. District Judge George Hart dismissing an indictment against former Maryland Senator Daniel Brewster for bribery.

In GRAVEL against United States, the Court narrowed a protective order limiting the interrogation of an aide of the Senator from Alaska in a grand jury investigation of the publication of the Pentagon papers.

There were dissenting opinions in both cases.

The principles discussed in these cases involve the autonomy and independence of the legislative branch, the separation of powers doctrine, and the relationship between the legislative branch on the one hand and the executive and judicial branches on the other. Accordingly they deserve the careful study not only of Senators and Representatives and the legal profession and students of government, but the American people generally.

The Joint Committee on Congressional Operations, of which I have the honor to be chairman, created by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, among other responsibilities has the duty to identify any court proceeding or action which, in the opinion of the joint committee, is of vital interest to the Congress, or to either House of the Congress, as a constitutionally established institution of the Federal Government and call such proceeding or action to the attention of that House of the Congress which is specifically concerned or to both Houses of the Congress if both Houses are concerned—section 402(a)(2) P.L. 91-510.

In carrying out this mandate the committee has been collecting and studying decisions and proceedings—including where possible the briefs and records—in litigation affecting the Congress.

Current cases have been assembled and briefed in committee print publications distributed to Senators and Representatives. These publications contain the text of some of the important decisions. There have been four of these reprints, the most recent of which was cumulative to May 31, 1972.

The Brewster and Gravel decisions will receive the close scrutiny of our committee together with other cases, current and completed which in the committee's judgment are of vital interest to the Congress.

Because of the direct effect these decisions have on the Congress, the committee will have copies of them to your offices as soon as a special report can be printed.

FOCUS ON THE JEWISH POOR

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, with all the attention that has been devoted to the problems of poverty and the decay of our cities, too little careful analysis has been devoted to the nature of poverty as it exists among various groups in our society. It is not enough to simply speak of poverty and assume that the term applies with the same meaning to all who are poor by some national or local standard. If our efforts to attack the root causes of poverty are to attain any measure of success, they must be based on an understanding of what poverty means to the poor, who the poor really are, and how different approaches may be formulated to different types of poverty.

At long last, attention is now being devoted to the plight of the Jewish poor in New York. The Jewish poor—the "forgotten poor" of our city—have not been adequately recognized in the development of the city's antipoverty programs and some of the underlying reasons are set forth in a perceptive and penetrating article prepared by Elly Rosen, executive director of the Association of Jewish Anti-Poverty Workers.

The message in this article has great significance for the future of the antipoverty effort and I commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

AND SUDDENLY THE JEWISH POOR

(By Elly Rosen)

For many years the scope and dimensions of Jewish poverty has been growing in urban centers such as New York City—the "inner cities" of America. In 1965, when the United States government declared "war on poverty," and the federal Office of Economic Opportunity initiated Community Action Programs throughout the country, many Jews living in the poverty stricken transitional neighborhoods of New York City felt a need to participate in these programs in an attempt to create services to help their poor Jewish neighbors. Thus began a grassroots (local community) awareness of the fact that, yes, we also had our share of poor people, and that something must be done to help them.

However, the poverty program was created through Black pressures and except in areas like Crown Heights and Williamsburg, where an organized Jewish community existed, Jews were kept out of the "Poverty Program." The major Jewish organizations did not wish to get involved in the problem for reasons which are understandable; they were not aware of the extent of Jewish poverty and they felt the Community Action Program (CAP) was in competition with their social service agencies. One cannot blame these organizations for not being aware of the problem for it is in fact invisible and silent, and it must be sought out.

In June of 1971, using statistics prepared by Ann Wolf and those contained in a study by the Columbia School of Social Work, I testified at a Congressional hearing on Manpower and Poverty. My testimony exposed the extent of Jewish poverty as well as the fact of discrimination against Jews in the City's poverty program. And suddenly—the Jewish poor were in the general news media, and on the priority agenda of government agencies and the major Jewish organizations.

Statistics show that there are between 350-400,000 Jews in the city of New York alone who have annual incomes of below $3,800. But Jewish poverty is invisible and silent. When I first made that statement last June, I didn't know to a great extent, who and where are the Jewish poor. Since that time, the Association of Jewish Anti-Poverty Workers, created for the specific purpose of determining and advocating the needs of the Jewish poor, has been looking for them in all five boroughs of the City. Unfortunately, we have found greater numbers of proud poverty stricken Jews.

Who are the Jewish poor? They can be found in any neighborhood of the inner-city, from an upper-middle income neighborhood like Forest Hills to the destroyed slums of our city like Brownsville.

WHO ARE THE JEWISH POOR?

It is said that 60 per cent of the Jewish poor are the elderly. The Jewish community of three and four generations ago are left alone to live out their lives on whatever fixed income they may still have.

Mr. and Mrs. Chaim Blumenthal live in Brownsville, Brooklyn. Eighty-six year old Blumenthal and his 84-year-old wife, Sarah, live on his Social Security benefits of $1,380 a year. Of $115 a month, Blumenthal pays $60 a month rent for a four-room apartment in which they've lived for 38 years. After paying the telephone, gas and electricity they are left with $35.00 a month. How does one live on that?

It's no great problem if you can't go out shopping more than once a week because the streets and hallways are crowded with junkies and teenage gangs. If you go shopping once a week and are too old to carry home more than one bag of groceries, you manage to live on what's in the bag. And says Sarah, "How much can an old person eat anyway? What I really want, God should be so good, is a shul (synagogue) for Chaim to go to daven (pray). He cries every day since the Stone Ave. Talmud Torah closed because there's no shul left. Why did they take away our last shul? Where did everybody go?"

How does one explain why Brownsville, once the center of Jewish culture in New York, closed the doors of its last shul? Where did everybody go?"

How does one explain why Brownsville, once the center of Jewish culture in New York, closed the doors of its last synagogue a year ago. Can I explain to Sarah or to the thousands of elderly Jews still living in Brownsville, Bedford-Stuyvesant, South Jamaica and dozens of other abandoned Jewish neighborhoods, the philosophy behind social change?

The Family Poor: The Hassidic and Orthodox. In an urban center like New York City it is estimated that there is a Hassidic population of 90,000. Because of religious ties and needs, the Hassidic poor stay within a community. So you may find poor Hassidic families in lower income sections such as Crown Heights, Williamsburg, the Lower East Side, or even higher income areas such as Washington Heights, Boro Park or Forest Hills.

Hassidic restrictions in the areas of birth control, dietary laws, and education, have extreme religious importance in the very existence of the Hassidic individual, but in many cases result in a life-cycle of poverty. This can best be exemplified in the case of Shlomo Goldstein and his family, who live in the Crown Heights section of Brooklyn.

Mr. Goldstein grew up in a Hassidic environment and spent most of his young life

devoted to the study of Torah and Talmud. Fear of assimilation and impurity of the outside world prevented him from much of secular education or training. Mr. Goldstein has a job in a Hassid-owned knitting factory where he earns $8500 a year. But, he has 10 children, all of whom he must send to Yeshiva (parochial school) where he must meet the tuition. Also, he must feed his family of 12 Glat Kosher food, the price of which is higher than regular food. So, although the welfare department won't accept it, his budget compared with his annual income put him below the poverty line.

Even if Mr. Goldstein were to enroll in a training program, or embark on a secular education, it would not perceptibly increase his available job market. Besides the problem of being a Sabbath observer and, therefore, having to leave work early on Friday, not being able to work on Saturday or the Jewish holidays, his beard, sidecurls and Hasidic garb will not make an insurance or accounting firm eager to hire him. It may be fashionable for Chase Manhattan Bank to hire a Black in a dashiki to work behind the counter, but Shlomo Goldstein doesn't have a Friend at Chase Manhattan.

In the United States, does a person not have the right to live with his religious beliefs and still have the right to survive?

The Broken Homes: Did anyone ever stop to think about what happens to a mother with four children who may suddenly become a widow or divorcee? And what if she was not of the "fortunate" ones to be left with a lot of insurance or alimony? Perhaps one should ask Mrs. Marlene Zweidman who lives with her four children and 20-month-old niece (left by her sister who is classified as an unfit mother) in the East Flatbush section of Brooklyn.

Mrs. Zweidman has to stay home and take care of the baby, thus she cannot work. How can she support her family? She decided that it wasn't too sensible to attempt survival on "Jewish Pride" alone so she takes what she is entitled to welfare. She is not religious but would like her son to know something about her heritage; she would like to send him to Yeshiva day school. Welfare will not pay for that. So, until and unless, she can find a school that can afford to take her son tuition-free he will have to go without it. This, of course, is a subsidiary problem.

There are thousands of mothers of disabled parents in Mrs. Zweidman's predicament, but they too are silent and invisible. And unfortunately, so far, no one has gone looking for them. The assumption is that they do not exist.

There is another segment of Jewish poverty which no one thinks about, but who nevertheless stubbornly insist on existing. They are the thousands of Black Jews spread throughout the inner-cities of our country. Can you imagine a family or individual having any of the problems previously mentioned only to have them compounded by growing up a problem-oriented Black ghetto, and, in addition, having to live with the standard discrimination suffered by all Blacks?

Perhaps if we restore the true meaning of Jewish pride we might once again learn to care for those less fortunate, to keep them in our community, and possibly prevent these problems from growing or recurring in greater proportions. "Jewish Pride" has somehow come to mean pride in accomplishments, pride in our leaders, but also shame in our failures. Shame to the extent that our Jewish pride will not allow us to think about the failures or do anything about them. And so it has happened that if one is affluent, his pride prevents him from thinking about those Jews of whom he cannot be proud.

Poverty agencies must learn to see through the myth of Jewish affluence which we ourselves are so proud of fostering, and allow poor Jews who may not believe the myth to participate in poverty programs. "No one is poorer than the poor who are conceived as being rich." And no one knows more suffering than those whose suffering is not believed.

TRIBUTE TO TOM LITTLE

HON. RICHARD H. FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the media in Tennessee, the South and, indeed, throughout America recorded a sad obit last week when they had to list the June 20 death of former Nashville Tennessean cartoonist Tom Little.

A Pulitzer Prize winner, a man whose drawings always carried a simple, unmistakable message about man and his worlds—his community, his politics, the achievement of his humanitarian goals—Tom Little in his 73 years displayed the talent, curiosity, and ingenuity which evey true journalist seeks to command.

In his memory and to bring to life for my colleagues this fine Nashvillian's dedication, drive, and accomplishments, I include the following June 21 Nashville Tennessean article in the RECORD:

CRUSADING CARTOONIST TOM LITTLE DIES AT 73

Tom Little, long-time cartoonist for the Tennessean who wielded a crusading crayon with unsubtle strokes which caused friends to smile and opponents to shudder, died at 5:30 p.m. yesterday at his home.

Little, 73, of 2046 Castleman Drive, had been in ill health since suffering a stroke in the fall of 1970, a few months after his retirement in the spring of that year.

Services will be at 2:30 p.m. tomorrow at Roesch-Patton Funeral Home, 1715 Broadway. Other arrangements were incomplete last night.

A man who won a Pulitzer Prize for his dramatic sympathy with polio-stricken children. Little also drew biting caricatures which gave presidents, governors, mayors and even the Republican party indigestion.

"I let cartoonists on Republican papers worry about the other side of the story," Little once said, with only the smallest bit of facetiousness. "I know our side is right."

In keeping with that remark, his cartoons were usually direct and often devastating—and always simple. Fellow employes of the Tennessean, most of whom spend considerable time making each other the butts of jokes, could make Little furious merely by observing:

"Uh, Tom, uh, I didn't understand that cartoon this morning."

During the first part of his journalistic career he served a long apprenticeship as a police reporter during Nashville's mad prohibitionist 1920s, chasing many an ambulance, dramatizing many a murder and interestedly witnessing many a call house raid.

It is said that when newsmen gathered near caches of whisky confiscated by policemen, Little always was chosen as the one to sneak inside and borrow them a bottle or two because, at 5-4, he was always the smallest in the crowd.

He also was always one of the most tenacious. At one particularly bloody murder which might have left a less experienced writer stunned and nauseous, Little beat an opposition reporter to the only nearby telephone, whose wire he cut. The opposing reporter thereupon missed his deadline and Little and the Tennessean carried the story first.

From years of these experiences followed by years of running the Tennessean newsroom as city editor, Tom Little brought a stunning seriousness and unmistakable reality to his drawing board when he got to it finally in 1936.

Although some of his earliest associates have said Little was an accomplished artist from the time he was 14, it took him two decades to become a cartoonist for the Tennessean. He became one through strange circumstances.

According to the late associate editor of the Tennessean, John H. Nye, Little actually was demoted to his job as editorial cartoonist after five uphappy years as a city editor. It resulted from an election-night argument with Lit Pardue, the late editor of the Tennessean.

"Pardue got so mad at Tom he fired him off the city desk and transferred him to the job of editorial cartoonist—with a cut in pay," Nye recalled.

About a year after Little's demotion to cartoonist, as said to have made him much happier than his earlier promotion to city editor, the late Silliman Evans took control of the newspaper. Little's tough, stark and uncompromising drawing style was made for Evans' hard-hitting brand of journalism.

Almost immediately the powerful nature of his drawings attracted national attention. He probably had more cartoons reprinted in other newspapers and periodicals than has any other cartoonist.

Among the biggest were Time, Newsweek, the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune. The Encyclopedia Britannica chose two of his cartoons to help illustrate its four-volume history of the Second World War decade—1937–47.

In 1948 he was awarded the cartooning medal by the National Headliners' Club, whose national awards are second in journalistic stature only to those offered by the Pulitzer Committee. But it was in 1957 that he received journalism's highest award.

It was a drawing of a child on crutches watching other children playing football and asking himself "Wonder Why My Parents Didn't Give Me Salk Shots?" This heavy-handed blow at parental apathy surrounding the new cure for polio was from the mainstream of the Little tradition.

"My idea was to wake people up to the opportunity they had to give their children these shots," Little said later. "It was a chance they never had before and might never have again.

"You rarely accomplish something good by praising something in a cartoon. To promote something good you have to point out something bad on the other side. Good cartoons are not funny. They are serious business. People don't laugh at them. They get mad at them."

Unlike many of his drawings, the theme of his Pulitzer winner was not assigned to him by the editors. He came up with it himself. Or, rather, his wife Lillian—former principal of Glendale School—gave it to him after receiving a telephoned suggestion from the late Dr. John J. Lentz, who realized what impact a Little cartoon could have on the public apathy to the newly discovered anti-polio vaccine.

"Getting a cartoon idea, particularly a funny one, is a grim and terrible business, and Tom makes the worst of it," once said Tennessean editorial cartoonist Charles Bissell, Little's brother-in-law.

"His face at such times is no pleasant sight. Written across it are more expressions than one face can comfortably contain. There is, of course, the painted look that inhabits most thinking faces.

"But also there are looks of suspicion, greed, intolerance, cruelty, shame, fatuity, friendship, mirth and murder . . . his face

assumes the expressions of the characters in his cartoons, and these characters usually are in embarrassing or unpleasant circumstances . . ."

Most of his political subjects were in especially embarrassing or unpleasant circumstances after he finished a caricature of them.

Little was a Mason and a Shriner and during his latter years he made many trips to Shrine conventions, reporting in the columns of the Tennessean the activities of the organization.

But unquestionably the bulk of the colorful stories about the cartoonist come from the old police-reporting days, times that—like those of every other man—grew more dramatic with age.

A native of Williamson County, Little was born Sept. 27, 1898, to John Wallace Little, a farmer, and his wife Florence Johnson Little. His father died when he was 2.

In 1926 Little married the former Helen Dahnke, a reporter for the Tennessean, who died in 1938. On Oct. 20, 1945, he married the former Lillian Hannah, who survives.

After attending Montgomery Bell Academy, he joined the Tennessean at the age of 17. It might be said that he was given half a job because he and a friend, Tom Sims, both decided to apply at the same time and went to the Tennessean offices together.

They were told but one job was available.

"Tom spoke up and said, 'We'll take it and split the salary,'" Little recalled much later. "We did, too. Fifteen dollars a week between us."

Sims later went to King Features, one of the Nation's largest newspaper syndicates, and became a columnist.

Little's real immersion into the central area of journalism came when he began covering the police beat in 1919—and almost immediately was faced with a famous murder that has never been solved—the slaying of a man named Robin Cooper.

Cooper's car was found on Highway 100 on a bridge over Richland Creek with hair and a bloody stone inside it. The body was found underneath the bridge, and as soon as Little heard police officers shouting from underneath that bridge, he started running for a telephone—only to find a rival reporter ahead of him.

"He got to this house first and started to call his office when I cut the telephone wire," Little said proudly many years later. "I got a ride to another house about a half mile down the road and we scooped them on that one."

One of the most brutal murders he recalled writing was that of a bootlegger named Harry Lehman whose life went well until he fell out of favor with the law enforcement authorities and went broke.

Becoming fair game for his erstwhile underlings, he was lured into an adjacent county by a woman before being slowly shot to death by his enemies who began by shooting off his fingers and toes.

Such events have an effect on some men's senses of humor, and they may well have affected Little's. His was wry and funny, as long as the joke was on the next man. According to his associates at the Tennessean, he never was terribly amused when the joke was on him. But the jokes he put on others were often as quick and direct as his cartoons.

In 1958, when employes and ex-employes of the Tennessean were gathering to pay a dinner tribute to Little, one of the visitors was Rufus Jarman, Middle Tennessean native who was a New York free-lance writer and former Tennessean employe.

Jarman dropped by the newspaper office and one of the reporters there asked for an interview.

"I've only got about 15 minutes," Jarman said.

"You could tell everything you ever knew or learned in 15 minutes," Little observed sonorously.

Little's cartooning days were not always the profound successes that Pulitzer Prizes and Headliner Awards would suggest. One of his bitterest disappointments had to do with a syndicated cartoon called Sunflower Street. It was a cartoon panel about blacks, and his decision to quit drawing it in 1950 resulted finally in a disparagement about the growing fragmentation and polarization of races and creeds in America.

He lamented growth of an inability of Americans to laugh at themselves.

"We stand in constant danger of offending somebody," he later said. "We also stand close to refining the good humor right out of American life."

At that time editors became leery of using Sunflower Street because of fear it might be construed as "looking down" on black people.

In 1972 such a prospect seems almost laughable. For more than 30 years, Tom Little's political cartoons championed, rather than tried to undermine, the rights of minority races and creeds in the South.

In addition to his widow he is survived by an aunt, Mrs. Tom Murray, of Franklin, Tenn.

Active pallbearers are Lou Bottiggi, Robert Cowan, A. A. Gorin, William S. Justice, Sam Molay, Phillip Perkerson, Lewis Stanley, James N. Stansell, Terry Tomlin, David Young and Bill Bissell.

ALLIED SERVICES ACT OF 1972

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today, along with my colleagues, on behalf of the administration, the Allied Services Act. The President, in his state of the Union message, proposed the Allied Services Act not only as a means of cutting bureaucratic redtape and streamlining the machinery of Government, but more importantly, as a means of enabling State and local agencies to deliver services to individuals in need in a more responsive manner.

The President said:

We need a new approach to the delivery of social services—one which is built around people and not around programs. We need an approach which treats a person as a whole and which treats a family as a unit. We need to break through rigid categoried walls, to open up narrow bureaucratic compartments, to consolidate and coordinate related programs in a comprehensive approach to related problems.

We believe, Mr. Speaker, that this bill, through the committee hearings, will open up a dialog which will enable all interested parties to have an opportunity to make their views known. We critically need to know and understand how to best deliver services to those in need as well as how to facilitate access to services.

At this time, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has over 200 categorical programs each with its own administrative structure at State and local levels. At no point is there a single agency accountable for organizing all of these separate service programs into a single system. No agency is responsible to the individual for arranging services to meet his or her multiple needs. We think the time has come for us to address the problem and attempt to find solutions to resolve it.

COUNTERVAILING DUTIES

HON. RICHARD H. FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 29, 1972, I introduced H.R. 15794, to amend section 516 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

The purpose of this bill is to provide judicial review for American manufacturers in countervailing duty cases. Under section 514 of the Tariff Act, importers have the right to judicial review of an administrative decision that a bounty or grant exists with respect to certain imported merchandise and that countervailing duties will accordingly be imposed on such merchandise. Until recently it was believed that a domestic manufacturer filing a countervailing duty complaint could similarly obtain judicial review under section 516(b) of the Tariff Act where the Treasury Department failed to act in accordance with the Countervailing Duty Law (19 U.S.C. 1303). The right to challenge Treasury inaction in such cases was, however, effectively denied American manufacturers in a 1971 decision of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals. *United States* v. *Hammond Lead Products, Inc.*, 440 F. 2d 1024. There, the appellate court held that the Customs Court lacked jurisdiction to review a complainant's challenge that Treasury had failed to assess a countervailing duty.

The effect of that case is to emasculate the countervailing duty law which is designed to offset the artificial competitive advantage of imported products over American-made products by virtue of subsidies given in the exporting country. While the countervailing duty law is mandatory in its terms, the Hammond Lead decision forecloses effective relief to injured domestic producers where Treasury decides for policy reasons not to enforce the law or unreasonably delays enforcement.

This amendment to section 516 is needed to accord fundamental equity to American producers suffering from this kind of unfair practice; that is, subsidies, and to insure that the intent of Congress as reflected in the countervailing duty law will be fulfilled. It should be noted that domestic manufacturers have the right to judicial review in other customs matters under section 516. This bill would make clear that that right extends to countervailing duty questions and is therefore in the nature of a technical amendment.

The bill would also amend subsection (f) of section 516 to make countervailing duties applicable in accordance with a final court decision with respect to

merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption as of the date the Secretary of the Treasury publishes a negative decision on an American manufacturers petition under section 516(b). The purpose of this technical provision is to make sure that, if the courts find the Secretary's decision not to impose countervailing duties to be in error, the complainant will not be denied meaningful relief, because of protracted litigation. Without this amendment countervailing duties would be imposed only on imports coming into the United States after a court decision sustaining the American manufacturer's challenge.

FEDERAL REVENUE SHARING

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, as many Members of the House are aware, I have for some time been a strong proponent of Federal revenue sharing. I was an early supporter of the Nixon administration proposals in this field, and traveled across the country campaigning for revenue sharing.

Thus, it was with great difficulty and regret that I cast a nay vote on H.R. 14370, the revised revenue sharing bill which passed the House on June 22.

The plan for sharing Federal revenues which was written by the Committee on Ways and Means contains several major flaws, the effects of which are so serious that I could not be a party to making them law.

First, this bill provides unusually powerful incentives for local and State governments to raise their taxes. Second, the bill will not correct the deficiencies in the present grant-in-aid programs. Instead, it will only add another layer on top of the existing Federal aid system, which is sorely in need of thoroughgoing reform.

By giving more money to governments which tax their constituents more heavily, the bill would place a double burden on the average taxpayer. The so-called "free money" from Washington must come from somewhere, and in this case, it is the average taxpayer who must pick up the tab, and $30 billion simply does not materialize out of thin air. In addition, it will not take local governmental officials long to realize that the more they raise local taxes, the more money they will get from Washington. Thus, the taxpayer gets hit coming and going, and intense pressure is placed on the upward spiral of taxation. Since taxes are already out of hand, this bill could place them beyond anyone's control in a very short period of time.

Moreover, H.R. 14370, which was supposed to begin a shift away from strings-attached Federal funds under the grant-in-aid programs, fails to do this at all. It simply spends money which just is not there, rather than spend the money we do have in a different fashion.

The initial proposal advanced by the White House provided for both general and special revenue sharing programs. Of the $16 billion annual expenditure which was originally proposed, only $5 billion was slated for general revenue sharing, with the balance of $11 billion to be spent in the form of special revenue sharing. Moreover, this $11 billion was not "new money," but rather was to be taken from existing categorical aid programs, and spent in a different fashion.

The rocky road through Congress changed all that. Instead of special revenue sharing, we have only "high priority areas" in which the shared revenue is to be spent. And instead of replacing categorical grants, this bill only piles more aid programs on top, leaving grant-in-aid programs untouched. To make matters worse, the new programs require "new money," money which is nowhere to be found in this era of unprecedented Federal budget deficits. Instead of instituting major structural reform in governmental aid programs, H.R. 14370 only compounds an already unsatisfactory situation.

There is a serious drawback in the manner in which the shared revenues are assigned to "high-priority areas." These areas include public safety, public transportation, and environmental improvement and protection. The problem is that there are already extensive Federal aid programs in effect which are designed to deal with these problems. In the area of public safety, for example, the budget for fiscal year 1973 already includes nearly a billion dollars for support of State and local crime reduction activities. Nearly $6 billion is in the budget for Federally assisted transportation projects. Many more billions are to be spent in environmental improvement projects.

While already funded areas receive even more money under this bill, areas in which a crisis or near-crisis situation exists receive no money at all. Local governments, which receive two-thirds of the funds appropriated by the bill, are expressly prohibited from spending any of it on education. With court decisions in at least four States, including California, threatening to bring a major readjustment in methods of financing education, to leave this area untouched by revenue sharing is almost unbelievable.

But perhaps the most dangerous aspect of this plan is its separation of the job of taxing from the job of spending. No longer will the desire of State and local governments to spend be tempered and restrained by the necessity to tax in order to raise the money spent. Besides increasing the propensity of local governments to spend, this bill will make them ever more dependent on the Federal Government.

Instead of accomplishing the original objective of revenue sharing, that of decentralizing government, and making it more responsive to the people, this bill makes local governments dependent on Washington, and centralizes government control. The two-thirds of the money distributed by this bill which goes to local governments is restricted to specific areas, and establishes a principle of Federal control over local expenditures. This is anything but bringing government closer to the people.

In short, this plan will reverse a tradition of separating Federal from State and local government which is as old as the Republic itself. It will accelerate centralized Federal Government, spend billions of dollars which we do not have to spend, spend the money where it is not needed, and will raise sharply the level of taxation at all levels of government. And while it does all this, it will fail to accomplish the single greatest reason for revenue sharing: it will not achieve genuine structural reform in the manner in which the Federal Government distributes aid.

Finally, gentlemen, we will be the ones who will have to raise this money, and we will have to answer to citizens already angry over the high taxes they must pay. This will be an uncomfortable reality long after the pressures of an election year have passed.

EDUCATION FOR LIFE: REPRESENTATIVE GONZALEZ' CHALLENGE

HON. ABRAHAM KAZEN, JR.

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this body recognizes that the future of our Nation depends on our youth. We cannot hide from them the tasks they face, nor that we are passing on to them problems which we have failed to solve. My esteemed colleague, HENRY GONZALEZ, expressed the challenge so well in a recent address to the graduation ceremonies of Nixon High School in my hometown of Laredo that I am pleased to share his message with all the Members of the House:

SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE HENRY B. GONZALEZ

As human beings, we have a unique capacity, a unique ability, which has given us the power not merely to live with the world we find ourselves in, but to change it, almost at will, to meet our needs or suit our desires. We need not suffer the cold, because we can build houses that enable us to be comfortable, no matter how cold it might be, even on mountain peaks and in the Arctic wastes. We need not suffer the heat, because we have learned how to build air conditioning that will keep us cool no matter where we are, no matter how hot it might become. We need not suffer the pangs of hunger if there is a drought or fire or other disaster affecting the crops, because we have learned how to store food, to freeze it, can it, dehydrate it, process it, and carry it wherever it is needed. We do not have to live with the world as we find it, because we have the ability to see how things work, and how they can be made better; we have the power to make things serve us, rather than being forced to accommodate ourselves to things as we find them.

But we have also the power for self delusion; the fact that we can think does not mean that we always think in the right direction. We have the power to reason, but that does no mean that we always use that power. Humans alone have the power to alter the world to suit them; and, humans alone

have the power to misuse that same power. Where we have the strength to build, we also have the strength to destroy. No one but a human can build an airplane; and no one but a human can load it with bombs.

Having the power to reason, we have at once a divine blessing and a potential curse.

What are we to make of a world in which, according to the figures, the rich get richer and the poor get poorer? For we know that in a single year the wealth of the United States grows as much as the wealth of India will grow during the next 200 years.

What are we to make of a world in which a tiny minority of the world uses up a third of the total energy produced—a third of the gas, oil, and electricity?

What are we to make of a world in which twenty percent of the people own eighty percent of the wealth?

What are we to make of a world in which man has the capacity to destroy all life, either by a nuclear catacylsm or by a misguided consumption of the resources the planet has to offer?

What are we to make of a world in which a nation conducts war by proxy, and in which enemies fight while their leaders embrace one another?

Faced with all of this, how are we to know the difference between what things are and what they only seem to be? How are we to know what is real, what is true, or even what is possible? Have we, with all our knowledge, all our capacity to learn even more, all our technology, only succeeded in building a maze that we can never escape?

Our task is more than just to survive. If only surviving were what we must do, then we would have no need to think, and we would have no need to know anything at all, other than how to find food. Our task is to master not only our surroundings, but ourselves as well. That is why we have education—not to equip us to survive, though survive we must—but to enable us to master ourselves.

Faced with the problems around us, the easiest thing to do is to surrender to a sense of fatalism—to say that we can't change anything, so why worry about it? And many people do this, just walk away and leave all the problems to somebody else.

I can understand this. After all, we are affected by events that we cannot control, and we are affected by events that we might not even be aware of. Most of the members of this class were and will be affected by an event in Indochina that took place in 1954, the year that many of you were born. When the fortress of Dien Bien Phu fell, France lost a colonial empire, and the republics of north and south Viet Nam were born. In that event, so far away, came the end of what history will probably call the first Indochina war and the beginnings of the second Indochina war. In 1961 the first Americans died in that war, so far away that few of us even knew of it.

Today, 45,000 Americans have died in that war, and another 10,000 or so have died in accidents directly related to our participation in that war. We have all been affected by it; ten thousand young men in my district are veterans of it; and we all know someone who has been there, and many of us know someone who never came back from there. Yet all of this stemmed from an event in 1954, and in a historical process that started even before that—so we know that we can be affected by an event that we are not even aware of, or if we know of it, cannot imagine that it has anything to do with us.

And we are left to wonder about the basic morality of things. If we are blaming the present carnage on the Russians, why then is our President embracing their President: And if the aggression of the North Vienamese was made possible by the Chinese, why then did our President embrace their leaders: If there is a war, why are not the contending national leaders enemies? It is difficult to understand how the leaders of nations can order their forces to war, and at the same time embrace one another as if nothing were going on. It is as if we could see a man kicking another man beneath the table, while both are smiling and pretending nothing at all is wrong.

If we are to be affected by events long ago and far away, I can understand how we can come to a sense of fatalism. If we are to see war taking place at one level and negotiations at another, I can understand why there would rise up a feeling of confusion and frustration.

I believe that the Nation is frustrated; we see all around us problems, and we see all around us things that need to be done, must be done, and which cannot wait—but which are nevertheless ignored. We do not seem to have a sense of mission; we do not know in what direction we want to go. We know that we have the power to accomplish great things, but we do not know what it is we want to do.

Some seek refuge in movements; some march, some curse, some pray.

Some seek refuge by escaping, however temporarily, into fantasy; into the euphoria that drugs and drink can bring about.

Some concern themselves about things that do not really matter, and seek oblivion by paying close attention to imaginary specks of dust.

Some seek out meaningful action, and try to offer leadership. Some study, some write, and some only drift along.

Let us admit that this is not an easy world in which to live. But let us also recognize that we are not here merely to live.

I believe that however small or great the role we play is, we should aim to live so that when it is all over, we can feel some sense of satisfaction. For the members of the graduating class, there is a sense of satisfaction for all of you—a sense of relief for all of you. The important thing is that you should have no regrets about school; you've accomplished something. What you have done is not just to survive a course, though I think that many of you probably feel that is the case. What you have done is to learn how to see things as they really are, how to deal with some of the problems that life presents. It may seem right now that there are more questions than answers, but that will always be true. The business of education is not to provide all the answers but to show how a few of them can be obtained, and to show how it is possible to master events, to master your surroundings—how to be in charge of yourself.

Knowing how to do a few things should enable you to learn how to do a great many more things.

You may sometimes be tempted to feel that fate controls your life. Some things in life you cannot control. From the day you were born, it was inevitable that you would go to school. It was not inevitable that you would die in a war. And that is the crucial business of being a human being—the business of accomplishing the things that make sense and finding some way of avoiding the irrational, or some way of solving problems that seemingly cannot be solved.

Wars are not inevitable: the problems of man can be solved in better ways. One example, there are about fifteen million people in South Viet Nam; we have spent something like fifteen billion dollars in a war there—$150,000 for every man, woman, and child in that land. It would have been better for them, and cheaper for us, to have given each family in North and South Viet Nam alike a hundred thousand dollars, which would have made them all wealthy by the standards of this world. One could have bought Indochina many times over for the price that has been paid in determining how and by whom it shall be governed. Surely, here was a better answer than this war.

As rational beings, we should surely be able to arrive at better solutions to rivalries than this. It is not inevitable that such tragedies take place.

Viet Nam, war, peace—all of these things may seem distant and without meaning, but they are issues that affect every one of us. The task of your education has been to help you find better ways to do things: you have learned some of these better ways.

Your education will never end; you will always be learning better ways. If we are fortunate, you will be better masters of destiny than any who have come before you. And I think that you will.

All of us are proud—proud to have come this far, proud to have seen you accomplish what you have—and prouder still that we know how much further you will go. You have made a beginning.

THE JUNE 20 PRIMARY ELECTION IN NEW YORK

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, many, if not most, people question the objectivity of a Congressman who has been defeated in a primary election when he comments upon that election. Nevertheless, I do feel constrained to comment upon one aspect of the recent primary election in New York.

The mechanical aspects of the election were a complete and utter fiasco. Thousands of people who wished to vote in the 22d District in the Bronx were effectively disenfranchised by the board of elections. A great many voters were not informed of their proper polling place. Many of those who did find the correct location arrived only to find long lines of voters waiting to use a limited number of machines or machines which were inoperable and went unrepaired for hours. Indeed, in some sections of the 22d District and indeed in many other sections of New York City, people were still voting at 3 a.m.—people who were in line at the official closing time at 10 p.m.

The board of elections in New York is a politically appointed and controlled institution and its appointments are in turn politically inspired. In large measure, this accounts for the total incompetence—if it was not, as seems probable, a deliberate attempt to disenfranchise thousands of voters—displayed in the recent election. It also gives those who control the board and its appointments a clear and manifestly unfair advantage over those who challenged the regular Democratic organization and its candidates for public and party office.

For example, during the recent election, officially appointed objective inspectors were observed making lists of voters and turning the lists over to the regular Democratic organization so that the organization would know of which of

its supporters had voted and which had not.

In my own case, I do not believe that the result would have been changed had the board or its employees displayed even a minimal degree of competence or, in some cases, the slightest objectivity. But, there are some contests in New York City where the result might very well have been different. At the very least, thousands upon thousands of voters would not have been disenfranchised.

Through the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the Federal Government demonstrated an interest and concern in the manner in which State and local governments conducted elections to Federal office. That act provides for a Federal take-over of election procedures where it can be demonstrated that State or local officials are preventing citizens from voting or registering to vote upon the basis of race or color.

As a logical extension of this Federal expression of interest in local procedures, the Congress should investigate the recent election in New York and other parts of the country in order to determine whether or not election to Federal office is being determined by local incompetence or political partisanship. If so, the Congress ought to seriously consider legislation providing for Federal supervision or Federal conduct of primaries and elections for Federal office.

CONGRESSMAN LUCIEN N. NEDZI REASSERTS OPPOSITION TO BUSING

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to reassert by continuing opposition to busing in pursuit of racial balance.

The controversy over busing is steadily moving toward ultimate decision in the U.S. Supreme Court, where I hope and believe there will be a ruling against busing so that the matter is resolved once and for all.

I believe the point should be emphasized that the majority sentiment in the U.S. House of Representatives, the body which most accurately reflects the popular will, is definitely antibusing. Furthermore, in those States where the busing issue has been presented to the voters, a strong majority, Democrats and Republicans, has said "No." Party platforms, written by persons who are not elected by the people, are advisory in nature and have no binding effect. They are an element in the political process, but impose no iron discipline on anyone.

I am personally for the concept of the neighborhood school, which I take to mean that all schoolchildren, without regard to race, color, or creed, have the right to attend schools nearest their homes.

The Congress is on sound ground, morally, legally, and politically, when it supports quality education without quotas. On the other hand, to construct an educational system based on racial balance, to do it in addition on a school-by-school basis, and to disregard neutrally drawn school district lines, is to invite chaos in education.

We in Michigan have watched with dismay as a series of rulings by U.S. District Judge Stephen Roth has plunged our State into bitter divisiveness and a mood of impending chaos. Michigan is a progressive State but there is nothing progressive about race-conscious quotas and cross-district busing.

It should be noted, moreover, that the Roth decision, in its preoccupation with social engineering, would make blacks a permanent minority in each and every school, even in predominantly black neighborhoods. The unfairness of such a design, and the loss of community voice in school matters, should be obvious. In a recent Detroit News poll, less than a majority of blacks favored cross-district busing.

Michigan, unlike some southern States, never had a dual school system, one for whites, one for blacks. It is inaccurate to portray Michigan's schools as analagous to the dual school system which existed in the South as a matter of law prior to 1954.

Convoluted efforts to engineer quotas not only place intolerable burdens on children, parents, and teachers, but tamper with the legitimate expectations of tens of thousands of education-minded families who have saved to buy or rent a home in a particular neighborhood near a particular school. It is no wonder that parents, having sacrificed and planned toward this goal, are shocked to then learn that a court plans to have their children bused to distant out-of-neighborhood, and even out-of-county, schools.

On October 19, 1971, I was among a bipartisan group of seven antibusing Michigan Congressmen (BROOMFIELD, DINGELL, WILLIAM FORD, GRIFFITHS, MCDONALD, NEDZI, and O'HARA) who introduced an amendment to the Higher Education Act. It became known as the Broomfield amendment.

Under this amendment, there can be no implementation of court-ordered busing until all appeals have been exhausted. The amendment passed in the House by a wide margin and prevailed in the protracted struggle between House and Senate conferees. It became law when the President signed the Higher Education Act in mid-June.

A stay of proceedings in the Michigan case should, in my judgment, be issued.

The Broomfield amendment provides one legal basis for such a stay. The President's proposed moratorium, which I have said I will also support, can be a second method to obtain a stay. The third avenue can be a stay issued independently by perhaps a justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, on the basis of the extraordinary nature of the case. This makes sense because: First, the Roth rulings go well beyond previous cases and established law; second, an order partially implemented and then reversed would cause educational disorder and widespread personal trauma; and third, the public interest demands it. I have consulted with attorneys for the State and have urged that a request for a stay be pressed with the fullest vigor.

The quickest and most desirable remedy would be to have the higher courts, and especially the U.S. Supreme Court, put a stop to busing.

If this approach falls short, however, the only alternative is a constitutional amendment. I have already signed the discharge petition which would take House Joint Resolution 620, the constitutional amendment, out of the Judiciary Committee, and bring it before the House for a vote.

Sound public policy, as I have said before, should seek to maximize good will and public support for quality schools. Such support is a fragile commodity, depending on the personal and political commitment of parents, teachers, students, and legislators. Busing for racial balance would tear apart this support, accentuate racial antagonisms, and do irreparable damage to education in America.

My views on this issue were earlier set forth in considerable detail in my October 1971, newsletter to my constituents, the text of which is set forth below:

The controversy in the Southeastern Michigan area over the increased bussing of schoolchildren prompts me to set forth my own views in this letter to my constituents.

I am for quality education. I am for the concept of the neighborhood school, which I take to mean that schoolchildren, without regard to race, color, or creed go to schools nearest to their homes. I support the elimination of racial discrimination in any form. I believe that when courts and schools are colorblind they are more likely to be on sound moral and legal grounds.

I begin with the affirmative statements because we should put first things first and not allow ourselves to become entangled in the rhetoric of negativism, labels, and symbols.

The notion of compelling racial percentages on a school-by-school basis is acutely color-conscious. To construct a dogma based on the will-o'-the-wisp of "racial balance" which crosses neighborhood lines, municipal lines, and even county lines would damage, not improve, our sorely-pressed public school system.

We should note that no governmental unit nor any court has as yet gone so far as to mandate cross-county bussing to achieve racial balance. But we must also note that parents, teachers, and public figures are deeply troubled by the speculations arising from a recent court decision.

There is a striking contradiction between seeking to establish a color-blind situation in educational opportunities, on the one hand, and that view, on the other hand, that schoolchildren should be forced to do something, i.e., submit to bussing, because of their color. When black students were, in many parts of the country, bussed past schools near their homes to predominantly black schools, that was wrong. To now bus whites and blacks past the schools nearest their homes to various more distant schools, on the basis of race, is a mistake.

Widescale bussing will not, in my judgment, improve the quality of education. Indeed, such bussing, if it is for the purpose of pursuing racial percentages, is certain to arouse antagonism and divert public attention from the essentials of good education: good teachers, good facilities, and financial support by federal, state, and local governments.

Equitable distribution of public resources,

not an investment in fleets of busses, is the way to improve education for all, black and white.

A public policy of support for education is frequently difficult. It depends on the personal and political commitment of parents, teachers, students, and the men and women of our legislative bodies. A policy of massive bussing, based on a misplaced emphasis on race, would simply exacerbate the growing attitude that says, "What the h— is going on?" We would wind up with a net loss, rather than a net gain, in our school systems. Federal financial aid to schools would be bogged down in controversy, resistance to school millage would increase, and racial antagonisms would be accentuated.

If it were only a question of political risk, that risk might be taken. But the concept of widespread bussing to pursue racial balance rests on a faulty, race conscious premise. It is presumptuous and patronizing to suppose that black children, in whose interest the concept is advanced, can only be educated if a certain percentage of white faces is produced in the same school, by transport if necessary.

It must be recognized that the developing controversy involves at least two essential elements: education and race relations. The element of race relations is many-faceted and is intertwined with such problems as job opportunities, crime and the fear of crime, economic disadvantage, housing, and family environment and motivation. Extensive bussing will not solve any of these problems.

A respected Washington journalist, who happens to be black, recently wrote,

"Convoluted efforts to achieve racial balance are not likely to produce educational improvement for the black children on whose behalf the efforts are undertaken.

"Somehow the point has to be made that what is wrong with the schools so many poor blacks are forced to attend is not the absence of white children.

"What is wrong is official unconcern, inadequate expenditures of public money and pervading ignorance as to how best to teach children who come to school profoundly disadvantaged in almost every way."

If we are to achieve quality education for all, it is essential that the precarious amity and good will between the races not be further eroded. It is essential that a higher priority be given to education on our national list of priorities.

As one who has regularly supported aid to education, school lunch programs, job training, and similar education legislation, I am bothered to see that some members of Congress and others who have opposed these programs, or engaged in sly efforts to weaken them, now rush to the media to take political advantage of the public agony surrounding race relations and education. Such conduct is "not thoroughbred," as the saying goes, and I hope it will not continue.

Sound public policy should seek to maximize good will and public support for quality schools. It should avoid the creation of questionable formulas and dogmas which would wrench at the vital strings of American life and which might convulse, year after year and generation after generation, the emotions and the politics of our beloved land. I trust that our nation will choose wisely and act wisely in the times ahead.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 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?

THE AMERICAN COUNTRYSIDE CAN NO LONGER LIVE ON ITS RURAL PAST

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, G. B. Gunlogson, of the Countryside Development Foundation, Inc., of Racine, Wis., has been devoting his life to the study of the problems of the countryside and solutions to these problems.

Just recently, he published a booklet, The American Countryside, which I believe should be must reading for every member of Congress.

Because I do not have enough copies of this booklet to distribute to each of my colleagues, with your permission, I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so all of the Members may gain a new insight into the problems of our American countryside:

THE AMERICAN COUNTRYSIDE CAN NO LONGER LIVE ON ITS RURAL PAST

There was a time not long ago that some of us remember well when the broad valleys and plains of the country were dotted with farms and villages. In place of concrete highways, there were overland trails and dirt roads which we took to school, to church, or when we went to town. About 20 million horses and mules provided the power in the fields and for hauling wagons around and buggies in town.

More people worked on farms than in all the manufacturing industries in cities. Life in the villages was closely geared to this agrarian economy.

Now much of this has changed. Now only one family in 7 or 8 is farming. Not only has the number of farms been rapidly shrinking, but agriculture has been a shrinking share of the total economy. Thousands of towns that once were thriving are now being abandoned. Unless diversification and industrial development are expanded to supplement farming, the exodus from country communities will continue.

A NEW WORLD HAS OPENED UP

While this rural deterioration has been in progress, there has at the same time been tremendous development going on in capital improvements and technological advancements in the countryside. This is a new resource that did not exist before. Combined with its vast natural resources and living space, the countryside can be made to provide better living conditions and more opportunities than ever before.

If a rural Rip Van Winkle had gone to sleep in the thirties somewhere in the heartland of America and awakened in the early seventies, he would feel strangely lost in a new world.

Some of the things he would discover are 3 million miles of hard-surfaced roads crisscrossing the country and reaching into every town; electric power available nearly everywhere for homes, towns and factories; a network of underground pipelines carrying natural gas to nearly every part of the country; two automobiles, telephone, radio, television, and electric appliances in nearly every home. The name of the game had become technology, which had permeated into the country as well as the big cities. Even the cropland was producing two and three times more grain to the acre than it had before.

Indeed, rural America had become a new world. All its vast natural resources and living space had acquired new values. The rain fell, the sun shone, and the earth was beautiful and abundant with living things. All these things, too, had become more precious and vital to the future of mankind at a time when millions of people are crowding big cities to near suffocation.

Despite recurring dreams about a better life, the public has been slow in exploring what the great body of America has to offer. For one thing, too many people, including agencies in our government, continue to cling to the outmoded image of the rural past. This image is perpetuated by continuing the "rural" designation for all of the United States that lies outside the boundaries of big cities.

WHAT'S IN A NAME?

The very essence of words and names is the image they covey. Business spends billions of dollars to popularize names of products. Many big industries are changing their corporate names in order to create a new image or to get away from an unfavorable one. We can learn from these experiences when it comes to developing the countryside.

(1) A study of a number of concerns that had established or were considering locating plants in country towns disclosed that a "rural" designation for an area was a hindrance. Plant personnel have aversion to moving into communities that are labeled "rural."

Another study of a large number of towns that were trying to develop job opportunities showed that almost without exception they wanted to get away from the term. Even towns of 1,000 population preferred to class themselves as cities and the surorundings as country or countryside. One man in a small Kansas town wrote: "People who refer to country towns today as 'rural' are hurting us. They are out of touch with the times."

(2) The popular connotation of the term is not compatible with development. Diversification and business development are going to take place in the towns and small cities and not in the back country. These towns will become the growth centers. In fact, most of the country is no longer "rural." Widespread public improvements and technological changes are taking place almost everywhere. In many states the educational system in small cities is better, and the record of literacy and high school attenance is considerably higher than it is in our nation's capital or the City of New York.

(3) To help improve conditions in country communities, the Rural Areas Development Service was established nearly 20 years ago. In 1964 this became the Rural Community Development Service and later the Rural Affairs Council. During all this time of rural activity, the exodus from country communities has been the heaviest in history.

Many people closely identified with these government programs realize that the term rural development is a "stumbling block." In a letter from the Rural Areas Development Service back in 1957, the statement is made: "The name is a stumbling bock, and we have to get around it by explaining what we are trying to do."

Ten years later the Acting Director of Rural Community Development Service wrote: "Secretary Freeman has asked me to reply to your letter of February 7 in which you commented on the dilemma we face when the term 'rural' is used indiscriminately. As you pointed out, the press is not much help. Frequently, when Secretary Freeman uses the expression 'smaller cities and towns and the countryside', it comes back rural America, or worse, 'back to the farm.' In programs such as the Rural Industrialization Program which

attempt to point out the advantages of non-metropolitan America for industrial development, we suffer because the connotation of 'boondock' is frequently attached.

The operations of government seem to be falling into the categories of urban and rural; therefore, we must constantly define what we mean by a description of rural America in the context it is being used in each instance."

Still more recently the Chairman of the President's Task Force on Rural Development wrote: "Members of the Task Force shared your concern about the term 'rural' and thought, in discussion with Department of Agriculture representatives, for an alternative term that might more clearly identify the problem and the people involved. We did not come up with any alternative word."

WHAT OTHERS HAVE TO SAY

(1) Some time ago Resources for the Future convened a meeting of representatives from various professional fields to discuss some of the problems and opportunities facing rural areas. It was concluded that "non-metropolitan" is more descriptive than "rural," because the smaller cities and towns lying outside the larger metropolitan areas face many of the same problems that confront the strictly rural areas.

This thinking points in the right direction, except the term "non-metropolitan" is negative and is hardly an appropriate definition for 98 percent of the United States. It falls into the "horseless carriage" category.

Dr. Obenhaus of the Chicago Theological Seminary writes: "I agree heartily with your expression that we must get away from the term 'rural.' We must avoid confronting people in towns with the outmoded term 'rural.'"

Still another point of view comes from England in a letter to an American friend who was about to visit that country: "You must allow ample time to travel through the English countryside to enjoy its charm and many points of interest. There, too, you may find some dusty corners of antiquity and even witchcraft, but we call that rural England."

(2) The continued use of the term "rural" by federal agencies and others as applied to most of the country and to people has tended to draw a sharp distinction between urban and country people. To enable the nation to make best use of its total resources, we must get away from the notion of two societies and two types of people in America. It makes no difference if people live in an inner city, a suburb, or in the country—their aspirations and human needs are pretty much the same.

This designation which came into use nearly two hundred years ago to define the hinterlands and the people who lived there as apart from urban places is no longer valid, and it has become discriminatory. Today is a different era in history. Most of the countryside has advanced tremendously in facilities and opportunities to enable people to enjoy better quality of life. At the same time, the nation is confronted with a historical emergency.

Millions of people have become trapped in an unreal world within big cities—a world of poverty, filth, pollution, unsafe streets, danger to normal development of children, and deterioration of human character and efficiency. We can provide a brighter outlook for both big-city and country communities, and we can provide the tools that will help a more orderly development of the whole country.

SOME 16,000 GATEWAYS TO PROSPERITY

Recently an Omaha business executive wrote: "The future of Omaha depends on the prosperity that may lie ahead for hundreds of communities and small cities scattered across Nebraska and western Iowa."

Actually, there are 16,000 towns and small cities in the American countryside ranging to 15,000 in population. They serve as trading and service centers. They are centers for local governments, schools, health facilities, religious and cultural activities for about 98 percent of the area of the United States.

These centers have a new promise for all America. Already there are hundreds of these towns scattered across the country that have grown into prosperous town and country communities. There are several thousand others that are equally well situated to accommodate industry and more people.

There is no other way to make the nation's vast natural resources and living space available for a greater share of the population. Decentralization would help the large cities by relieving the pressure and problems from overcrowding. Jobs can be created more economically in smaller cities where money works harder, costs are lower, and transportation is simpler and people are safer.

Widespread development of the countryside could be the best thing that has happened to farm families in a generation. It would encourage better land use. It would enhance home ownership as well as wider land ownership.

FEDERAL PROGRAMS CAN BE MORE HELPFUL

While the processes of diversifying the economy, creating new industries and businesses are mainly up to private initiative, there is much the Federal government can do to encourage this movement. We need to define new goals and formulate new approaches to develop this vast body of America. Those new approaches should be formulated jointly by the various Federal agencies or Cabinet offices rather than predominately the Department of Agriculture. Almost every aspect of national life is involved.

It would also seem that a Congressional Commission or Committee on Countryside Affairs is needed to help stimulate wider public interest in this new outlook for America. Most members of Congress have a very direct stake in the future of the countryside. A more rational distribution of population and industry is of concern to the whole nation and should be of continuing concern to every branch of government.

G. B. GUNLOGSON,
The Countryside Development Foundation Inc., 4747 Highway 31, Racine, Wis. 53405.

(NOTE.—The Countryside Development Foundation Inc. (non-profit) was organized for the purpose of sponsoring studies and information pertaining to the American countryside.)

NEWSLETTER

HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request that the contents of my most recent Newsletter be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that it may be made available to all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I will shortly send this information to those on my mailing list.

The text is as follows:

FLETCHER THOMPSON REPORTS TO YOU

THE PRESIDENT'S TRIP

President Nixon has just completed two important trips. First, to China and second, to Russia. At a time when these two powers possess the hydrogen bomb, which can destroy any city—Washington, Savannah, Atlanta or San Francisco—and can be sent by rocket to our country within 45 minutes, America must keep communications open in an effort to assure peace. President Nixon has lessened world tension and has served the cause of peace by his trips. However, we must not lose sight of the fact that peace is maintained by strength and Russia has broken 24 of the last 25 summit agreements. While the President agreed to a freeze in nuclear weapons he did not agree to reduce American strength. We still possess the power to destroy Russia several times over, as they do us. In other words, we have agreed to a nuclear stalemate.

BLOCKADE OF NORTH VIETNAM

The President's blockade is definitely cutting off war supplies to North Vietnam. Despite the cries of Senators and Governors against the President's action, it appears that this one bold move will probably have as much to do with ending the war and getting our POW's home as any other single action taken by the American Government.

VIETNAMIZATION

The President promised when he took office that he would phase out American ground combat troops and phase in South Vietnamese. The graph (not shown) illustrates the success of Vietnamization while at the same time we were not abandoning the South Vietnamese to Communism.

ELECTIONS IN VIETNAM

North Vietnam is a Communistic dictatorship. They have never had an election. South Vietnam is a Democracy. Although fighting a war, they have had two general elections in the last five years. President Thieu won both. In the first, even Senator Kennedy admitted it was honest and fair. In the last, President Thieu's two opponents quit and demanded no election be held. Of course it was, and Thieu was reelected. Frankly, I wish my opponents would quit. In 1966 one did.

A CONGRESSMAN'S DAILY ACTIVITIES

Few people realize how often Congress is presented with new spending proposals. Every one sounds good. However, somebody has to say no to excessive spending. In this letter I am giving you several examples of our daily work in Congress involving spending of money. Often Congressmen are reluctant to vote against spending beyond and above the budget when it involves well-sounding programs. I view a Congressman's responsibility as one wherein he must say NO to excessive federal spending even though friends and special interest groups ask him to say yes.

TWO MILLION DOLLARS

In early June our Committee was asked to create a Commission to look into cargo thefts at the Nation's airports, particularly New York. The Commission was going to cost $2,000,000 even though the total thefts for one year amounted to only $732,000. I succeeded in killing this proposal in committee and insisted that there were already enough people on the government payroll to investigate cargo thefts. We do not need to spend $2,000,000 of taxpayer's money for a new commission.

BUMPERS?

Everyone wants a bumper on their car which will protect the car from damage when going at least five miles an hour. The House just passed a bill on the emotion of this subject costing the taxpayers $81,000,000.00 in new spending. But, this one was not needed. A five mile an hour bumper will be required next year under a law already in effect. This bill was 54 pages and of course, 54 pages is not needed if bumpers were the only purpose. The real purpose of the bill was to hire more federal employees to examine every make and model of car that comes off the assembly line, in order that the Federal Government in the future may tell automobile companies how to design

every part of your automobile. This will probably raise the cost of automobiles to you in 1975 by $300 to $400 each. I voted against this because more spending means higher taxes and the Federal Government's design of automobile parts means higher prices to you for cars.

RED INK $1.3 BILLION

The House of Representatives just passed the HEW Appropriations Bill which included many worthwhile projects. However, it was $1.3 billion higher than the budget figures. Many Congressmen felt compelled to vote for it since it included funds for education. I am very much for education. However, I cannot support excessive spending, which is going to mean higher taxes and more inflation. Because it was $1.3 billion above the budget, I voted against it.

DEFENSE OPTIONS AFTER MOSCOW AND PEKING

HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, on June 10, 1972, a conference entitled "Defense Options After Moscow and Peking" was held at Claremont Men's College in California. This conference heard papers delivered by a number of experts on our Nation's defense posture. Two of the papers presented there deserve the particular attention of the Congress. The first, by Dr. Edward Teller of the University of California, a major contributor to our Nation's security through his scientific efforts in nuclear physics; and the second by Dr. William Schneider, Jr., a defense analyst from the Hudson Institute, now on the staff of U.S. Senator JAMES L. BUCKLEY of New York.

In view of the consequences of the Strategic Arms Limitation accords recently concluded in Moscow between the President, and Soviet Communist Party Secretary Brezhnev, the importance of a complete understanding of what alternatives are available to maintain our security and independence is essential. The papers by Drs. Teller and Schneider make an important contribution to that understanding, and deserve careful study. I include them in the RECORD at this point:

COMMENTS BY DR. EDWARD TELLER ON THE STRATEGIC ARMS LIMITATION AGREEMENTS

Our Nation's rapidly declining position of strength relative to the Soviet Union, coupled with our projected position over the next five years of the Strategic Arms Treaty, is a very real danger to our continued survival. I firmly believe that a deadly danger will soon exist for the United States. This danger is to the very life of our country . . . to the United States as an historical fact . . . as an idea . . . as a way of life! I believe this danger will become a reality within five years . . . not the actuality but the danger. In one way or the other many people in our Nation are aware of the existence of this danger.

Regarding the Moscow Agreement: firsts, this Treaty leaves the United States in a clearly inferior position. Second, there is a real possibility of cheating: we can't and we won't . . . but the ABM Agreement is full of possibilities. Third, we must remember the possibility of abrogating the Treaty by moving very fast on the basis of earlier technological advancements. The Soviet Union now possess a superior ABM, they have accomplished much more research, and have gained considerably more experience than we have. And finally, the greatest danger is that we now say that we can relax since we have these Agreements. This final danger may be further reinforced by the presence of the Treaty. If we do relax, what I term as a clear, but hopefully improbable danger will indeed become a dreadful probability.

In the harsh cold light of political reality, we have not given away much by signing these Agreements, when we said in these Treaties that we will not build additional missiles and additional submarines, it is a political fact that Congress would not have agreed in the foreseeable future to that anyway. Therefore, what we signed was probably the best compromise we could have hoped for in this very terrible state of affairs.

Now, to come to the advantages of the Treaty. Here I will make one point: there is a possibility . . . but by no means a certainty . . . that the Treaty will freeze or at least slow down the Russian submarine and fixed land-based ballistic missile development. If that happens, and there is at least a chance . . . perhaps a good chance . . . that it will happen, then we have got something! There is one other advantage, and that one is closely connected to a disadvantage which I have mentioned. We have agreed to freeze our own strategic missile force at its present level. This practically forces us to say to the American public, in some very import respects, "We are second!" This may help to wake us up: an unknown or insidious weakness is more dangerous than a weakness we have clearly written into a treaty. And since we could not have done anything about it anyway, why not acknowledge it? This to my mind is the main reason why, with proper reservations, I support its ratification.

My last point about the Treaty is terribly important. The Russians are working on Research and Development in a tremendous way, with colossal establishments of exceedingly high standards . . . bigger than anything else in the Western world. This must not be forgotten. At the same time, our young people have turned away from defense programs, some technology, even from science! This is an extremely dangerous situation—Treaty or no Treaty. The Treaty does not regulate Research and Development and I cannot foresee how any treaty could do so. What is not foreseen . . . what is not even dreamed of . . . cannot be checked . . . cannot be written into treaties. We must revitalize our technological Research and Development in the United States. This is our insurance for survival.

IMPLICATIONS OF STRATEGIC SUFFICIENCY

(By William Schneider, Jr.*)

The introduction of nuclear weapons into the calculus of warfare has revolutionized the strategy as much as the technology of organized international military conflict. The sometimes discordant, sometimes harmonious rhythm of technological change and political perceptions of what constitutes "security," have imparted sharp discontinuities to the strategic doctrine govering our policies concerning the acquisition and employment of strategic nuclear weapons. This paper will discuss the implications of the most recent change in strategic doctrine, strategic sufficiency.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF STRATEGIC SUFFICIENCY

During the 1950s, the U.S. deployment of thermonuclear weapons, and a vast delivery system composed of medium and heavy bombers reinforced the policy of "containment" of Communist expansion by spawning the "massive retaliation" doctrine promulgated by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles in 1954. Under this doctrine any outward Soviet thrust would be met with an overwhelming nuclear response on Soviet territory. Expenditure on strategic forces in the late 1950s approached $15 billion, nearly one-third of the defense budget, or about four times the current level in constant dollars.

The emergence of intercontinental and submarine-launched ballistic missiles in the late 1950s, and a Soviet preference for "wars of national liberation"—insurgency war by proxy—over more direct military confrontations with the U.S., eroded the credibility of massive retalliation. The erosion of the doctrine's credibility necessitated it change in policy which would preserve if not enhance the ability of a U.S. President to support U.S. foreign policy objectives under circumstances where replicating the stark nuclear superiority of the mid-1950s was difficult for political or other reasons.

The change in policy emerged gradually, but unmistakeably in the early 1960s. As early as 1954, analysts noting the probable diminution of credibility of "massive retaliation," sought to increase the number of alternatives available to the President should the use of force be necessary.[1] These notions were eventally contained in the doctrine of "flexible response." Our forces were to be designed to cope with all levels of violence from insurgency conflict to unlimited strategic nuclear warfare. While the notion of "flexible response" was an important element in the modernization and reorganization of our General Purpose (conventional) Forces, there was considerably less enthusiasm for the doctrine with regard to our strategic nuclear forces. There was some early interest expressed during the Kennedy Administration in designing U.S. strategic forces for counterforce rather than countervalue warfare, most notably, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara's 1962 Ann Arbor speech,[2] but interest rapidly dissipated. What emerged was to become the dominant fashion in strategic doctrine of the 1960s, "assured destruction," also known as "mutual assured destruction," (quite literally, MAD). The doctrine reached the zenith of its development in the latter half of the 1960s. In his annual Defense report to the Congress in 1969, Secretary Clark Clifford stated the objectives of the prevailing strategic doctrine: [3]

"We must be prepared to maintain at all times strategic forces of such size and character, and exhibit so unquestionable a will to use them in retaliation if needed, that no nation could ever conceivably deem it to its disadvantage to launch a deliberate nuclear attack on the United States or its allies."

The practice of assured destruction imposed several requirements on the United States. Its strategic forces should be secure and invulnerable to attack. The forces should be of such a character that they are neither accident-prone nor difficult to employ should a Presidential order for retaliation be given. U.S. strategic forces were structured in a way which employed three distinct but integrated components—manned bombers, submarine-launched ballistic missiles, and land based ICBMs. These forces, designed to be redundant to provide a high degree of confidence in their ability to carry out their tasks, and all requiring different countermeasures to defeat them were to be reliably controlled through a secure communication system. Land based ICBMs were to be protected by hardened sites, manned bombers were protected by airborne alert and/or dispersal,

---

*The author is on leave from Hudson Institute, Croton-on-Hudson, New York, serving as Legislative Assistant to U. S. Senator James L. Buckley (C.-R., N.Y.).

Footnotes at end of article.

and submarines, because of the extended cruise capability afforded by nuclear propulsion systems, were protected by concealment.

These forces were deemed sufficiently secure and reliable to be capable of absorbing a first-strike with sufficient forces remaining to destroy one-fifth to one-third of the Soviet population. Assured destruction had several weaknesses which did not become apparent until the technology of the 1960s—ballistic missile defense, multiple warheads, precision missile accuracy—eroded its credibility as a viable means of supporting U.S. foreign policy objectives in a crisis. Multiple warheads and precision accuracy made a first strike far more feasible such that perceptions about the adequacy of the deterrent forces would always be in doubt.[4] The feasibility of ballistic missile defense for the defense of population centers (deployed in limited numbers by the Soviet Union around Moscow as early as 1964) weakened the viability of the assertion that programmed strategic forces could hold sufficient numbers of Soviet citizens as nuclear hostages to insure the credibility of "assured destruction" even if such a policy were desirable. Indeed, a distinguishing characteristic of devotees of assured destruction is the zeal with which they reject any system of active or passive defense to protect civilians in the event of the failure of deterrence out of a fear that either side might lose a significant number of "hostages" (i.e., those protected by defenses).

Disenchantment with "assured destruction" led the Nixon Administration to institute the third major change in strategic doctrine in less than twenty years, known as "strategic sufficiency." President Nixon summarized the sufficiency doctrine in his 1972 Foreign Policy message to Congress.[5]

"Our forces must be maintained at a level sufficient to make it clear that even an all out surprise attack on the United States by the U.S.S.R. would not cripple our capability to retaliate. Our forces must also be capable of flexible application. A simple 'assured destruction' does not meet our present requirements for a flexible range of strategic options."

Secretary of Defense Laird in his FY 1973 "Posture Statement" noted that The Defense Department had four planning criteria—criteria which were subject to change from the outcome of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks as well as significant changes in Soviet and Chinese Communist strategic weapon deployments.[6] These criteria are:

(1) Maintaining an adequate second-strike capability to deter an all-out surprise attack on our strategic forces.

(2) Providing no incentive for the Soviet Union to strike first in a crisis.

(3) Preventing the Soviet Union from gaining the ability to cause considerably greater urban/industrial destruction than the U.S. could inflict on the Soviets in a nuclear war.

(4) Defending against damage from small attacks or accidental launches.

All of the sufficiency criteria are affected either by the proposed ABM treaty or the Interim Agreement on Offensive Arms made between the U.S. and the Soviet Union on May 26, 1972.[7] The nature of the ABM agreement precludes satisfying the fourth criteria—defending against damage from small attacks or accidental launches—because the permissible ABM deployment is limited to militarily insignificant levels. The relevance of the first three criteria will be influenced by the pace of the Soviet MIRV program, and the extent to which the Interim Agreement becomes permanent in the second phase of the SALT exercise. If the existing agreement becomes permanent and the Soviet Union deploys a counterforce capable MIRV system, it is unlikely that any of the sufficiency criteria could be satisfied. If the Soviets are not able or willing to improve the quality of their forces, the sufficiency criteria could be satisfied within the constraints of the SALT agreements.

Footnotes at end of article.

SOVIET STRATEGIC DOCTRINE

The extent to which the Soviet leadership shares U.S. doctrinal assumptions will have a significant impact on the efficacy of U.S. policy. There is some evidence to suggest that Soviet strategic doctrine is considerably more stable than U.S. doctrine, perhaps reflecting the greater continuity of military and civilian leadership made possible by the manner in which Soviet society is organized.

The first serious Soviet strategic nuclear forces were developed and deployed by Soviet Premier Khrushchev's regime including the SS–6, 7 and 8 ICBMs, the TU–20 BEAR and MYA–4 BISON heavy bombers, as well as the "G" and "H" class ballistic missile launching submarines.[8] These forces were procured in small numbers to support Khrushchev's version of a minimum deterrence policy. A recent study of Soviet military doctrine cited two objectives of Soviet strategic doctrine prior to 1965: [9]

(1) The avoidance of general nuclear war and the maintenance of "deterrence."

(2) The maintenance of its military strength within the Eurasian land mass, with special emphasis on Europe and (to a greater extent in the post 1965 era) on the Eastern reaches taking in the threat from China.

Following Khrushchev's downfall, considerable dissatisfaction with Soviet strategic doctrine began to surface. In a thoroughgoing review of the implications of general nuclear war by the Soviet political and defense establishment a sweeping critique of the minimum deterrence posture of the Khrushchev era emerged.[10] It was concluded that minimum deterrence is not an adequate military posture for Soviet needs—war by "accident" (i.e. by political miscalculation in Soviet lexicon) was a definite possibility. Moreover, minimum deterrence as such does not prepare the Soviet Union for the consequences of the failure of deterrence—a posture unacceptable for the Soviet Union. Soviet doctrine after 1965 required what was described as "military-technical superiority in the quantity and quality of nuclear munitions and their means of delivery." The fabric of the Soviet perception of "military-technical superiority" emphasizes a favorable relative war outcome, should deterrence fail, and a quantifiable margin of superiority available in peacetime. The evolutionary post-1965 shift away from minimum deterrence brought a corresponding change in Soviet targeting policy. Instead of relying upon threats of mutual suicide implied by Khrushchev's minimum deterrence doctrine, (an explicit forecast of the necessary consequence of the failure of deterrence by U.S. assured destruction advocates) the new policy emphasized that Soviet strategic forces would be directed "primarily against the enemy's means of nuclear attack" [11] and secondarily against counter-administration and counter-industrial targets.

There is no support in the Soviet military literature for a perception that the Soviet Union believes it may preclude damage by active defense—ballistic missile defense, anti-aircraft defense, anti-submarine warfare (ASW)—or civil defense but only that the consequences of the failure of deterrence be mitigated to permit a favorable relative war outcome. Soviet damage limiting measures historically have focused upon anti-aircraft defenses where a massive effort has been made. More recently, the Soviets have emphasized damage limitation against ballistic missiles, but have focused upon counterforce targeting for damage limitation purposes against U.S. ICBMs, and ASW against POLARIS/POSEIDON submarines rather than ballistic missile defense. This perhaps explains the Soviet disinclination to retain militarily significant levels of ballistic missile defense at SALT.

The Soviet Union does not have a doctrinal counterpart to our "assured destruction" and "sufficiency" doctrines.[12] There is direct evidence from Soviet strategic doctrine, and indirect evidence from the character of their weapons acquisition program that they seek to maintain "balance" between forces designed for deterrence and forces designed for coping with the consequences of a failure of deterrences. The Soviets have a well-known propensity to go for large numbers of weapons and to "over-insure" against contingencies.[13] Therefore, it is not possible to assert *a priori* that the Soviets perceive that they have achieved "parity" or "superiority" in their sense of the terms. However, it does appear likely that should the Soviets perceive a significant strategic advantage in the "military-technical" sense, they would become substantially more difficult people with whom to bargain in a political crisis. In recent testimony before the Congress, a British scholar on Soviet affairs, Robert Conquest observed that the Soviet leadership "would regard it as both justifiable and natural to use their advantage greatly to increase political pressure on the United States and its allies throughout the world." [14]

U.S. AND SOVIET STRATEGIC NUCLEAR FORCES

The strategic nuclear force deployments of both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. have tended to support their respective doctrinal preferences over the years. During the 1950s, the U.S. maintained a force of over 1000 heavy and medium strategic bombers, nuclear-capable carrier based aircraft, and a serious IRBM and embryo ICBM force in the latter part of the period. A substantial investment was made in active defenses against manned aircraft.[15]

In the 1960s, as the doctrine of assured destruction tended to dominate defense decisions, forces were procured which supported the doctrine such as silo-launched Minutemen missiles, Polaris submarines, and a secure U.S. based bomber force—those forces which did not support the assured destruction doctrine such as ballistic missile defense for population centers or offensive forces designed for war-fighting purposes—were not procured.[16]

Similarly, the Soviet Union tended to procure forces which supported their doctrinal preferences. During the Khrushchev era relatively small numbers of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems were built. At the time of the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962, the Soviets had only 75 ICBMs, and less than 200 heavy bombers.[17] This low level of effort was thoroughly consistent with Khrushchev's minimum deterrent posture.

With the change in Soviet strategic doctrine under the Brezhnev-Kosygin regime, Soviet strategic weapons deployment changed accordingly. The requirement for a counterforce capability against land-based strategic forces accounts for the SS–9 (a substantially larger follow-on to the SS–9 which would be a replacement for the SS–9 under the terms of the SALT accords is awaiting test firings at the Turyatam test complex). A large number of SS–11s and a small number of SS–13s were also procured—presumably for counter-administration and counter-industrial targeting. Impressive Soviet efforts in air defense (10 thousand plus SAM launchers, 3,300 manned interceptors) [18] and ASW (new ASW carriers, the new 36 knot "V" class attack submarine, and long range maritime aircraft) [19] suggest a continuing emphasis on force "balance." There is no evidence which supports the notion of their forces being designed for a meticulously calculated "first strike," but the doctrinal analog of the traditional artillery maxim of "pre-emption" to break up an enemy attack which was inevitable remains a constant element in the

Soviet strategic literature. The trend to a high level of readiness in Soviet strategic forces is consistent with this doctrine.

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FUTURE OF STRATEGIC SUFFICIENCY

The outcome of the first round of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks suggest that some changes will have to be made in the strategic sufficiency criteria if the doctrine is to be a useful guide to major defense decisions. Changes in the doctrine will necessarily be dominated over the next several years by three aspects of the Political-military context:

(1) The large potential offensive force disparity in favor of the Soviet Union is likely to persist under all contemplated U.S. strategic weapons acquisition efforts in the next five years. The Soviet strategic buildup which has taken place since the start of SALT has provided an infrastructure for a substantial Soviet advantage in the aggregate measures of the ability to conduct strategic warfare if the Soviets choose to make the qualitative improvements, especially MIRV and counterforce capable guidance, which would be available to them in the next several years. For example, if the Soviets were to gain the engineering ability to equip the ballistic missile force with warheads the size of our POSEIDON, they could deploy 35–40 thousand separately targetable warheads on their force—a number many times the size of our own force.

(2) The doctrinal disparity between the U.S. and the Soviet Union will impart continuing differences in procurement policies, arms limitation preferences, and behavior in a political crisis. If the U.S. is to maintain its existing strategic doctrinal preferences, constraints imposed by the SALT accords will impose substantially higher performance requirements on those portions of U.S. strategic forces not covered by the agreements.

(3) The SALT accords impose severe constraints on the ability of the U.S. to maintain a credible strategic position for crisis bargaining, because the U.S. is prohibited under the terms of the accords from matching the Soviet Union in deploying the infrastructure (i. e., heavy payload ballistic missiles) needed to equal the Soviet potential in the major aggregate measures of the ability to conduct strategic warfare; throw weight—and thus, warheads—numbers of delivery vehicles and the diversity of strategic delivery systems (e. g., FOBS, DICBM, MOBS, etc.)

These three aspects of the defense policy environment limit the choices available to the U.S. political leadership. The provisions of the ABM Treaty, unless modified by Congress require U.S. strategic doctrine to remain permanently in a quasi-assured destruction posture, offering no possibility, now or in the future (even if a technical feasibility were demonstrated) to protect either the U.S. civilian population or strategic forces from the consequences of the failure of deterrence. The ABM Treaty thus requires that the Department of Defense continue to be an instrumentality for insuring the vulnerability of American citizens in the interests of a rather bizarre theory of strategic stability.[20]

A consequence of the Interim Agreement on Offensive Arms is that the U.S. must make a major effort to improve the quality of its strategic forces which are not subject to the agreement if it is to avoid being coerced in a crisis. Moreover, the flexibility of existing U.S. strategic forces for limited strategic nuclear war must be increased if the U.S. is to maintain credibility in demonstrating an ability to cope with Soviet strategic forces. Some of the measures appropriate in this regard would include the following:

(1) Increase the B–1 bomber buy to a level sufficient to cope with contingencies ranging from conventional war situations where large quantities of conventional ordnance are required through all levels of nuclear conflict from limited attacks to all out retaliation.

(2) Increase the survival potential of the B–1 bomber force in hostile environments by upgrading the programmed avionics and the self-defense capability of the aircraft, assuring a high-confidence ability of the aircraft to perform the penetration and standoff missions.

(3) Increase the survival potential of Minuteman through passive means—preferably through mobility. The efficiency of the Minuteman and Poseidon force should also be increased through counterforce-capable targeting.

(4) Procure the Trident (ULMS) submarine to offset, to some extent, the Soviet land-based ICBM payload advantage.

The aforementioned steps will tend to mitigate, but not offset the consequences of the first round SALT accords. Hopefully, the second round of negotiations will provide for a more stable strategic relationship than was obtained during the first round of negotiations. It is not clear what can be salvaged from the sufficiency doctrine that is relevant to a post-SALT environment. It is more likely that new criteria are needed which would emphasize the U.S. ability to develop more flexible and technologically superior strategic forces that may provide a representative U.S. President with the means dealing with Soviet threats on some other basis than pure deterrence. In the absence of the legal right to provide active defense which we have abandoned in the ABM treaty, this implies a major capability for limited strategic war, and a complete rethinking of our ideas on passive defense for civilian populations.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Bernard Brodie, "Unlimited Weapons and Limited War," *The Reporter*, November 18, 1954, and W. F. Kaufmann (ed.), *Military Policy* and *National Security*, (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1956). Early interest in limited war was severely circumscribed by the technology available at the time. For example, Szilard suggested an arbitrary series of "prices" for various types of Soviet aggression. For example, a Soviet attack on Iran, would result in Kiev being destroyed. These ideas were expressed in "Disarmament and the Problem of Peace," *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, October, 1955, pp. 297–307. Szilard's basic idea with modifications to reduce its inflexible and arbitrary character have been developed by Morton A. Kaplan, "The Calculus of Nuclear Deterrence," *World Politics*, October 1958, pp. 20–43, and *The Strategy of Limited Retaliation*, Policy Memorandum No. 19, Princeton University, April 1959, Herman Kahn, *On Thermonuclear War* (2nd ed.), McMillan, New York, 1969, and *On Escalation: Metaphors and Scenarios*, Penguin Books, Baltimore, 1968.

[2] Robert S. McNamara, *The Essence of Security*, Harper and Row, New York, 1969.

[3] *Defense Report to the Congress of Secretary of Defense Clark Clifford*, Before the Committee on Armed Services, U.S. House of Representatives, March 1969.

[4] Dr. John S. Foster, Director of Defense Research and Engineering, noted in testimony before Congress, *Diplomatic and Strategic Impact of Multiple Warhead Missiles*, Hearings before the Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Development of the Committee on Foreign Relations, House of Representatives, 91st Congress, 1st Session, p. 244, that the Soviet SS–9 possessed a "guidance and control system . . . much greater than that required to implement a simple MRV. The things we do know about this mechanism are completely compatible with MIRV, even though they do not prove a MIRV capability." Fears that the Soviets could combine MIRV and precision accuracy impelled the Congressional decision to proceed with the Safeguard ABM system in 1969. Though the likelihood of this taking place has increased rather than diminished, we are precluded by the terms of the ABM Treaty from defending our land-based strategic forces with militarily significant levels of ballistic missile defense. It should be emphasized that small changes in accuracy have a large impact on effectiveness. The effectiveness of a missile force against hardened targets is described by the expression $(K) = \frac{\Sigma \text{ Yield } 2/3}{CEP^2}$ where yield is the energy release of a nuclear weapon in ton-equivalents of TNT and CEP (Circular Error, Probable), the distance within which 50% of the warheads will land) means that cutting the miss-distance (CEP) in half accomplishes as much as a ten fold increase in yield.

[5] President Richard Nixon, *U.S. Foreign Policy for the 1970s; The Emerging Structure of Peace*, A Report to the Congress, February 9, 1972, p. 158.

[6] Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird, *National Security Strategy of Realistic Deterrence*, Annual Defense Department Report, FY 1973 before the Senate Armed Services Committee, February 15, 1972, p. 66.

[7] The text of the *Interim Agreement on Certain Measures with Respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms and its Protocol*, and the *Treaty on the Limitations of Anti Ballistic Missile Systems* as released by President Nixon in Moscow, May 26, 1972.

[8] International Institute for Strategic Studies *The Military Balance, 1971–72*, IISS, London, 1971, pp. 55–59.

[9] John Erickson, *Soviet Military Power*, Royal United Services Institution for Defence Studies, London, 1971, p. 8.

[10] E. Rybkin, *Kommunist Vooruzhennykh Sil*, No. 17, September, 1965, pp. 50–56.

[11] I. Zavylov, Krasnaya Zvezda, 30 March 1967.

[12] Erickson, *ibid.*, p. 50, also David Holloway, *Strategic Concepts and Soviet Policy*, based upon a paper presented at an Institute for Strategic Studies seminar reproduced in *Survival*, November 1971, p. 366. Earlier studies which authoritatively discuss Soviet strategic doctrine are, Raymond L. Garthoff, *Soviet Strategy in the Nuclear Age*, (New York, Praeger, 1958) and Thomas W. Wolfe, *Soviet Strategy at the Crossroads*, (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1964). A thorough anthology of Soviet strategic literature up to 1967 is contained in W. R. Kintner and Harriet Fast Scott (eds.), *The Nuclear Revolution in Soviet Military Affairs*, (Norman, University of Oklahoma Press), 1967.

[13] Erickson, *ibid.*, pp. 50–52.

[14] Testimony of Robert Conquest before the Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations of the Committee on Government Operations, 92nd Congress, 1st Session, April 30, 1971.

[15] Professor Eugene Wigner of Princeton University has estimated that the Soviet Union has spent the Equivalent of $125 billion on active defense—mostly air defense—since World War II. The U.S. has spent about $50 billion in the same period.

[16] A useful study of comparative U.S. and Soviet strategic weapons deployments since World War II is contained in, Johan J. Holst, *Comparative U. S. and Soviet Deployments, Doctrines, and Arms Limitation*. Center for Policy Study, University of Chicago, January 27, 1971.

[17] IISS, *The Military Balance, 1971–72*, *ibid*, p. 56. At the same time, the United States had 294 ICBMs and 144 SLBMs. In addition, the U. S. had 39 heavy bomber squadrons (vs. 26 today) and 89 medium (vs. 6 today) bomber squadrons at the time. See Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird, *Toward a National Security Strategy of Realistic Deterrence*, Annual Defense Report

before the House Armed Services Committee, March 9, 1971, pp. 155–161.

[18] Annual Defense Report, March 9, 1971, *ibid.*, p. 169.

[19] Erickson, *ibid.*, p. 49.

[20] A comprehensive discussion of this subject is contained in D. G. Brennan, "The Case for Missile Defense" in J. J. Holst and W. Schneider, Jr. (eds.), *Why ABM? Policy Issues in the Missile Defense Controversy.* (Elmsford, Pergamon Press, 1969).

JACKSON, MICH.: BIRTHPLACE OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, one week from tomorrow the Michigan Republican Party and the Jackson County Republican Committee are sponsoring dedication ceremonies of an official Michigan State Historical Commission Marker recognizing the site "Under the Oaks" in the city of Jackson, Mich., as the birthplace of the Republican Party.

This Member, along with many prominent guests, including Michigan Gov. William G. Milliken; Senator ROBERT P. GRIFFIN; my colleague, Representative CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN; the Michigan Republican State chairman, William F. McLaughlin; members of the State legislature; and other top Republican officials will be present for this historic observance.

In addition to the ceremonies dedicating this location as an officially recognized Michigan historical site, an opportunity will be provided those attending to view the adjacent historic residence which has been acquired by Mr. Jerry D. Roe, my former district representative and now the executive director of the Michigan Republican State Central Committee, and State Representative Michael A. Dively in order that such residence may be established as a historical museum were memorabilia of the founding of the Republican Party may be kept and preserved.

Although I recognize some of my colleagues may not share the enthusiasm I feel about the founding of the Republican Party, I am sure they nevertheless would be interested in the edification provided by my good friend and Michigan's junior Senator, Minority Whip ROBERT P. GRIFFIN in remarks made by him in the Senate several years ago and so I wish to incorporate such remarks herein and they follow:

JACKSON: BIRTHPLACE OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, July 6 marks the 103d anniversary of the founding of the Republican Party at Jackson, Mich., in the year 1854.

To mark that anniversary, the people of Jackson are planning an appropriate observance of that city over the weekend of July 7. Among the events scheduled are a banquet, a pageant, exhibits and addresses by prominent Republicans, including Members of Congress.

A highlight of the observance will be an address by Representative FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, who is well known in and out of Congress as an authority on the first Republican President, Abraham Lincoln.

The early days of the Republican Party, and the concerns which gave birth to the party, need to be recalled frequently—not only in Jackson, Mich., but throughout the Nation.

It was in Jackson on July 6, 1854, that our party was founded; here that the principles for which the youthful Republican organization then stood, and still holds to, were adopted by a formal convention assembled precisely for that purpose. That famous gathering "under the oaks" remains a testament to the conscience of this America, and to the initiative and human concern of the people of Michigan.

The Republican Party is unique in our political history. It originated spontaneously, born of a determination to no longer avoid an issue—slavery—which to them was of the utmost moral consequence. It was not so much the glamor of a particular leader which brought together men of various political allegiances, backgrounds, and loyalties; but rather the love of individual liberty and the nobility of the human spirit.

Think back to that green summer day in Jackson, over a century ago, when Whigs and Democrats, Free Soilers, and Liberty men banded together to voice their anger at the evil of slavery and their belief that human dignity is not limited by color or race or religious beliefs—principles on which the Republican Party still stands today.

The party's birth is chronicled in numerous journals, from one of which I quote the following excerpt:

"As the hall was entirely inadequate to the accommodation of those assembled [a complaint we cannot make today], an adjournment was had to an oak grove on the outskirts of the village, where a platform was hastily erected. The scene, as the crowd moved toward the grove, was an inspiring one. As far back as the eye could reach was a procession of men, with many women also. The grove itself was a beautiful place of woods, situated on what was known as "Morgan's Forty," situated between the village and the race course. The scene there was an animated one, suggesting a huge picnic, the Jackson brass band enlivening the occasion with patriotic mira.

The convention, assembling at the spot which later became the intersection of Franklin and Second Streets, was perhaps the first group officially to fuse the new anti-slavery elements into a cohesive group and to give that group the name "Republican." The Jackson Convention is clearly the first assembly to formulate and give an abiding place to Republican principles in a party platform.

Horace Greeley is thought to have been responsible for suggesting the Party's name. Joseph Warren, the editor of the Detroit Tribune, who had done so much to galvanize public sentiment in opposition to the extension of slavery, later stated that Greeley had suggested the name Republican a day or two before the assembly in Jackson. At the convention Warren urged the adoption of the name, which was included in the platform.

The name was a logical choice—for theoretical, sentimental, and historical reasons. Because Jefferson had initiated the policy of restricting slavery in the Ordinance of 1784, sentiment favored naming the new party "Republican"—a name which Andrew Jackson had earlier deemed expendable. For the slavery-sympathizing Democrats had betrayed both the heritage of Jefferson and the cause of liberty. It was up to the new party to revitalize the Jeffersonian concept of human freedom and republican liberty which were now so shamefully abused. Writes Arthur Norman Holcombe:

"The original spirit of the Anti-slavery Republicans was the spirit of the Declaration of Independence, of the Land Ordinance of 1785, and of the Northwest Ordinance of 1787. Of the first of these great documents, Thomas Jefferson was the author; he had a leading part in the preparation of the second; his ideals were embodied in the third. In these three documents the fighting principles of the Anti-slavery Republicans were first set forth. The interests to which the Anti-slavery Republicans were most strongly devoted were those which had most loyally supported the Jefferson policies. Thus the spirit as well as the name of the original Jeffersonian party was revived by the party of Lincoln, of Seward, and of Chase."

William S. Myers has pointed out that Michigan was especially fertile ground for the Republican Party to take seed in, since its people were well informed and scorned the institution of human slavery.

He writes:

"The State of Michigan was then peopled by inhabitants of old American stock, far above the average in education and intelligence, and we can see this section of the American people at its best."

The young Republic Party appealed to the educated and culturally sophisticated men and women who formed the intellectual nucleus of the Nation. As one historian—A. M. Simons—has noted:

"Whittier wrote its campaign songs, Lowell translated its doctrines into poetry, while Emerson, Bryant, Longfellow, Holmes, and Motley were some of the names high in American literature counted on its membership roles."

Particularly important in gaining for the Republicans the publicity necessary to political survival, was Horace Greeley's newspaper, the New York Tribune. Journalists such as Greeley helped the Republican Party recognize in its 1854 platform the interests of working men and women as well as the intellectuals of the day.

The Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854, which repealed the Missouri Compromise and opened the Western territories to slavery, led to the Jackson meeting. Among the Democratic leaders who participated were Kingsley S. Bigham, Hovey K. Clarke, and Isaac P. Christiancy, all famous names in the history of Michigan politics.

Among the Whigs who joined the group was Zachariah Chandler, who later distinguished himself as Republican Senator from Michigan. Chandler's speech at the 1854 convention was particularly stirring. He caught the spirit of this conference. Said Chandler:

"Misfortunes make strange bedfellows. I see before me Whigs, Democrats, and Free Solicits all mingling together to rebuke a great National wrong. I was born a Whig: I have always lived a Whig, and I hope to die fighting for some of the good Whig doctrines. But I do not stand here as a Whig. I have laid aside party to rebuke treachery."

Another speech of great appeal was made by Lewis Clark, a fugitive slave immortalized as the character, "George Harris" in "Uncle Tom's Cabin."

Clark was the son of a Revolutionary soldier and a Kentucky Negress, and was then living on a farm near Sandwich, Ontario. He told how at the death of his father the family was sold on the auction block, and how he escaped from slavery. The effect of his speech on the assembly was powerful, intensifying the determination of the audience to end this institution.

It was an inspiring day; one of those high moments in history which still affects human affairs.

The timelessness of that first Republican platform makes it worth repeating:

"Surely that institution [that is, slavery—for which today we may substitute civil injustice of all kinds] . . . Surely that institution [reads the platform] is not to be strengthened and encouraged against which

Washington, the calmest and wisest of our Nation, bore unequivocal testimony: as to which Jefferson, filed with a love of liberty, exclaimed: "Can the liberties of a Nation be ever thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of the people that their liberties are the Gift of God? That they are not to be violated but with his wrath? Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just: that His justice cannot sleep forever . . ." We believe these sentiments to be true now as they were then."

In 1967, those sentiments are just as true: the Republican Party still stands for the rights of men, for human justice, and for individual dignity. The convocation under the oaks on that bright summer day did the Nation an invaluable service, for which the city of Jackson, Mich., is justly remembered.

This city is today a thriving example of the American spirit. A center for industry, transportation, and higher education; it has a reputation for enlightened political activity. The congressional district in which Jackson is located sends a Republican Representative to the Congress—partial testimony to the prominent role Republicans have played in Michigan history in the century following the Jackson convention.

Yes, we are proud of our party, and of the role which Jackson has played in its formation and perpetuation.

I salute the city of Jackson and offer my sincere admiration for the loyalty of its people to the principles for which the Republican Party stands.

As the Detroit Post Tribune wrote long ago:

"To the men who gathered on that midsummer day in the oak grove at Jackson belongs the honor of being the first to comprehend a great opportunity; they were wise enough to improve all its possibilities, and there founded and named the party of the future."

ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF SPECIAL PROJECT GRANT AUTHORITY UNDER MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH SERVICES PROGRAM

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased that this afternoon the House will pass legislation to extend for 1 year the special project grant programs under title V of the Social Security Act. As you know, these projects have been in operation for the last 5 years giving comprehensive health care to mothers and children in lower socioeconomic areas throughout the country. These projects represent one of the major reservoirs of experience in comprehensive health care today, especially to the poor children of the country.

These years of experience in delivering comprehensive health care has proved to be a practical and efficient way to treat children who would otherwise continue to experience crisis-oriented, episodic care. These programs provide medical, dental, nursing, psychological, psychiatric, nutritional counseling, speech and hearing, physiotherapy, medical and dental specialty, and social services on a complete and continuing basis, emphasing the advantages of preventive care and health maintenance.

I met with the directors of the New York children and youth projects on April 16, 1971, to discuss their concern that the funding for the projects was set to expire on June 30, 1972. I commenced a campaign in Congress to insure that these projects, not only in New York, but throughout the country, would not be phased out, but rather would continue to be funded by the Congress. In the course of the past 14 months, 85 Members of the House have cosponsored legislation I introduced to extend these projects for 5 years. On the Senate side, similar legislation was introduced by Senator GAYLORD NELSON and EDWARD KENNEDY with 15 other sponsors. Continued Federal funding for these special projects has the endorsement among others of the American Medical Association, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American College of Obstetricians and the National Association for Retarded Children.

The statistics for these projects are impressive. The national average health care cost per year per man, woman, and child is $350. The cost for care under these children and youth and maternal and infant care projects as of June 30, 1971, was $129.81 per patient. In spite of inflation, the estimated cost by June 30, 1972, will have decreased to $126. And even with this reduced cost there has been an increase in the quality of care.

Mr. Speaker, we must, though, continue to work to insure that this 1-year extension to be authorized today not be construed as a phaseout year. We must continue to provide medical care for our Nation's poor—especially the children of our deprived citizens who suffer in so many ways.

I do want to thank Chairman WILBUR MILLS for his leadership in shepherding this bill and I want to express my special gratitude to my colleagues, the distinguished gentlemen from Illinois (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI) and from New York, (Mr. CAREY) for their efforts within the Ways and Means Committee to obtain the support of their colleagues on that distinguished committee and in the Congress resulting in our voting today on the bill, H.R. 9410, which is the final version of H.R. 7657 as amended.

One thing should be noted and that is that this could not have been done without the grass roots cooperation and support led by Dr. Frederick Tunick, director of the CATCH program at the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn, and Dr. Fred Seligman, of the University of Miami School of Medicine.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the military procurement and research and development authorization for fiscal year 1973 not because I believe in unilateral American disarmament. Rather I voted against the bill because it contained millions of dollars for unnecessary items which are not essential to our security.

Thus, my vote should not be construed as expressing opposition to a defense posture which enables us to act effectively in those areas which are vital to American security. For example, the United States does have a real strategic interest in the Middle East. We must continue to support our allies in that area of the world and we must maintain a defense posture which will convince them as well as the Russians that we are reliable friends who in a direct confrontation will not blink first.

My vote in opposition should be interpreted only as a protest against continued wasteful spending for fancy gadgets which have no bearing upon our real security and for spending in areas of the world where we have no real security interest. It was not a vote in opposition to those aspects of our defense policy which are essential to our national security or to the defense of our interests and our true allies in other parts of the world.

RISING COST OF LIVING

HON. CLAIBORNE PELL

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, our older Americans have become the innocent victims of an unsuccessful war against the rising cost of living. Through a failure of national economic policy, our senior citizens have been quite literally robbed of part of their livelihood—the cost of living has skyrocketed, and their incomes remain fixed.

What should be their golden years has become their tense years.

Common decency demands that social security benefits be increased. Simple justice requires that the increase in benefits be sufficient to provide real security to older Americans.

Earlier this year, I conducted hearings in the cities of Woonsocket and Providence on the problems confronting older Americans in Rhode Island. At those hearings, Rhode Island senior citizens presented moving and compelling testimony on the need for a substantial increase in social security benefits. Partly as a result of those hearings. I cosponsored the amendment to provide a 20-percent increase in benefits.

There are those, Mr. President, who believe our senior citizens should wait a bit longer for this overdue adjustment of benefits. I disagree. Lockheed was not asked to wait a little longer when it faced bankruptcy; the Penn-Central was not asked to wait a little longer when they asked for help. They got help, and they got help promptly.

Our senior citizens need help, and they need it now.

BOY SCOUT TROOP 321 WINS 101ST EAGLE BOY SCOUT AWARD

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, because of my confirmed belief that the Boy Scout movement generates respect for good government and provides the means of making good citizens of its members, I have always felt that it deserves commendation from those of us who are in Government service. For that reason, I wish to take this opportunity to commend Boy Scout Troop 321, sponsored by St. Pauls United Methodist Church of Findlay, Ohio. It has just been presented its 101st Eagle Boy Scout award, which is a mark rarely obtained by any troop anywhere in this area. I know that my colleagues will be happy to join me in recognizing this outstanding achievement and in extending our congratulations.

PLAYING POLITICS WITH SOCIAL SECURITY

HON. JACK R. MILLER

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, having supported social security benefit increases with a cumulative total of 57 percent over the last 5 years, while the cost of living has increased 27 percent, I believe my concern for social security beneficiaries is well established.

I am also the father of the change in the law under which social security benefits will be automatically increased to keep pace with increases in the cost of living. If inflation continues—granted that it is slowing down—it will probably be another year before the automatic increases will be triggered. But the law is now on the statute book—where I have been trying to put it since 1963.

During the votes in the Senate on Friday, June 30, I was necessarily absent in order to meet long standing commitments in Iowa. However, as is my policy, I made sure my position was recorded on these votes so that no one—and particularly a cynical opponent—could ever say I "ducked" an issue.

I was positioned "for" an amendment to increase social security benefits by 10 percent. I was positioned "against" an amendment to increase benefits by 20 percent. And I was positioned "for" the bill—the so-called debt ceiling bill—on final passage.

The 10-percent increase, which I also voted for in the Senate Finance Committee, would have brought the cumulative increase in benefits during the last 5 years to 57 percent. The bill, as amended, contained my automatic cost-of-living increase provision. I believe my position "for" these changes was fully justified. However, the 20-percent increase was excessive and constituted a flagrant example of playing politics with our social security beneficiaries.

I say "flagrant," because the leadership of both the Senate and House decided to tack it on as an amendment to the debt ceiling bill—a bill that had to be passed by midnight, June 30, or else our Federal employees could not be able to draw their paychecks. They also contrived to time the action so that increases in benefits would be reflected in checks received during the month before the November elections. While I am sure the increased checks will be welcome, I am also sure that our older Americans resent the obvious attempt to make political footballs out of them.

The difference between the cost of a 10-percent increase and the 20-percent increase will amount to nearly $3 billion, and it will have to be paid for by taxes taken out of present wage earners' paychecks. Those nearing retirement age will not have as heavy a burden as the millions of our younger people. I am sure our older Americans do not wish to put an unnecessary burden on the younger generations. There are, of course, many social security beneficiaries who need higher benefits. But there are also many who do not. It would have been far more equitable to work out a method of supplemental payments to those who need them and finance the cost out of the general fund of the Treasury instead of out of social security taxes.

Instead, the 20-percent across-the-board increase will be financed out of social security taxes. It will add to the already serious budget deficit, increase the tax burden by nearly $3 billion, and cause deepening resentment among the younger people who will pay most of the cost. This irresponsible action could place our entire social security system in jeopardy.

I might add that in visits with numerous older people I found that the single most important thing they wished to see Congress do was to put into effect the automatic increase to keep pace with increases in the cost of living. If this were done, they would have been content with a 10-percent increase in benefits at this time. They knew what was fair, and no one I talked with was asking for a 20-percent across-the-board increase.

By using this extra tax money for a blanket increase, those in the leadership have pretty well killed the chance to cover other needs—the widows who receive only 82½ percent of the benefits their husbands would have received, the opportunity to earn more without being penalized for doing so, the opportunity for married couples, both of whom have worked, to have their benefits computed on their combined earnings, and expanded coverage of the disabled.

Part of what is wrong with our country today is that there are too many politicians who still think that the way to get elected is to promise all kinds of benefits without really caring about how the cost will be met. We are passing on a frightful debt to our children and grandchildren, and I, for one, do not wish to add to it.

I insert in the RECORD a table which shows the taxload that will have to be paid by employees and the self-employed under the 20-percent increase. Of course, the employer must match the employee tax, and this will tend to boost prices to consumers:

SOCIAL SECURITY EMPLOYEE TAXES

Annual income	1972 under present law and proposals	Present law 1973 and 1974	With 20 percent increase	
			1973	1974
$5,000	$260	$282.50	$275.00	$275
$7,000	364	395.50	385.00	385
$9,000	468	508.50	495.00	495
$10,000	468	508.50	550.00	550
$11,000	468	508.50	594.00	605
$12,000	468	508.50	594.00	669

SOCIAL SECURITY SELF-EMPLOYMENT TAXES

Annual income	1972 under present law and proposals	Present law 1973 and 1974	With 20 percent increase	
			1973	1974
$5,000	$375	$382.50	$390.00	$390
$7,000	525	535.50	546.00	546
$9,000	675	688.50	702.00	702
$10,000	675	688.50	780.00	780
$11,000	675	688.50	842.40	858
$12,000	675	688.50	842.40	936

THE SCHOOL LUNCH AND CHILD NUTRITION ACT

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the House's action last week in extending through fiscal 1974 the expiring provisions of the School Lunch and Child Nutrition Act. Needless to say, I am among the strongest advocates of this legislation and voted for it when it reached the House floor last Thursday evening. As you know, the most urgent provision of the bill provides the necessary funds to allow the summer feeding program for underprivileged children to continue and expand. Almost 1,160,000 children now benefit from the breakfast program. Under the provisions of the extension bill, the number will climb rapidly to 2,200,000 before the year is out. Still further, Mr. Speaker, the bill removes the limitations on the amounts that can be appropriated to expand the school breakfast program, and, going even one step further, it explicitly clarifies every school's eligibility for the program. All needy children will participate no matter what kind of school they attend.

The legislation is one of many landmarks throughout the history of the school feeding program.

The Federal Government first recognized the need for a national school lunch program in the 1930's. At that time only cafeteria workers' salaries were provided. In 1946, we witnessed the passage of the National School Lunch Act which provided cash and commodities for school lunches. Thirty years ago, this act provided a broad program to provide nutritious lunches to every American schoolchild. It was a broad program but not generous enough to meet our current needs. More recently—in fact,

in 1966—the NSLA was amended to provide money for breakfast programs and luncheon equipment.

I cite these facts to show that historically we have made great headway toward the goal of providing for our Nation's children.

Last week we passed another amendment to bring us closer to that goal. Our authorization amendment of H.R. 14896 requires a breakfast program to be instituted in every school that applied for it.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 15390, EXTENSION OF PRESENT TEMPORARY LEVEL IN PUBLIC DEBT LIMITATION

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I support the pending conference report on the debt-ceiling increase which includes provision for a 20-percent increase in social security benefits.

An increase in social security benefits is long overdue and I earlier cosponsored legislation to provide for a 20-percent increase. I oppose any motion to reduce the increase to 10 percent, because such an increase simply is not adequate to assist our senior citizens at this time.

I am confident that the 20-percent increase will be approved by a wide majority in this House. I regret that I will not be present for the rollcall vote when it occurs today.

Several months ago, I accepted an invitation to be the main speaker in Buffalo on this date as 149 new U.S. citizens take their oath of allegiance in a Federal district court ceremony. Had there been any question in my mind about the outcome of the vote on the pending conference report, I would have canceled my commitment and remained here for the rollcall. As the son of an immigrant father who was a participant in a similar ceremony years ago, I feel deeply about the importance of the naturalization ceremony in welcoming these new citizens.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the social security system and the questions on financing which are being raised, I am becoming convinced that we need a major policy change.

Present policy provides for equal payments to the social security fund by the employee and the employer. This percentage of salary contribution has been increasing over the years and further increases are provided.

Rather than the present 50–50 by the employer and the employee, it seems to me we should consider seriously making it an equal three-way setup; that is, one-third by the employee, one-third by the employer, and one-third by the Federal Government.

I hope that the Committee on Ways and Means will delve into social security funding at its earliest opportunity.

PLIGHT OF THE CRIMEAN TARTARS

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, the Crimean Tartars in the Soviet Union were exiled to the Soviet Republics of Central Asia in 1944. So far, they have not been permitted to return to their native Crimea, even though there is an acute labor shortage in the Crimea today.

Below is appended a letter by Mr. Paul Nedwell, who resides in my congressional district, to the first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine, appealing that the Crimean Tartar people be allowed to return.

Mr. Nedwell's letter indicates that 80,000 of the Tartars were sent to Central Asia. The State Department informs me that the actual figure was as high as 200,000—nearly the entire Crimean Tartar nation. Moreover, the deaths among the deported people have been estimated at nearly 50 percent.

In line with the stand that many of us have taken for civil rights, both here and abroad, I want to focus on this problem by submitting a copy of Mr. Nedwell's letter of June 3 to the Communist official in Kiev, as follows:

POUGHKEEPSIE, N.Y.,
June 3, 1972.

VLADIMIR SHCHERBITSKY,
First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, Building of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, Ordzhonikidze Street, Kiev., U.S.S.R.

DEAR FIRST SECRETARY VLADIMIR SHCHERBITSKY: The year 1944 marks an unfortunate period in the life of the Crimean Tartar people, for it was in this year that the entire Crimean Tartar population of the Crimea was accused of collaboration with the German Fascists and, on the basis of this charge, was deported in toto to the Soviet Republics of Central Asia. Fortunately, in September of 1967, the Crimean Tartar people in exile were finally exonerated of the wartime accusation that they collaborated with the German Fascists; however, they were encouraged to remain in exile and they were discouraged in every possible way from seeking a return to their ancestral national homeland, the Crimea. And this despite the fact that the majority of the Crimean Tartar people in exile, both young and old alike, long to return to their rightful national homeland and to see the restoration of the Crimean Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic—they have suffered enough injustice in the past and their aspirations deserve to be realized. After all, is it not the Crimean Tartar people themselves who are morally and properly entitled to determine the ultimate fate of the Crimea?

The history of the Crimean Tartar people is well known to informed persons in the West. The Crimean Tartar people, as scholarly research has shown, are descended from the original inhabitants of the Crimea, who mixed with, and were assimilated by, the Turco-Kipchak race of Tartars, which settled in the Crimea between the 11th and 13th centuries. From the 13th to 18th centuries, a high level of culture and civilization was attained by these people. Then, in 1783, the tzarist Russian Army marched into the Crimea and took the country over by sheer force of arms—it was at this moment in history that the long historical tragedy of the Crimean Tartar people began.

On October 18, 1921, as is well known to many informed persons in the West, the Crimean Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic was formed. At this moment in history it might have seemed that this action would insure the future territorial integrity of the Crimean Tartar people, but such was not to be the case. Following the proclamation of their own national Republic, the Crimean Tartar people were beset by various forms of discrimination in all spheres of their national life. Then, in that fateful year of 1944, the entire Crimean Tartar population of 80,000 men, women and children was accused of collaboration with the German Fascists and was deported to the Soviet Republics of Central Asia. Such has been the fate of the Crimean Tartar people.

In recent years, the Crimean Tartar people have been trying to achieve their just aspirations: a return to their ancestral national homeland—the Crimea—and the restoration of the Crimean Autonomous Soviet Socialistic Republic. Unfortunately, it appears that Soviet officials have continually put obstacles in their path at every turn, as they seek to realize these aspirations. Is justice best served by such actions? I think not.

Being that the Crimea was "officially" transferred to the Ukrainian Republic on February 27, 1954 and that it is presently "officially" part of the Ukrainian Republic, although there has never been any historical or moral justification for such an annexation. I appeal to you to consider the following. At the present time there is a labor shortage in the Crimea and an immigration target of 500,000 people has already been planned for the Crimea—this is presently the numerical strength of the Crimean Tartar people living in exile—so why not invite the Crimean Tartar people to return to the Crimea and in this way solve your problem. Such a solution has already been proposed by two Soviet Ukrainians—philologist Taras Franko and biologist Maria Lysenko—and here I add my voice to theirs for a consideration of such a just solution.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL NEDWELL.

"HAP" MORRIS

HON. GENE SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, when Hap Morris came to work on the Hill in 1932—the beginning of more than 40 years of continuous service—I am sure he did not realize that he would become a permanent, indispensable, and lively fixture of the Congress.

He has watched Senators, Congressmen, and Presidents come and go and, from what I hear, some of them have gone away from gin rummy encounters with him with lighter pockets.

In times like ours when all of us tend to get too serious or too overwrought, it has been nice to see and talk to Hap, who always had a bright word, or some advice or encouragement. Just the fact that Hap was always there gave a sense of solidity and constancy to our work in the House. This is one of the reasons why we will miss him but by no means the only one.

Consider how the volume of work has

increased since Hap was elected as Postmaster of the House in 1955. He has always been equal to the challenge, though, and—as each of us knows—has performed his task with diligence, faithfulness, and high spirit.

Hap is retiring now and the House of Representatives and many of its Members and staff will miss him. Those of us from Kentucky are fortunate because he is settling back home and, if I know Hap, we will be hearing from him just like we always have.

I am sure I join all those on the Hill and elsewhere who have known and worked with Hap Morris in thanking him and hoping that the next years will be as happy and productive as the many years he has given us and his country here in Washington.

PRESENTATION OF AUGUST A. BUSCH, JR., BOATING SAFETY AWARD TO COAST GUARD COMMANDANT AND CHIEF OF BOATING SAFETY

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, in ceremonies this month in the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, it was my privilege and honor to substitute for Mr. August A. Busch, Jr., chairman of the board and chief executive officer of Anheuser-Busch, Inc., in presenting to Adm. Chester R. Bender, commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, and to Rear Adm. Austin C. Wagner, chief of the Coast Guard's Office of Boating Safety, an award originated by Mr. Busch as a special form of recognition for outstanding service to the cause of recreational boating safety.

Mr. Busch, an industrialist who has devoted as much of his time and effort to civic causes and to public service as he has to his far-flung business interests, has translated his own great enthusiasm for pleasure boating into a national program to promote education for safety on the waterways.

Anheuser-Busch has distributed approximately 1,600,000 booklets on this subject, aimed particularly at those families which are attracted to boating as a form of wholesome family recreation but who are not especially familiar with the rules of navigation or the hazards which can arise out of this unfamiliarity. In addition, the company has distributed 475,000 large litter containers for use on pleasure boats, and has prepared and made available to clubs and other groups throughout the country an outstanding documentary film on the do's and don'ts of operating a boat safely.

RECREATION FOR THE ENTIRE FAMILY

As a St. Louisan and as a Member of Congress in whose district Anheuser-Busch has its main plant and office, I have had many reasons to be proud of the contributions Mr. Busch has made to the improvement of our city, and to the development of delightful recreational facilities in St. Louis and elsewhere, such as Busch Stadium and Grant's Farm in St. Louis, and Busch Gardens in Tampa, Los Angeles, and Houston; and I have been impressed by his dedication to youth and to sports activities as president of the St. Louis Cardinals baseball team. Mr. Busch has always been a strong advocate of and believer in entertainment and recreation which can be shared by children with their parents to bring about closer family ties.

His interest in educational work for boating safety grew out of this concern. The excellent cooperation given by the Coast Guard to these efforts by Anheuser-Busch in the preparation of useful materials for improving safety practices by boat operators led to the selection of Admirals Bender and Wagner for the August A. Busch, Jr., Boating Safety Award. Under boating safety legislation which was originated in the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the Coast Guard is responsible for enforcing safety standards in recreational boating.

The chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Congressman EDWARD A. GARMATZ, and numerous other members of the committee were present at the ceremonies in the committee room on June 5 when the awards were presented.

In his response, Admiral Bender noted the fine work by the Coast Guard Auxiliary, the Red Cross, the power squadrons, and corporations like Anheuser-Busch "which have taken the initiative on their own to cooperate in this great boating safety program," and added:

Anheuser-Busch has done so much that has already been described, by way of their film, their booklets, and, of course, their program to protect the environment through the litter bag distribution.

PRESENTATION OF AWARDS AND ADMIRAL BENDER'S RESPONSE

In presenting the August A. Busch, Jr., Boating Safety Award to Admiral Bender and Rear Admiral Wagner, I made the following statement:

Admiral Bender . . . Admiral Wagner . . . I am very happy to make this presentation this morning because the award itself is an indication of the tremendous importance which is being attached to boating safety and the saving of human lives on the inland waterways and the coastal regions of the United States.

Recreational and family boating has assumed enormous proportions in the lives of our citizens.

There are literally millions of boats on every body of water in the United States, and their numbers are increasing daily.

From the statistics I have been given, the overwhelming majority of these boats are in the small boat category which means that people of average means are rapidly turning to the waterways of our nation for healthful family recreation and enjoyment.

This is accompanied by . . . not so much the danger of the waterways . . . as it is the fact that people do not know how to use the waterways safely.

There is no finer and no more enjoyable recreation than to take a boat out on one of the many bodies of water made available by local, state, and federal agencies.

To the Coast Guard has been given the tremendous task of enforcing the laws governing boating safety and of educating the millions—if not the tens of millions—of people to the proper usage and handling of their boats for maximum safety and enjoyment of all concerned.

The Coast Guard, through its Auxiliaries . . . through their educational programs . . . and through its activities with the Power Squadrons and the Red Cross and the Safety Council . . . has been the spearhead of preaching the gospel of boating enjoyment through boating safety.

Many corporations, who feel a social responsibility to aid in this program, have joined with you and the Auxiliaries . . . and, to them, all of us owe our thanks and appreciation.

One such company is the Anheuser-Busch company in my district in St. Louis. I am very proud of the program this company has undertaken which has resulted, as you know, in the distribution of approximately 1,600,000 boating safety booklets, 475,000 litter bags, and the viewing by hundreds of thousands of persons of an outstanding boating safety film.

Today, I represent Mr. August A. Busch, Jr., chairman of the board of Anheuser-Busch and its chief executive officer, in presenting to you . . . Admiral Bender . . . Admiral Wagner . . . this highly prized and most beautiful award . . . signifying the appreciation that one of America's major corporations has for the outstanding leadership which you, Admiral Bender, as Commandant of the Coast Guard; and you, Admiral Wagner, as Chief of the Office of Boating Safety, have exhibited to promote . . . to encourage . . . . and to carry out one of the world's outstanding safety programs.

No one knows better than you do how much work yet needs to be done, and it is the sincere hope of all of us in Congress—and I am sure all of our citizens—that you will continue your efforts in this direction.

On behalf of Mr. August A. Busch, Jr., I express the thanks and deep appreciation of this company and all of its thousands of people throughout the United States.

Mr. Speaker, Admiral Bender's response was as follows:

It is a great honor for Admiral Wagner and me to receive this award.

He and I, of course, as well as the other Coast Guard people, are very pleased with the success of this boating safety program.

We are pleased that our part in it has been of some assistance. But, still it is the responsibility given to us by Congress, so we are carrying out our duties really in performing the acts we have performed in this regard.

Really, it is with the cooperation of many of you who are here present today that this program has achieved some success.

I speak, of course, of the Coast Guard Auxiliary represented here today in person by Commodore Harry S. Osbourn, by the Red Cross, and the Power Squadrons and for corporations, too, like Anheuser-Busch which have taken the initiative on their own to cooperate in this great boating safety program.

Anheuser-Busch has done so much that has already been described . . . by way of their film . . . their booklets . . . and, of course, their program to protect the environment through the litter bag distribution.

And, so, Mrs. Sullivan, we appreciate again what you have done, as well as Mr. Busch's kindness to us in this recognition.

THE SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASE

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the 20-percent social security increase enacted

by the Congress last week answers a pressing need. Every time the cost of living inches upward, the 25 million Americans whose livelihoods hinge on social security benefits are driven deeper and deeper into what most people would consider poverty. Nearly 25 percent of them, 5 million people, now exist on incomes that fall well below the Census Bureau's official "poverty line"—$2,328 for a family, $1,953 for a person living alone. More than 20 percent live on incomes that just barely edge above this poverty line. And virtually all of them, regardless of their economic status, must live more frugally than at any other time in recent memory.

The legislation established a 20-percent across-the-board increase—legislation substantively identical to the bill I introduced in March of this year—honors our commitment to the elderly and to the millions of widows, children, and disabled now sheltered by the social security system.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, one provision of this social security increase authorizes still further increases—automatic ones—every time the cost of living rises. This provision is vitally important. It means that social security benefits will never again lag behind the cost of living.

In sum, Mr. Speaker, the legislation is a landmark in the history of the social security system.

SCOTT'S JULY NEWSLETTER

HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, since coming to the Congress, I have sent periodic newsletters to constituents to help keep them informed of congressional activities. Our July newsletter has just been completed and I insert it in the RECORD for the information of our colleagues:

CONGRESSMAN SCOTT REPORTS

FLOOD DAMAGE

All of us are concerned about the destructive effects of recent rains and you might be interested in possible federal sources of help to individuals and communities.

The Office of Emergency Preparedness is coordinating the federal government's efforts and has declared Fairfax, Goochland, Loudoun, Prince William, and Stafford Counties and the cities of Richmond, Alexandria, and Fredericksburg, among others, as eligible for disaster assistance.

Aid to individual victims may include:

Temporary housing, with up to 12 months free rental in mobile homes, in VA or FHA residential properties, or in whatever suitable places can be provided to get the homeless out of emergency shelters.

Temporary mortgage or rental payments up to a year for persons faced with loss of their residences because of disaster-caused financial hardship.

Food coupons or surplus commodities to needy victims.

Unempoyment compensation and reemployment assistance to those who have lost their jobs because of the disaster.

Legal services to low-income persons unable to secure adequate services.

Removal of debris from private property if in the public interest.

Loans for homeowners and businesses whose properties have been destroyed or damaged. The Small Business Administration (SBA) and the Farmers Home Administration have liberal 30-year disaster loan programs at an initial rate of 5⅛%. Homeowners can obtain up to $50,000 for restoration of home and $10,000 for replacement of personal effects, not to exceed $55,000 for both. The law provides for "forgiveness" of part of the loan principal—up to $2500 on a $3000 loan, for example. Also, loans are to be made without regard to the applicant's age—an important aid for elderly homeowners. A few days ago the House passed a measure to amend the law so that the rate of interest on disaster loans could be as low as 1% or as high as 3% where there's a forgiveness feature.

Applications for such loans may presently be obtained from participating banks, the Washintgon SBA office, 1310 L Street, N.W., 7th Floor (telephone 202/382-7405); the Information Center, 2nd Floor, Princess Anne Hotel, Fredericksburg; Parkside Elementary School, Manassas; T. C. Williams High School, Alexandria; and the Federal Building, Main Lobby, Richmond, Virginia. Officials of SBA strongly urge applicants to check their insurance policies to be sure damage is not covered. If not, applicant should be prepared to support their applications by photographs and estimates for repair from reputable contractors.

Of course, our office contacted the Governor, the President and various departments and agencies immediately upon learning of the damages caused by the storm. A number of communities were visited and we want to help in every possible way. If difficulty is encountered and you feel that we can be of help, please give us the facts in writing or call me or my Administrative Assistant, Jack Davis, who has attempted to obtain information regarding the various problems which have arisen.

SALEM CHURCH DAM

The Public Works Appropriation Bill passed by the House of Representatives a few days ago included $600,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1 for further preconstruction planning of the Salem Church Dam on the Rappahannock River above the city of Fredericksburg. The project was authorized five years ago and this is the fourth year preconstruction planning funds have been appropriated by the Congress.

The multi-purpose dam will permit maximum use of one of Virginia's major natural resources, the Rappahannock-Rapidan rivers. It will help satisfy the increasing water needs of Prince William and other counties within the urban corridor; will reduce the danger of flooding in the Fredericksburg area; will regulate the flow of water below the dam to the mouth of the Rappahannock; control water quality; help regulate salinity of the oyster beds of the lower basin; hydroelectric power can either be included or omitted and, to my knowledge, a definite decision has not been made on this item, although indications are that it will not be included. There will be boating and fishing on the lake behind the dam and camping in parks along its shore. Of course, even after construction is started, it will be several years before the project can be completed and become operational.

GUN CONTROL LEGISLATION

Ever since the days of the wild West with its shoot-outs, Americans have been fascinated by guns. However, during the past decade, misuse of firearms has grown into a serious national problem. In the wake of the shooting of Governor George Wallace, many Americans are demanding that something be done about guns.

Gun control arouses frenetic opposition among sportsmen, who see the threat of ultimate confiscation lurking behind any system that pinpoints ownership of guns. The problem is, basically, that honest men will obey gun control laws, but criminals won't.

More and more thought is being given in Congress to laws that ignore the guns per se and go after those who abuse the privilege of having a firearm. Most of the bills introduced, including one of mine, call for mandatory prison sentences for any felony committed with a firearm. Some say this would not work, since juries would regard the penalties as too harsh for a first offender and fail to convict on that basis.

Perhaps that is the crux of the entire problem. Crime has become less and less punishable. The courts have bent over backwards to be lenient to criminals. Perhaps it is time for a rethinking of our national mores and attitudes. The New York *Times* recently said that we cannot solve the crime problem until it becomes as dangerous to be a criminal as it is now to be a victim.

If a stiff, mandatory sentence were to be meted out for crimes committed with a gun—with plenty of publicity about it at all levels—it certainly seems it would discourage a lot of armed robberies that net the criminal only a few dollars. The penalty seems drastic. But trigger-happy criminals, who are nervous when embarking on their lives of crime, are gunning down innocent citizens. Perhaps it is time that we regard crime for the national cancer it has become—and take whatever steps are necessary to stop the drift into lives of crime that has been the trend for the past decade for thousands of young Americans. There is no constitutional right to hold up another person and there should be no question of the right to combat this lawlessness with stiff mandatory prison sentences.

An opposite approach, however, is under consideration by committees of both the House and the Senate. The House Judiciary Committee has had hearings on a number of bills which would strengthen existing federal laws for gun control. Some would forbid the sale of pistols to private citizens and others would provide for the registration of all privately owned firearms of any nature. In the Senate, a subcommittee headed by Birch Bayh has favorably reported a bill which would forbid the possession of the so-called "Saturday night special," a low-cost pistol said to be in prevalent use by law-breakers. No action is expected by either body of the Congress, however, until after the July recess, but further gun control legislation will no doubt come before both the House and Senate later this year. Your thoughts on this very controversial matter would be most welcome.

TRAFFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

You will recall our meeting a few weeks ago attended by the Virginia Commissioner of Highways, the Federal Highway Administrator, the Under Secretary of Transportation, and a White House aide to review the overall Northern Virginia transportation picture and determine whether some interim measures could be adopted to relieve congestion. At that conference, it was agreed to expedite the widening of the Capitol Beltway to four lanes in each direction; to give consideration to widening of Route 50 on existing rights of way; study the practicality of connecting adjoining service roads; review plans for using existing rail lines and commuter trains; and consider the widening of the George Washington Parkway, especially between Spout Run and Key Bridge. Everyone present agreed to the need to expedite the completion of the Metro system and the completion of Interstate 66 as early as practical. The parties to the conference are being requested to let me know what specific action has been taken since we met.

SENIOR CITIZENS' FORUM

We had approximately 300 people in attendance at a Senior Citizen's Forum last Friday at Mary Washington College in Fredericksburg. Among officials speaking before the group were Arthur S. Flemming, Special

Consultant on Aging to the President and a former Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare; Fred B. Rhodes, Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; Andrew Ruddock, Director, Bureau of Retirement, Insurance and Occupational Health of the Civil Service Commission; and Maurice D. Dewberry, Regional Commissioner of the Social Security Administration. The Chancellor of the college, Dr. Simpson, made arrangements for the use of the auditorium and dining hall and welcomed the visitors. The morning session was occupied with direct presentations and in the afternoon the group was divided into four sections, each presided over by one of the morning speakers for an exchange of views and responses to questions. The entire affair was well received and we are grateful to those who helped put it together, especially the Fredericksburg area Senior Citizens Club which provided coffee, registered the guests and helped in other respects. If your questions remained unanswered, however, please let us know in writing and an attempt will be made to obtain an official response from the specific agency involved.

SOMETHING TO PONDER

Rutherford B. Hayes: "He serves his party best who serves the country best."

A SHORT STORY ON STREET CRIME

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to acquaint the House of Representatives of an incident involving street crime in which I was the victim, and how it was resolved. On May 4 of this year I left my home which is in New York City just off Washington Square Park shortly after 6 p.m., intending to attend a dinner given by the American Jewish Committee at the Americana Hotel.

As I walked through Washington Square Park to get to the Sixth Avenue Subway I was stopped by an individual who was about 6 feet tall and probably weighed over 200 pounds. He was very threatening in manner and became even more so when he said to me, "Give me a quarter, man." I replied, "No." He then said, "Give me a quarter, man, or I am going to beat the———out of you," and he put up his hands as though to strike me.

In response I said, "No, I am Congressman KOCH and I am going to have you arrested." Unaccountably the man dropped his fists and started to walk away.

I looked for a police officer in the park. There was none. I thought to myself that I really should go to the dinner where I was expected. It was about 6:10 p.m. But, Mr. Speaker, I decided I could not permit this incident to pass and not take some action, because I knew how the residents—women, children, senior citizens—of the area are afraid to use the park because of incidents like this.

I watched the man stop others who gave him coins in response to his demands. And I followed him as he started to walk up Fifth Avenue. About a block later I saw a police patrol car, stopped it, explained what had happened, and asked that the individual be arrested. The police officer said, "Do you really want to press charges? Do you know how much time it will take?" I told him, "Yes, I do want to and while I know I can't make my 6:30 p.m. dinner appointment I hope I can at least get to the dinner before it ends."

I got into the patrol car, drove a block, to where the individual was now standing and got out of the car. Immediately the man said to the police officers, without any intervening conversation, "I didn't do it." They arrested him and the two of us were taken to the Sixth Precinct headquarters.

By then it was 6:30 p.m. It took 45 minutes for the police to fill out the information forms on the arrested individual. At 7:15 p.m. we were taken by police car down to the Criminal Court Building and arrived there at 7:30 p.m. where again forms had to be filled out, and this took another 45 minutes.

The defendant was charged with intoxication, loitering, and harassment. I was told by the assistant district attorney that I should charge him with attempted robbery, but I told him I did not want to make a "Federal case of it" and that I simply wanted to have him punished for what had occurred, in some reasonable way. At 8:15 p.m., I was taken to the court room where the defendant was present with counsel provided by the court. A new assistant district attorney said to me that he did not think that it was worth pressing the matter and that nothing would happen since there were so many cases of this kind. I said, "That is why I have taken the time to come here." He said if I wanted to have something done I should charge the defendant with attempted robbery, but he warned that would take another 3 hours. I said no, I would simply press the three original charges. The defendant then pleaded guilty to the charge of harassment and I asked the court whether I might make a statement. The judge said, "by all means."

What I said to the court in substance was that I had taken the time to do this, although I knew that it would be more sensible from the point of view of safety and convenience to pay the quarter, because somebody had to stand up and say "No." The court sympathized with what I had said, stating that crime was rampant not only in the area in which I lived, but in so many places in the city. And then the judge, turning to the defendent, said:

I want you to know that the next time you come into this court I will deal with you very sternly and this time I will fine you $50.

Defendant's counsel told the court that the defendant was employed, giving the court the name of the employer. He said that the defendant earned $4.50 an hour, but did not have any money with him that evening; he asked that the court give him time in which to pay. The court asked, "Will 3 weeks be enough?" Counsel said it would. The defendant and I both left the Criminal Court Building at 8:30 p.m. by the same door. And as he passed me he smiled; he knew something I did not.

I arrived at my dinner at 9 p.m. where the meal was over and all that was left were the speeches.

Having become a statistic, I decided to find out what happens in a case of this kind. And so, approximately 3 weeks later, I wrote to the clerk of the court and asked whether the fine had been paid. Not receiving a response by June 15, I wrote to Administrative Judge David Ross of the Criminal Court of the City of New York. By letter of June 26, Lester C. Goodchild, the court's executive officer, responded: The defendant failed to appear and pay his fine. A warrant for his arrest was issued, but he could not be found. The residence and employment information he had given the court was false.

Mr. Speaker, one additional statistic and that is there are thousands of bench warrants outstanding in New York City. This will be one more probably never to be executed. Is it any wonder that the people of this country are outraged at the way our courts are administering justice.

A copy of Mr. Goodchild's letter follows:

CRIMINAL COURT,
CITY OF NEW YORK,
June 26, 1972.

Hon. EDWARD I. KOCH,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This is with reference to your letters of May 29, 1972 and June 15, 1972 regarding the disposition of a case wherein you were the complainant and a Mr. Joseph Hardy was the defendant.

Please be advised that the defendant failed to appear to pay his fine, that a warrant for his arrest was thereupon issued and forwarded to the Police Department for execution, and that I am informed by the Police Department that they have been unable to execute the warrant as the residence and employment information given by the defendant are false.

Please forgive this late answer to your letters; we were awaiting an arrest in the case. Please be assured that we will keep you informed of any new developments.

Very truly yours,
LESTER C. GOODCHILD.

LEARNING, LIGHT, AND LIBERTY

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, "Learning is not only light, it is also liberty," Ivan Turgenev, the 19th century Russian author, wrote over 100 years ago. Those words are as true today as they were then.

The relationship between liberty and learning, between freedom and education, has puzzled philosophers and politicians since Plato recognized the significance of education to the State. Indeed, our country's constitutional form of self-government was founded on the fact that only an educated citizenry can govern itself. To be sure, the development of democracy is closely aligned with the development of a free public system of education in which education has come to be believed as the birthright—if not constitutional right—of every child. As Thomas Jefferson once remarked:

If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be.

More recently, Admiral Rickover claimed that education is "our first line of defense" and concluded that—

Only massive upgrading of the scholastic standards of our schools will guarantee the future prosperity and freedom of the Republic.

But the relationship between liberty and learning goes far beyond the confines of our political system to the heart of the learning process itself. Freedom is, said the distinguished philosopher, Alfred North Whitehead:

The dominant note of education is at its beginning and at its end . . . but that there is an intermediate stage of discipline . . .

For Whitehead, the greatest rate of learning occurs when the learner discovers the exact balance between freedom and discipline.

John Dewey, one of the greatest American philosophers, had similar thoughts. He believed that freedom designates "a mental attitude rather than external unconstraint of movements, but that this quality of mind cannot develop without a fair leeway of movements in exploration, experimentation, application."

Both these great philosophers claimed that freedom is a fundamental feature in education which enables the individual to make up his own mind and to offer his own unique contribution to the class. The individual's activity has personal meaning to him, because he freely decided that undertaking. Freedom forced him to choose a course of action and freedom confronted him with the consequences of his acts. That is the meaning of freedom defined as "moral responsibility, voluntarily assumed."

However, as Turgenev noted, learning is light. Education is a process of enlightenment and nothing enlightens like knowledge. Knowledge dispels myths and destroys ignorance. It can also liberate the learner from prejudices and provincialism so as to broaden the range of his mind and imagination free from most mental faults.

Thus, the relationship between freedom and learning is twofold. Not only is freedom an essential of education in that freedom facilitates learning; but also, political and personal freedom is seen as an end of our system of education. The educated man is the master of his own destiny, not a slave to his emotions. And he is also capable of democratic self-government as an informed and intelligent voter and participant in the political process.

Educators must therefore create a climate, an atmosphere of freedom in the schools so that true learning can take place. The Government, in turn, run by educated people must preserve the political framework in which freedom thrives and flourishes. Only by such a cooperative combination of energies and efforts can the "crisis in the classroom" be overcome and turned into a demonstration of faith in America that every citizen shall have an equal chance to learn and live in freedom.

REPRESENTATIVE PATSY T. MINK TO PROTEST FRENCH UNDERGROUND NUCLEAR TEST

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, despite the protests which have been filed, the French Government has reportedly undertaken an atmospheric nuclear test in the Pacific on Mururoa Atoll on Sunday, June 25.

I am pleased to note that the U.S. Government filed a protest on June 29 together with Australia and New Zealand.

It is quite appalling that the eastern press has all but blacked out news about this test and there has been little or no news regarding the growing protests in the Pacific. In order to make up for this neglect of concern for the people of my part of the world, I am inserting in the RECORD another series of articles on this subject:

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, June 28, 1972]

FRENCH N-TESTS BEGIN: PACIFIC PROTESTS IGNORED

PAPEETE, TAHITI.—France, ignoring worldwide protests, has started a series of nuclear tests in the South Pacific.

Government sources said today the first bomb in the series was detonated Sunday morning.

The government sources did not specify the size of the explosion. But France's Defense Ministry said yesterday in Paris that the new series would not be of high yield.

The ministry said it would not give details concerning the explosions until the current series of tests is over.

Sunday's blast ended a more than two-week wait since French naval authorities in the South Pacific signaled the possible start of testing by issuing warnings to navigation to stay out of the test area.

Observers said the subsequent delay was due either to unfavorable atmospheric and wind conditions in the test range or, possibly, to French hesitation to resume testing in light of an outburst of international protests from several South Pacific nations.

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, June 28, 1972]

"FLOTILLA" SAILS IN PROTEST

Three protest ships are scheduled to set sail today from Wellington, New Zealand, into the French nuclear testing zone in the South Pacific.

The Advertiser learned of the protest move during an hour-long transpacific radio conversation last night over the University of Hawaii's PEACESAT communications system.

The system, which links Hawaii with several major universities in the South Pacific, was used for a round-robin discussion among anti-nuclear test leaders in New Zealand, Fiji and Hawaii.

Dr. Walter Johnson, University professor of history, represented Hawaii.

The major news developments came from New Zealand.

Dr. Barry Mitcalfe, chairman of the Peace Research Media Project in affiliation with the University of Wellington, disclosed the plans.

He said the three ships—one of 100 tons—would sail under legal permit from the New Zealand government. He said two members of New Zealand's parliament and one member of Fiji's parliament will be aboard.

Mitcalfe said that the first French nuclear test is understood to be scheduled for July 3.

The French have kept their nuclear test dates a closely guarded secret. The only word they have released is that nuclear tests are "planned."

Amalia Rokopuicuna, an official of the YWCA in Suva, Fiji, reported via PEACESAT that efforts also are under way there to charter a ship and sail it into the test area.

Meanwhile, in Melbourne, UPI reported a 24-hour police guard was placed on the home of the French consul in South Yarra following a death threat by an unknown caller.

[From the Washington Post, June 30, 1972]

UNITED STATES JOINS OPPOSITION TO FRENCH A-TESTS

Secretary of State William P. Rogers joined the foreign secretaries of Australia and New Zealand in expressing opposition yesterday to French nuclear tests in the Pacific.

Without naming France, the three members of the ANZUS Council, meeting in Canberra, Australia, affirmed their hope that all countries would adhere to the treaty banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere. France and China declined to sign the pact.

The ANZUS countries—Australia, New Zealand and the United States—noted that "notwithstanding mounting opposition amongst countries of the Pacific, nuclear tests were still being conducted in the atmosphere."

The French government has rejected protests from many Pacific nations against the series of tests it is holding this summer at the Mururoa Atoll. Unconfirmed reports said the first explosion took place last Sunday, but the French government has declined to comment.

On the island of New Caledonia, a French colony in the South Pacific, French authorities threatened to ban Australian and New Zealand imports in retaliation for a boycott by Australian and New Zealand unions against French ships and aircraft heading for Tahiti, advance base for the nuclear testing zone.

PARIS OBSTINACY ON BOMB TESTS BREEDS RESENTMENT

On the eve of the 1972 series of nuclear tests on Mururoa Atoll, the French Government has come up with the assertion that the fallout caused by the tests will not reach levels harmful to people in the South Pacific.

There are certainly conflicting reports on the precise effects of recent previous tests in the atmosphere, both by China and France, but the undoubted fact is that there has been proven evidence of a rise in nuclear pollution, to at least some degree, at widely scattered observation points, following all such tests.

There is no means of knowing just where and how, and for how long, this will affect human beings and their food.

It is sufficient to know that there is potential danger to at least some people somewhere, and the nations of the South Pacific have said, with increasing firmness and growing concern, that they want none of this.

They do not all take the semi-hysterical stance of the international president of the Association of Apex Clubs who talked of "putting into jeopardy the lives of countless millions in the Pacific" and of death being sent by France which will "invade our earth . . . and rape our very beings"

They do not use lawlessness and wanton destruction as a means of protest, as those responsible for burning down the UTA office in Auckland did.

But they do claim, and the voices and actions of their political dealers have emphatically affirmed the claim, that when they object to the South Pacific being used as a testing ground their objections should be heeded.

It does not help the situation when it is known that the French testing area had to be moved from the Sahara Desert because of objections by the Algerians.

SUPPRESSION

Parallel complaints by people of the French territory of Tahiti are ignored when they are not suppressed or discouraged by the presence of troops brought from France.

Mr. Pompidou and his colleagues are completely out of tune with the spirit that now prevails in the South Pacific, and seemingly take little account of the accumulated resentment their obstinacy has aroused.

They accuse their critics of hypocrisy because, they claim, the criticism is confined to France's nuclear activities.

The accusation has substance where those who now ignore the equal of the Chinese are concerned.

It is nonsense to suggest that there were no protests about American and Russian testing in earlier years.

It was because of vigorous and widespread expressions of alarm that the test ban treaty came about.

If the speed limit is lowered on a stretch of road because of a record of death and injury, it is idle for a driver who subsequently exceeds the limit to say, "But others used to do it and they weren't stopped."

There have been suggestions, especially in New Zealand, that strongly expressed complaints about the French tests may react unfavourably against any application for favourable terms for the sale of produce to the European Economic Community (Common Market).

Such suggestions, and the attitude "Never mind you, I'm all right, Jack," displayed by France in connection with the Pacific protests must strengthen the already great doubts about Britain's wisdom in surrendering so much of her sovereignty as part of the price of joining an organisation in which France plays so prominent a part.

[From the Fiji Times, June 23, 1972]

PITCAIRN PLAN TO EVACUATE: FEAR OF FALLOUT

SYDNEY.—The 92 descendants of the 18th Century HMS Bounty mutineers living at Pitcairn Island are preparing for possible evacuation because of the scheduled French nuclear tests at Mururoa Atoll.

The Sydney Morning Herald yesterday quoted the island's leader, Mr. Tom Christian, a great-great-great grandson of Fletcher Christian, leader of the Bounty mutineers, as saying: "Evacuation is a possibility."

Mururoa Atoll lies about 500 miles northwest of Pitcairn.

The Herald said two ships, a British freighter and a French frigate were standing off the island to help in the evacuation if fallout from the nuclear tests heads for Pitcairn.

"The islanders are showing great concern . . . the forthcoming explosions seem special ones," Mr. Christian said:

"How would we fare? Where would we go? These are the thoughts of many.

"Undoubtedly all would panic if contamination reaches us."

For Australians are planning to parachute into the nuclear test zone as a protest against the tests.

One of them, 30-year-old Sydney parachute instructor Gordon Mutch, said the men planned to take life rafts, scuba gear and provisions for a month.

Mr. Mutch said he and his companions planned to hire a Cessna 310 aircraft to fly over the test zone.

He said they would stop at three islands to refuel on the way, but would not say when they would land in the region of Mururoa.

"The French will not be able to move because they do not know where and when we will make the drop," Mr. Mutch said.

Mr. Mutch said he thought his group's action would add strength to the efforts of the Canadian yacht Greenpeace III, now sailing towards the test zone, to stop the tests.

The New Zealand Prime Minister, Mr. John Marshall, said in Sydney yesterday that Australia and New Zealand must continue to protest against nuclear testing until a comprehensive test ban was achieved.

In another development, Australian unionists yesterday placed a ban on all radio communications linking French authorities or companies in Australia with France or its territories.

[From the Fiji Times, June 24, 1972]

JAPAN AND CANADA JOIN N-TEST OBJECTORS

PARIS.—Countries with coastlines on the Pacific Ocean yesterday stepped up their protests over the French nuclear test series at Mururoa Atoll.

These included Japan and Canada, who appealed to France to call off the tests in speeches at the 25-nation Geneva Disarmament Conference.

The two countries urged the conference to speed up its work on a proposed comprehensive test ban treaty including underground explosions.

The Australian Ambassador in Paris, Mr. Alan Renouf, and senior members of his staff paid several calls on the French Foreign Ministry, clarifying the reasons for their Government's protests.

They conveyed Canberra's anxiety over the pending tests, which France has surrounded with secrecy, and pointed out the escalation of public protests in Australia, an embassy official said yesterday.

DIPLOMATIC BREAK

In Santiago, the Chilean Chamber of Deputies voted to protest to the French Government and Parliament, and international organizations.

The Chilean Senate had earlier passed a similar motion.

Peru has threatened to break off diplomatic relations with France if the tests are held.

In Los Angeles, a spokesman for the Seventh Day Adventist Church, which maintains radio contact with Pitcairn Island, said the people there had no immediate plans to evacuate.

But the spokesman, Mr. Herbert Ford, added: "Of course if radiation were to blow their way or things went wrong, the island would be evacuated."

In London, the British House of Commons Speaker, Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, refused a request by a Government MP for an emergency debate on the tests.

The French explosions could come at any time and have been expected since noon on Tuesday (Fiji time).

FRENCH PACIFIC N-TESTS BEGIN

PARIS.—France has resumed nuclear atmospheric testing in the South Pacific in spite of vigorous protests by several nations that the blasts may endanger their environments, the French news agency Agence France Press said yesterday.

The agency said in a report from Tahiti that the first nuclear warhead-type device was detonated Sunday morning in the vicinity of Mururoa Atoll, 800 miles southwest of Tahiti.

The French Defense Ministry declined comment on the report as did the nuclear experimentation center here which coordinates atomic testing in the Pacific.

The ministry indicated that no official comment would be forthcoming on the tests until the series was completed, presumably sometime later this summer.

There was no word about the safety of the protest yacht Greenpeace III which last was reported heading into the test area.

Another yacht manned by members of the French Nuclear Test Protest Committee was preparing to set sail this afternoon for the test area from Tauranga, New Zealand, 100 miles south of Wellington.

In Wellington, New Zealand Prime Minister John Marshall said last night he would seek confirmation that the tests had begun but would not send a protest note to France.

"There's no point in wasting more paper and time in telegrams," he said.

The reported blast came after a 10-day effort by New Zealand, Australia and Peru to force a cancellation of the new series of test explosions.

The three countries, joined later by others, initially issued formal complaints against the planned tests at the re-opening of the Disarmament Conference in Geneva, earlier this month.

A series of antinuclear-test demonstrations and bomb attempts against French property followed in Australia and New Zealand.

Australia's Prime Minister, William McMahon, sent a personal message to French President Georges Pompidou to ask for an end to the tests.

LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS' BILL OF RIGHTS

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, today, I am joining in cosponsorsing legislation to provide a "bill of rights" for law enforcement officers. This bill does not provide any special privileges for police officers; it simply affirms the rights they are due as citizens of this country. It is unfortunate that in a nation like ours such a bill is needed; but history has shown all too often that policemen's rights are abridged by local department regulations and procedures. In some communities, policemen are discouraged for participating in politics while off duty and when accused of malfeasance, they are not given the same rights and protections accorded ordinary citizens. Furthermore, an imbalance has evolved because, while we have taken steps to insure the rights of defendants and complainants, we have failed to protect the rights of policemen.

The consequence of this disregard is a deep sense of personal frustration borne by many law enforcement officers. Instead of feeling that they are an integral part of society, too many policemen feel isolated from the rest of the community.

The police in our country have a very difficult role to play in our society and none would question that it is an essen-

tial one. Surely the fair execution of the law in a community can be no better than its law enforcement officers.

I believe that the passage of this "law enforcement officers' bill of rights" will go a long way in giving proper accord to the important role our law enforcement officers have in our communities and recognizing that they are entitled to civil rights, too.

Another way to do this is to provide policemen with better pay and fringe benefits. One of the first pieces of legislation I introduced when I first came to Congress in 1969 was the Police Compensation Act to provide a 10-year Federal program to increase policemen's salaries and add more men and women to local police forces. Too many towns and cities are not able to adequately recompense for the sound judgment, emotional maturity, and personal courage required of their policemen. My bill, introduced under the number H.R. 836 during this Congress, would help to correct this deficit by providing $100 million in each of the program's 10 years.

Finally, I would like to call attention to another bill I have introduced, H.R. 13914, that deals specifically with the political rights of municipal employees, including policemen. H.R. 13914 eliminates the limitations against active political participation imposed by the Hatch Act on any employee administering a federally assisted program or receiving any part of his compensation from Federal funds.

Mr. Speaker, each day policemen protect the safety of millions of people, often at great peril to their own lives. The least we can do as a country is to insure their rights as citizens and accord them the respect and remuneration their role in the community demands.

AFRICA AND THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY PLATFORM

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, for the first time the Democratic Party platform contains planks on the critical issue of U.S. policy toward Africa, both with respect to the necessity of expanding aid to Africa and to the urgency of a drastic overhaul in U.S. policy toward the liberation of Southern Africa. It clearly recognizes that U.S. complicity with apartheid must be ended.

I would like to include the thoughtful attention to my colleagues, first, the text of the African section of the Democratic platform; second, my press release of June 30 welcoming and commenting on the section on Africa and the Democratic Party platform; third, my testimony at the Democratic Party national platform hearings on Friday, June 23, in Washington; fourth, the testimony before the committee on June 22 of Dr. Herschelle Challenor, Department of Political Science, Brooklyn College of the City University of New York; and fifth, the statement of the American Committee on Africa before the committee on the same day. The Public Printer estimates the material will make 5¼ pages and will cost $892.50.

The material follows:

THE 1972 DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM EXCERPTS: AFRICA

AFRICA.—The central feature of African politics today is the struggle against racism and colonialism in Southern Africa. There should be no mistake about which side we are on. We stand for full political, civil and economic rights for black and other non-white peoples in Southern Africa. We are against white-minority rule. We should not underwrite a return to the interventionism of the past. But we can end United States complicity with such governments.

The focus of America's concern with Africa must be on economic and social development. Economic aid to Africa, without political conditions, should be expanded, and African states assured an adequate share of the aid dollar. Military aid and aid given for military purposes should be sharply reduced.

All military aid to Portugal should be stopped and the Nixon $435 million deal for unneeded Azores bases should be cancelled.

U.N. sanctions against the illegal racist regime in Southern Rhodesia should be supported vigorously, especially as they apply to chrome imports.

The U.S. should give full support to U.N. assertion of its control over Namibia (South West Africa), in accordance with the World Court's ruling.

The U.S. should make clear its opposition to the racial totalitarianism of South Africa. The U.S. government should act firmly to press U.S. businesses in South Africa to take measures for the fullest possible justice for their black employees. Blacks should be assigned at all levels to U.S. offices in South Africa, and throughout Africa. The South African sugar quota should be withdrawn.

No U.S. company or its subsidiary should be given U.S. tax credit for taxes paid to white-minority-ruled countries of Africa.

PRESS RELEASE BY CONGRESSMAN CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

WASHINGTON, D.C., June 30.—Congressman Charles C. Diggs, Jr. (D-Mich.) today praised the Democratic Platform Committee for its adoption of what he termed "the first positive platform recommendations in the direction of just and sensible U.S.-African relations."

Referring to the planks in the draft platform which deal with Africa, Congressman Diggs said: "I am pleased by the inclusion of specific recommendations for the reordering of American policy toward the African nations, including:

The end of all military aid to Portugal and the cancellation of the Nixon Azores agreement;

The vigorous support of U.N. sanctions against the illegal racist regime in southern Rhodesia, especially in the area of chrome imports;

The full support of U.N. control over Namibia (southwest Africa) in accordance with the World Court's ruling;

The complete opposition of the U.S. to the racial totalitarianism of South Africa, to be evidenced by pressure from the U.S. government on U.S. businesses in South Africa to ensure justice for their Black employees, and the withdrawal of the South African sugar quota; and

The removal of tax credits to U.S. businesses or their subsidiaries for taxes paid to white minority-ruled countries of Africa.

"For the first time," Diggs continued, "a major political party in the United States has realized the dangers of the short-sighted policies the U.S. has followed with respect to Africa, and has recognized the two critical directions in which American policy toward Africa must move:

1. The end of U.S. complicity with racist, colonialist governments which oppress the non-white peoples of southern Africa; and

2. The expansion of economic aid, without political restrictions, to African nations for economic and social purposes; while at the same time sharply reducing aid for military purposes.

"Past administrations have made strides to achieve an enlightened policy toward Africa. But the policies of the present administration have made a shambles of our efforts.

"The draft of the 1972 Democratic platform recognizes the need to abandon the course the Nixon Administration has set this nation on. Make no mistake—these policy recommendations are only a beginning and not all-embracing. Decisive action on these and other issues in African-American relations are needed. And no matter who sits in the President's chair in November, I will continue to do everything in my power to see that the actions and policies of the U.S. toward Africa conform to the principles of justice and self-determination for all peoples."

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., JUNE 23, 1972

It is a privilege to appear before you today and to present what I believe are some of the vital requirements for a sane foreign policy. I am especially anxious to appear before the Democratic Platform Committee in order to urge upon you the necessity for including certain specific planks on U.S. policy toward Africa in the 1972 party platform. Although the sixties saw some 41 African nations become members of the United Nations and constitute the Organization of African Unity, the Democratic Party Platform did not, either in 1964 or 1968, include a consideration of the new issues which the emergence of Africa has created. The geopolitics of the situation of Africa demonstrates the basis of our concern. Africa is the huge land mass—some 3½ times the size of the continental United States—to the South of Europe and between Asia and the Americas. There are some 300 million people on this continent.

Moreover, the minerals and other primary products of this continent are absolutely essential to the United States industrial society. It is clear that the United States has vital interests in Africa, whether we are speaking of political, economic or strategic interests. The geopolitics of Africa makes clear that U.S. self-interest in itself dictates an enlightened policy toward Africa. And yet, the policy which the present Administration has been pursuing toward Africa can only be characterized as one of disaster. While the African-Americans in this country have suffered under the policies of "benign neglect," the African peoples have seen the Nixon Administration formulate the insidious policies of *malignant neglect* and even nourishing the cancer of racism.

This nation cannot afford such limited and distorted vision. The lack of an adequate program of economic assistance and cooperation with the African nations in the past four years has seriously undermined our earlier position. Moreover, the actions of the present Republican Administration with respect to the liberation of the areas of Africa remaining under colonial and minority rule have impelled the conclusion, at home and abroad, that the United States supports the maintenance of the status quo and the minority rule of Africa.

But, actions by the U.S. that would try to stem the tide of self-determination which I personally witnessed in southern Africa are not only folly—they are useless. Majority rule is coming to South Africa, to Rhodesia, to Nambia, to Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau; and the United States has no choice but to get on the side of freedom. The geopolitics of Africa means that considerations of justice, human rights and morality aside, our own national security interests require that we support majority rule in Africa.

Even more, with respect to Africa, our foreign policy and domestic interests converge and compel us to redirect our international priorities. Southern Africa holds the frightening, but real, potential for another Vietnam. The same elements of racism, imperialism, and militarism are present, but on a more awful scale. The United States must act to avoid such a racial holocaust. This is why the present policy is so lamentably disastrous. Our business involvement in southern Africa—the direct investment alone exceeds $800 million—not only forms a bulwark for the status quo for apartheid, but also stands as the same kind of "interests" which the U.S. has used in the past to justify military intervention when the liberation struggle heats up—as it most definitely will. When that day comes, the composition of this country with some 25 million African-Americans makes it clear that any such involvement would be suicidal.

Thus, all of our interests—domestic, foreign, strategic, military, economic, and moral—those items essential to the development of a strong, unified America converge on the question of Africa. And only a sane foreign policy can protect those interests.

There are two priorities. One relates to economic cooperation and assistance. The present aid policy whereunder only 10 of 41 countries of Africa receive bilateral aid must be revised for a more comprehensive, more flexible and more meaningful program. We must pursue all avenues of aid—bilateral, multilateral and international programs. For the growing gap between the developed and developing, between the poor and between the affluent, nations presents a danger to us all. The United States should allot one percent of its gross national product for programs of economic cooperation and development; and Africa should share equitably, that is a minimum of 15 percent in these programs. The U.S. should support the African Development Bank.

The other priority is for a complete overhaul in the U.S. policy towards the liberation of southern Africa. The stifling words of hypocrisy must be ended and actions must be initiated which support the legitimate aims of self-determination and majority rule of the peoples in the present white-ruled and colonial areas.

In order to work towards these priority goals, I would like to suggest today certain specific policy recommendations which I believe should be incorporated into the platform of the Democratic Party, if the platform is to address the vital issues with which we are confronted. This presentation will include what I believe are the essential elements for U.S. policy towards Africa. I will draw on the set of some 55 recommendations which I made to the Nixon Administration in December, 1971, as a result of my trip last summer to South Africa and to Guinea-Bissau, one of the so-called Portuguese territories. Point 4 of this Action Manifesto is, I believe, basic:

"That the United States cease its condemnation of the efforts by the majority of the people of these areas to achieve their freedom by the only means available to them, and in reaffirmation of the principles enunciated in the Declaration of Independence—principles which gave birth to the American Revolution and to the United States of America—acknowledge the sacred right of these peoples to use, so long as the recalcitrance of those governments continues, whatever means are necessary to achieve self-determination and to win their freedom."

The population facts of these minority-ruled areas, when added to the increasingly-demonstrated determination of these people to win their freedom, shows the folly of any policy which refuses to recognize their right to do so.

In Rhodesia, where Ian Smith, pursuant to the Unilateral Declaration of Independence, rules in defiance of the legal sovereign, the United Kingdom, and in defiance of the United Nations Security Council, *95% of the population is black.*

In South Africa, the land of apartheid, *82% of the population is not white.*

In Namibia, the international territory formerly mandated to South Africa, which continues its illegal occupation thereof in defiance of the United Nations and the International Court of Justice, *82% of the population is African.*

In Angola, the Portuguese territory, where the liberation forces control large areas east and south of the central plateau, *93% of the population is African.*

In Mozambique, the Portuguese territory, where the liberation forces also control several provinces and operate freely south of the Zambezi River, *96½% of the population is African.*

In Guinea-Bissau, where the Portuguese control only the urban areas, *97½% of the population is African.*

The strike by the Ovambos in Namibia, the opposition by the people of Rhodesia or Zimbabwe to the Heath/Smith Settlement Proposals, and the current upheaval in South Africa itself growing out of the protests of the Black students underscores the determination of the people of these areas to be free. And yet, the Republican Administration has relaxed the arms embargo with South Africa, permitted the sale of troop transport carriers and Bell helicopters to the Portuguese, failed to implement its oral adherence to the International Court of Justice Advisory Opinion that states should refrain from any acts implying recognition of the legality of South Africa's illegal presence in Namibia, and finally, in the words of Senator McGee:

"Must bear the burden and the responsibility for the failure of legislative efforts to turn this country around on the issue of sanctions against Rhodesia."

The Nixon Administration entered into the infamous Azores Agreement with Portugal, continuing our base rights in the Azores *and* agreeing to make available to the Portuguese some $434 million in loans and credit guarantees and other means over the next two years—the enormity of this, almost a half billion dollar commitment to Portugal, can be better realized when we note that Portugal spends almost 50% of its budget to wage colonial wars against the peoples of Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea-Bissau, and that the value of this Agreement to Portugal is equivalent to its military budget for one year.

It is clear, therefore, that the Azores Agreement must be repudiated.

It is clear that the United States contravention of its international legal obligations by the importation of chrome from Rhodesia must be ended, and the United States must once again become a law-abiding member of the international community.

It is clear that United States complicity with apartheid must be ended. Although the policy of exclusion of Black foreign service officers from our Embassy has recently been modified, it is clear that this does not constitute the kind of foreign policy example that the U.S. should provide.

It is clear that the practice of apartheid in our Embassy and Consulates in South Africa and the NASA Tracking Station near Johannesburg must be ended.

In these predominately black areas, it is dangerously short-sighted for the United States to have relations solely with the small ruling white minorities, and it is clear that the United States must in South Africa, as well as in these other areas, establish substantial contacts with the majority.

If the United States is not to become hostage to apartheid, it is clear that effective disincentives to U.S. investment in these areas must be developed.

It is clear that the United States Government must openly and actively take the lead in the effort to end U.S. business exploitation in southern Africa and must pursue all legitimate means, legislative and administrative, to cause and assist United States businesses who continue to stay in South Africa to institute fair employment practices.

It is clear that our acknowledged legal obligations require that the United States Government not grant any privileges or tax credits to companies doing business in Namibia.

Present legislative authority must be exercised to terminate the finanical bonanza to apartheid under the United States sugar quota.

U.S. recognition of the threat to international peace and security posed by the situation in southern Africa requires a commitment once more of strict adherence to the arms embargo against South Africa—and for a decision to enforce the arms embargo with respect to Portugal until Portugal recognizes its obligations under the United Nations Charter with respect to the self-determination of the peoples of Guinea-Bissau, Angola, and Mozambique.

It is clear that our own survival requires that nuclear cooperation with countries such as South Africa, which refuse to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty must be ended.

The United States must place increased emphasis on cooperation, economic and technical assistance with the majority-ruled states of southern Africa.

In the United Nations, the past 3½ years under a Republican Administration have witnessed a complete reversal of the U.S. position on African issues. In fact, as expressed in my statement of resignation from the U.S. Delegation to the United Nations last December 17, under the Nixon Administration the U.S. Government "while uttering its abhorrence of apartheid, unflaggingly votes in opposition to any attempt to act, rather than orate, with respect to apartheid and the minority regimes of southern

Africa." It is clear that the eroding U.S. position at the United Nations on Africa, as well as other issues must be reversed.

A Special Task Force on Africa should be created composed of recognized experts, public and private, on Africa, and charged with the function of formulating comprehensive recommendations for implementing a sound U.S. policy towards Africa.

In conclusion, I would stress that any consideration of United States policy on vital issues confronting our nation today must include United States policy towards Africa, that the present policy towards Africa is not only a reproach to the principles on which this country was founded, it carries with it the seeds of internal and international chaos. Moreover, this national interest is reenforced by partisan political considerations. The constituency for Africa is growing apace. In fact, I believe a phenomenal expansion in this constituency is taking place. This was shown by the inclusion by the Congressional Black Caucus in its initial presentation to the President in March, 1971 of specific planks on Africa. This was shown in the unprecedented gathering of concerned Black Americans in the African-American National Conference on Africa held at Howard University on the occasion of African Liberation Day. This was shown by the thousands who marched on African Liberation Day to witness the solidarity of African-Americans with the cause of African liberation. And, so I urge most strongly that the Democratic Party must delineate certain basic principles on U.S. policy towards Africa as part of its 1972 Platform, and as a covenant of its commitment towards a more just America and international peace and security.

TESTIMONY BY DR. HERSCHELLE CHALLENOR, AFRICAN HERITAGE STUDIES ASSOCIATION

The problems of the seventies and subsequent decades will be the coincidence of the color line with the poverty line. This North-South split between the rich nations and poor nations is replacing the East-West tension that dominated international politics in the past. The existence of an East-West detente appears evident after the Moscow accords and President Nixon's earlier statement in his 1972 foreign policy message, when he acknowledged that—

"Our alliances are no longer addressed primarily to the containment of the Soviet Union and chained behind an American shield. They are instead addressed to the creation with the powers of a stable world peace."

The Democratic Party must realize that a generation of status quo peace can bring no lasting stability. That America does not need a "new isolationism" but a more just basis for involvement, one that reflects not only America's traditional ideals, but also the realities of the post cold war era.

United States self encapsulation is neither possible nor desirable. Assuming that the Democratic Party is concerned about peace, it has a responsibility to clarify for the American public those factors and conditions that may threaten international peace and security in the years ahead. The recent fundamental changes in the world order—the end of empire, nuclear stalemate and the related detente and rehabilitation of the People's Republic of China and the successful reconstruction of Japan, and Europe—have tended to change both the arena and the basis for conflict. Most armed confrontations since 1950 have involved internal wars in Third World countries as opposed to clear acts of aggression in Europe. In Africa and Asia these conflicts usually reflect remnants of a colonial past: a quest for self-determination, poverty, artificial boundaries and internal political fragmentation. We are entering a period whereby European direct political control over weak states is being replaced by economic clientship relations between industrialized and less developed countries.

The Democratic party should capitalize upon this East-West era of good feelings to attack those problems of poverty that threaten the stability of the future. Kissinger and Nixon through secret bilateral great power diplomacy have sought to restore a world that no longer exists. While appreciating the traditional ties existing between the United States and its NATO allies, America must begin to look beyond Europe. It must eschew all notions of "no growth" models and demonstrate as much concern about the environmental pollution that results from underdevelopment as from industrialization. While it maintains military superiority, United States national honor requires that the richest nation must not be among the most parsimonious in its contributions to the development of the Third World.

UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD AFRICA

Historically United States policy toward Africa, particularly during the present administration, has been one of malign neglect clouded with moral hyperbolism and sophistry. The United States still perpetuates the myth that Africa is of no strategic importance. Such an assertion has been possible because this country did not consider those littoral states with which it has maintained special relations—South Africa, Tunisia, Morocco, Ethiopia and Libya—to be part of Africa. Future governments must reassess the African continent's relationshp to the US national interest, because the world of 1972 is vastly different from that of 1960 when the Democrats last arrested power from the Republican Party.

United States foreign policy must be adjusted to new international and domestic realities. Three major factors call for a policy reassessment. First, as a result of the changing political complexion of the international community, African peoples account for about one third of the world's sovereign nations (42 African and 4 Caribbean out of 135 United Nations member states). Secondly, the impact of Japanese and European competition with the United States in international trade requires a greater American economic effort in Africa. British membership in an expanded European Economic Community will probably result in a contraction of markets for US exports in Africa. The common market will probably extend the preferential trade and investment arrangements EEC members enjoy with the 18 African associated states to include all of north and tropical Africa and part of the Caribbean. This spectre of an autarkic Euro-African community is particularly forboding in light of US future energy requirements. By 1985 it is estimated that this country will have to import 50% of the oil it requires for domestic use as its consumption increases from 16 million to 26 million barrels a day. (*New York Times*, 5/22/72) In view of the political complexities of assuring a constant oil supply from the Middle East, African oil may serve as a complementary source of supply. In addition Africa contains much of the world's uranium reserves. In its quest to make nuclear power economical, the US may find itself in competition with Europe not only over the cheapest method of enriching uranium, but also over access to African uranium fields as well.

Most significantly, the increased political participation of Blacks resulting from the Civil Rights Act of 1965, coupled with their heightened concern about political and economic development on the African continent, may make Africa a factor in domestic politics. Last month, slightly more than ten years after the dramatic, but isolated, Black nationalist disruption in the United Nations gallery after the killing of Patrice Lumumba in 1961, 20,000 Blacks marched in Washington to demonstrate their support of majority rule in Southern Africa. This demonstration followed three other important events: the dominant role accorded African issues in the foreign policy section of the Gary Black Political Convention Platform, the sending of a letter signed by former Black Ambassadors and other State Department officials to the President protesting US policy toward Africa; and the convening of two Black policy conferences on Africa: the first organized in Puerto Rico by academics and other professionals and the second by the Black Congressional Caucus. These events transmit political messages that should not be ignored.

African political empowerment south of the Zambezi and economic dependence throughout the African continent are the major foreign policy issues facing Africa today. Under the Republican administration, we have witnessed a steady deterioration of the progressive leadership inaugurated during the Kennedy era. The Democratic record is not spotless however. While President Nixon did not arrange a mutually convenient time to discuss Southern Africa with President Kenneth Kaunda in 1970, President Johnson launched the Kisangni (Stanleyville) paradrop after refusing to meet with the official delegation from the Organization of African Unity Commission on the Congo in 1964.

SOUTHERN AFRICA

The Democratic platform must reverse the present policy that accords verbal and material support to Southern Rhodesia, Portugal and South Africa. The passage of the Byrd Amendment and the Senate's failure to rescind this authorization to import Rhodesian chrome flies in the face of the policy to expand trade with the Soviet Union. Importing Rhodesian chrome, in violation of mandatory treaty obligations imposed under Article 43 of the UN Charter is particularly unnecessary, since the US has sufficient chrome to meet its defense requirements for the next forty years (Senator Kennedy, *Congressional Record*, May 31, 1972).

The symbolic importance of this legislative act bears a frightening resemblance to the impact of the American Congress' passage of a Neutrality Resolution and refusal to apply "meaningful sanctions" against Italy during the Abyssinian affair of 1935. Then, according to the *New York Times* of August 26, 1935, the Neutrality Resolution, "disappointed and even discouraged many here [London] who hoped for United States cooperation in compelling the truculent to keep the peace . . . it must have justified doubt in these circles of European government as to the wisdom or significance of such punitive action."

The Azores base agreement and the accompanying aid package markedly enhance Portugal's ability to wage war against Africans seeking self-determination in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau. This $434 million aid agreement is more than the United States foreign assistance program for the entire continent of Africa in the past two years ($176.1 million in FY 1971 and $163.1 million in FY 1972). America cannot continue to

blindly support its NATO allies in their colonial ventures in Africa, but must develop an independent policy toward the states of Africa. Indeed, it appears that NATO partners either through investment, trade or sale of arms have adopted a tacit policy of containing majority rule north of the Zambezi.

Privately the United States has justified its unwillingness to take concrete action against South Africa because of the increased naval presence in the Indian Ocean. By portraying itself as a democratic bastion against communism and a haven for safe profitable investment, South Africa has enlisted the staunch support of important groups in this country. However, the recent South African government reaction to Afrikaaner and other European student protest *against* apartheid raise questions about the democratic nature of the regimen and the acceptibility of its policies to future leaders in the white communities.

The present American policy of increased dialogue with South Africa and peaceful change, reflecting the positions of such men as C. B. Marshall, Dean Acheson and George Kennan, is either naive or disingenous. Clearly the dialogue the UN has maintained with South Africa since 1948 has not brought about an enlightened relationship with Namibia. Despite the International Court of Justice opinion of 1970 declaring South Africa's continued presence in Namibia illegal and subsequent General Assembly resolutions placing that territory under de jure UN administration, South Africa has refused to withdraw from its former Mandate. In May of 1970, the United States responded to these events by discouraging further investment in Namibia and preventing future Export-Import Bank assistance to that country. This policy, which would be similar to using sanctions against Czechoslovakia in 1939 because it was invaded by Germany, punishes the victim and not the perpetrator of annexation in the long run.

Americans must realize that their long run economic and political interests dictate that they support the majority of African states and not South Africa. For this reason, Black Americans can accept nothing less than an unequivocal commitment to majority rule throughout Southern Africa. The US cannot put the cold war on ice in certain areas of the world and justify support of the racist reactionary regimes of Voster, Smith and Caetano in terms of East-West tensions.

AID, TRADE, AND INVESTMENT POLICIES

United States over-optimism in the 1960's about the chances for rapid economic development in Africa must not be replaced with over-pessimism in the seventies. This country's attitudes, policies and economic health frequently is determinitive. It is the largest market for exports from the less developed countries (23.4% 1968/69) and the largest aid donor in absolute terms contributing about 40% of total financial flows to developing countries in 1969. President Nixon's new economic program of August 1971 culminated a period beginning around 1965 when declining magnitudes of aid, hardening aid terms and creeping protectionism became increasingly more evident.[1] This drying up of resources available to African states occurred at a time when they face heavy debt service burdens. One estimate places the outstanding external debt in Africa at $9 billion in 1970 up from $6 billion in 1965. Debt repayment amounted to approximately $844 million in 1971, or about 42% of the total aid flows of $2 billion into Africa. (B. Kitchen, Speech in Chicago, 2/10/72).

Sixteen of the twenty-five least developed countries in the world are located in Africa. Nevertheless, the United States provided bilateral assistance to only eleven countries,[2] none of which were among the least developed, last year. The total aid program to all African states in FY 1972 amounted to $173.2 million, somewhat less than the $200 million.

Since most African countries earn most of their foreign reserves from one export commodities, they are particularly sensitive to deterioration in their terms of trade. Although African exports have steadily increased as a result of lower world market prices and the higher prices they must pay for manufactured goods, because of inflation in the West, they face severe trade imbalances and depletion of their foreign reserves. For example the world price of copper fell from $1700 per ton to approximately $900 a ton last year, thereby creating serious economic difficulties for Zambia, and to a lesser extent, Zaire.

Increased trade offers a more acceptable means of economic development than aid, consequently the United States should take measures to expand markets available to African exports and support price stabilization programs and international commodity agreements for cocoa and vegetable oils.

PLATFORM RECOMMENDATIONS

Southern Africa

1. We endorse Congressman Charles Diggs, Jr. proposals on Southern Africa presented to the Congress and reported in the Congressional Record January 18, 1972.

2. Following the precedent set by the Scandinavian countries and Holland, the United States should provide direct humanitarian assistance to the Organization of African Unity Liberation Fund.

3. U.S. should abrogate the terms of the Azores base agreement and stop all Ex-Im Bank assistance to Portugal and South Africa.

4. Rescind the Byrd amendment and support the continuation of economic sanctions against Southern Rhodesia within the United Nations.

5. Extend the punitive economic measures imposed against Namibia May 1970 against the Republic of South Africa itself.

6. Provide security assistance, if requested, to those African countries such as Zambia, Tanzania, Guinea and Senegal who have suffered military incursions into their territory by either Portuguese, Rhodesian or South African forces.

7. Relocate U.S. NASA facilities presently in South Africa and stop all cooperative nuclear research with that country.

8. Institute an assistance program of relief for Southern African refugees resident in the United States and facilitate visa arrangements for such persons.

9. Support action under Chapter 7 of the UN Charter to end South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia.

10. In view of the fact that the African nationalists under the PAIGC of Amilcar Cabral exert effective control over two-thirds of the territory of Guinea-Bissau, a fact confirmed by a visiting UN mission, the U.S. should recognize the PAIGC leadership structure as the legitimate government of that country.

[1] In 1961, 80% of all US aid was repayable in local currency, now all is repayable in dollars; interest rates increased from ¾% in 1961 to 7% today; US moved from 8th position in 1964 to 11th position in 1968 with respect to the grant portion of its aid among DAC members. At least 90% of Australian, Belgian, Canadian and Scandinavian aid is grant aid.

[2] Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Liberia, Morocco, Nigeria, Somalia, Tanzania, Uganda, Zaire.

UNITED STATES POLICY IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

A statement submitted to the Democratic Party National Platform Hearings at the City University of New York, June 22, 1972.

AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON AFRICA,
New York, N.Y.

United States policy towards southern African must become a major issue in the 1972 campaign.

Everywhere in southern Africa people are in revolt against the conditions under which they live: 35 million Africans in South Africa, Namibia (South West Africa), Zimbabwe (Rhodesia), Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea-Bissau are oppressed by a white minority of 5 million. They are denied the most basic human right to live in their own homes with their families; to have a voice in their conditions of work and wages; to equal training, educational, and vocational opportunities; to freedom of person, speech, and press; and to participation in the government that rules them.

In Angola, Guinea-Bissau, and Mozambique, the African liberation forces now control large areas of their countries, while they face some 150,000 Portuguese troops backed by NATO training and supplies.

In Namibia, despite the illegal South African police-state rule, a general strike of African contract workers and a nation-wide protest organized by African leaders have demanded an end to South African occupation and independence for a united Namibia, as well as world action to match world promises of independence.

In Zimbabwe Africans have united, defying bannings, arrests, and death to say "NO" to British-Rhodesian settlement terms which would keep the white minority in control indefinitely.

In South Africa, continuous political trials reveal that opposition cannot be crushed by the *apartheid* system and government terror.

In the face of this growing African struggle, United States policy has led towards increasing support for the colonial and racist regimes of southern Africa.

THE UNITED STATES AND THE PORTUGUESE EMPIRE

Most recently, the United States has extended $435 million in grants, waivers and credits to Portugal in return for the use of bases in the Azores, propping up the Portuguese economy strained by three colonial wars. Previously, the United States had authorized the sale of Boeing 707's and 747's to Portugal to be used for troop transport, as well as Bell helicopters for use in Mozambique. The United States sends $2.4 million in direct military aid to Portugal each year, and both directly and through NATO the United States provides training for Portuguese forces and exchange of military missions and information, including counter-insurgency strategy. With government sanction, the Gulf Oil Corporation, operating in Angola, contributes $30 million (annually) to Portugal's budget and the United States remains Angola's best customer for coffee.

We call for:

An end to the U.S.-Portugal military alliance and U.S. withdrawal from the Azores bases;

An end to Portuguese membership in NATO;

Discouragement of U.S. investment in Portuguese-held territory, including no tax credits or loan guarantees;

Technical and economic assistance and political support for the liberation movements in Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea-Bissau;

Support for the anti-colonial strategy of the United Nations.

THE UNITED STATES AND THE SELL-OUT OF ZIMBABWE—RHODESIA

The United States at first supported the economic sanctions against the illegal minority regime in Rhodesia imposed by the United Nations at the request of Britain. By 1971, sanctions had weakened the Rhodesian economy to the extent that the regime reopened negotiations with Britain. At this crucial point Congress, by passing the Byrd Amendment which allowed the importation of chrome and other so-called strategic materials from Rhodesia, effectively ended U.S. implementation of sanctions.

Thus, as the people of Zimbabwe organized to reject the British-Rhodesian settlement, the U.S. joined Portugal and South Africa as the only open violators of the U.N. sanctions and lined up with Rhodesia's ruling racists.

We call for:

Re-imposition of the U.N. sanctions so long as the white minority rules;

Assistance to the U.N. to aid in enforcing the embargo;

No support for a British sell-out; no independence before majority rule;

Aid to the African majority in their struggle for independence.

THE UNITED STATES AND THE INDEPENDENCE OF NAMIBIA

The United States has stated that it accepts the opinion of the International Court of Justice (June, 1971) that South Africa holds Namibia illegally and that states have a duty to refrain from actions that help South Africa maintain illegal control. But U.S. actions have been limited to a warning that new U.S. investments in Namibia would not be protected against the claims of a future government. This did not help strikers at U.S.-owned Tsumeb, largest base-mineral mine in the territory, who were subjected to severe police repression, nor has it stopped the flow of new U.S. capital to Namibia.

We call for:

Action by the United States to back its verbal support for the International Court and for the principal of self-determination;

Support for immediate independence for an undivided Namibia;

Support for the U.N. Council for Namibia as a transitional authority;

Discouragement of U.S. corporate activity in Namibia through refusal of tax credits on money paid to South Africa; disavowal of claims and franchises made by South Africa; rejection of South African goods at customs;

Aid to Namibians to prepare for independence through educational training, including immigration permits when necessary;

Material and political support for strikers and other Namibians organizing against South African rule.

THE UNITED STATES AND THE STABILITY OF APARTHEID

Despite U.S. condemnation of *apartheid*, practical support for the South African regime has grown more open under the Nixon Administration.

Licenses were granted in 1971 for the sale of easily convertible light aircraft and helicopters, primary weapons of anti-guerrilla warfare. About $3 million annually in military spare parts goes to South Africa. Beyond this, some 300 corporations continue to strengthen the South African economy by their participation and know-how, exacting profit rates of 15–25%.

The U.S. favors South Africa by including it in the sugar import quota system, thus providing a subsidy of about $5 million a year; it has assisted via close scientific ties in South Africa's all-white atomic energy program; it operates three NASA tracking stations, thus providing critical technological know-how.

The U.S. is giving de facto support to the minority regime by insisting that violence is not acceptable as a method of change in South Africa while it accepts violence as a means of maintaining ruthless racist power. The U.S. call for "communication" to promote change carries the false implication that the destiny of the African majority can be determined by increasing dialogue between white U.S. officials and white South African despots.

We call for an end to U.S. partnership in *apartheid:*

An end to all government support for the *apartheid* state and economy;

Discouragement of private investment and other relationships with South Africa;

Support for the anti-*apartheid* policies of the United Nations;

Material and political support for the liberation forces.

NEUTRALITY IN SOUTHERN AFRICA?

The United States is not neutral in southern Africa. Its economic and political power, and increasingly its military power, is alined with the oppressive status-quo.

The U.S. must withdraw military forces, evacuate military bases, and end the policy of military support for the minority regimes.

The U.S. must withdraw all other support it gives to the oppressive and racist regimes of southern Africa.

The Congressional Black Caucus has given leadership in the ways that Congress can act to change U.S. policy in southern Africa. We support the demands of the Black Caucus in relation to U.S. policy in Africa, as set out in the Black Bill of Rights, 1972. Representatives Diggs and Dellums have initiated legislative action to check U.S. corporate operations in southern Africa. They need an Administration that will support anti-racist action, not oppose it.

Every candidate for office in 1972 must be measured by this policy.

H. H. MORRIS RETIRES AS POSTMASTER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. H. H. "Hap" Morris retires on June 30 as Postmaster of the House of Representatives; and while all of us wish him a well-earned and happy life in his native Kentucky, we also want him to know that he will be missed on the Hill.

"Hap" Morris arrived on the Hill in 1932—as an assistant to the late Representative Virgil Chapman, and he was elected Postmaster in January 1955. All during those long years, those of us who have served in the House have known the dedicated, efficient, and—above all—happy service rendered by H. H. Morris. I do not know exactly at what point in time the name "Hap" became a part of the man, but I do know that it is a most fitting name and an apt description for a public servant who has served long and with honor.

We wish you a long and happy retirement "Hap"—we, in Kentucky, consider you one of our own, and you have earned the respect and admiration of the entire House.

FOR HIGHWAYS IN 1 DAY—$4.4 BILLION

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, despite the continued pressures of inflation, Transportation Secretary John A. Volpe has announced that the full highway authorization for fiscal year 1973, $4.4 billion, will be released to the States tomorrow, July 1. This is a departure from the customary procedure of releasing highway funds on a quarterly basis.

The reason advanced by Secretary Volpe for releasing the entire authorization on the very first day of the fiscal year is "in order that national goals set for the Federal-aid highway program by President Nixon may be achieved."

The Secretary, in a Department press release, went on to explain that the action "is in line with the President's repeated emphasis on improving the Nation's total transportation capacity as rapidly as possible within necessary fiscal restraints."

It would appear that when it comes to the highway program, particularly in an election year, the fiscal restraints are few; $4.4 billion can be unloaded in 1 day despite what inflationary impact it might have on the construction industry and the rest of the economy. On the other hand, when it comes to mass transit, whose appropriations have never been more than a fifth of that of highways, fiscal considerations become very important. It should be noted that the Secretary's announcement comes at the heels of a year in which the Office of Management and Budget felt compelled to freeze one-third of the Urban Mass Transportation Administration's funds. For fiscal year 1972, the Congress authorized $900 million for expenditure on mass transit programs; not only were these funds not all released at the beginning of the fiscal year, but also the administration announced early this year that spending would be limited to $600 million. Some $4.8 billion in Federal funds were spent on highways, however.

Secretary Volpe spoke of the President's "repeated emphasis on improving the Nation's total transportation capacity." Regrettably, this special step taken in the interest of highway construction confirms once again where the President's emphasis on improving "the Nation's total transportation" lies—in

highways. I would submit, however, that if we are to meet the transportation crisis of our country, we need to shift this emphasis. For too long we have neglected mass transit in favor of highways; as a consequence our cities are mired down in traffic congestion. This mobility crisis is not going to be solved by more highways—it will be solved by the development of efficient mass transportation systems. If indeed we are to improve the Nation's total transportation, we must at this point give special attention to public transportation to compensate for our past neglect.

WHAT NEXT AT THE WHITE HOUSE?

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, Kansas has been and is by most measuring sticks a Republican State. It is a rare circumstance when it does not support a Republican presidential candidate. It is an even rarer circumstance when its organs of public opinion, and particularly its newspapers, find fault with Republican policies, programs, and partisans.

So it is with some concern that I read an editorial in the El Dorado Times of June 24, 1972, questioning these matters. The Times' editor and publisher, Mr. Rolla Clymer, is a distinguished gentleman of the old school. He is regarded in our State as perhaps the sagest political analyst in Kansas, and his observations are widely quoted and reprinted.

I include his editorial, "What Next?" to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with the hope and purpose that in some manner it will escape the preliminary censorship of the guardians at the White House, and be read by another sage politician who is the real inhabitant of that edifice. It might suggest to him that some changes are in order for the good of the party and the country.

The editorial follows:

WHAT NEXT?

We keep wondering just what else can plague and embarrass the Nixon administration in an election year.

With a fair chance to be returned to office by the electorate in the November election, it seems that some setback springs up against the party in power almost every day.

For example, when Aide John D. Ehrlichman was asked why the President no longer holds press conferences, he replied it was because of the "flabby and fairly dumb questions" he is asked by the newspaper fellows. This was no sort of an answer to a fair question by the press. We publish a small daily out here in Kansas, and would like to know just why the press conferences have been abandoned. Some of the hirelings around the President seem to have grown too high and mighty for their britches.

Then there is the latest episode of the so-called director of security of the Committee to Re-elect the President who was caught, with four companions, early in the morning in the headquarters of the Democratic National Committee in Washington. Details of the sordid affair have been scarce, but it looks upon its face that the quintet was in the enemy's command post for no good purpose. The Democrats, of course, are playing up the matter in order to gain all the political benefit possible out of the sorry happening. A suit for one million dollars has been filed against the Republicans by Democrat high officials.

It is inconceivable that the President or John Mitchell, head of the organization to re-elect Mr. Nixon, should have had any official connection with this silly, strong-arm raid. Yet the incident smells badly and attaches a stigma to the Republican party it should never have been caused to suffer.

Maybe the men around the President have become too arrogant and over-bearing. Viewing them from our little post out here in Kansas, we urge them to walk a bit more humbly and sensibly, at least during the campaign weeks.

It wouldn't be too difficult for the Nixon apple cart to be overturned.

LABOR FOR PEACE CALLS FOR IMMEDIATE WITHDRAWAL FROM INDOCHINA

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 23 and 24, 985 delegates from 35 international unions from 31 States convened at a conference called by Labor for Peace, in St. Louis, Mo. Their purpose was to consider ways and means of ending the tragic conflict in Southeast Asia.

The delegates adopted a compelling statement of policy calling for the "immediate withdrawal from Indochina of every American soldier, every gun, every plane, every tank, every warship, and every dollar."

I think there could be no more clearcut statement than this. We have, as the Labor for Peace statement of policy says, "exacted an intolerable toll" in waging this war. An immediate end to the war is essential, so that we can begin to rebuild America, and so that we can signal a halt to the death and destruction which still hold sway in Asia.

The delegates to the Labor for Peace conference have issued a demand which simply cannot be ignored. I offer my gratitude to them for their affirmation of peace, and I urge my colleagues to answer their call for peace by ending this war.

Following is the state of policy of Labor for Peace, and a list of the members of the steering committee of Labor for Peace:

LABOR FOR PEACE STATEMENT OF POLICY

We, some 1,000 representatives of organized labor, who count in our ranks millions of members, have been brought together in St. Louis, Missouri out of our common concern and a sense of frustration and anger over the failure of our government to end the war in Vietnam.

We hold these facts to be self-evident:

It is self-evident that this nightmare of killing and destruction has gone on far too long, and that this war is illegal and not in our national interest.

It is self-evident that this war has exacted an intolerable toll in the division among our people, in the alienation of our youth, the blighting of our cities and the distortion of our national priorities—and that it has triggered unprecedented strife, racism and violence.

It is self-evident that this war has undermined the economy of our country, lengthened the rolls of the unemployed and placed greater hardships on the backs of the working poor. It has created tremendous inflationary pressures, increased our tax burdens, and robbed working people of the value of their paychecks. Wage controls have made a mockery of collective bargaining and threaten to become a permanent straitjacket on the labor movement.

It is self-evident that this war has severely tarnished the good name and moral leadership of our country in the arena of world opinion.

And finally,

It is self-evident that the overwhelming majority of Americans agree that this war is not worth one more life, one more prisoner, one more hard-earned tax dollar, or one more devastated city whether here or in Indo-China.

We are therefore resolved that the voice of American labor, which has been raised in every struggle for justice and decency in our nation's history, shall not remain silent during this critical period. As men and women of labor, who treasure our country's heritage and future, we proclaim our responsibility to harness every effort to end the war NOW.

We demand the immediate withdrawal from Indochina of every American soldier, every gun, every plane, every tank, every warship and every dollar. This would end the fighting and bring about the return of our prisoners of war. It would also free our energies and our resources for the tremendous task of repairing the ravages of this war, both in Vietnam and in our own land.

We accept our responsibility for the crucial task of reconverting to an economy of peace. Our swords must be converted into ploughshares—our immense industrial technology must be directed into peaceful, constructive channels—our people must be put to work to fulfill the pressing social and economic needs of our nation.

To achieve this goal, and to insure that there will be no more Vietnams, we here today establish Labor For Peace as a national organization. We declare our intention to bring into our midst ever-broader sections of the trade union movement in this effort to turn our country from the path of killing and destruction to the path of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness through peace, dignity and full employment.

We dedicate ourselves to this purpose in the interests of American labor and the human family.

Adopted June 24, 1972.

STEERING COMMITTEE, LABOR FOR PEACE

Mario Abreu, Vice President, District 65, Distributive Workers of America.

Ken Bannon, Vice-President, United Automobile, Aerospace, Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW).

Joseph Belsky, President, Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of North America (AFL–CIO).

Irv Bluestone, Vice-President, United Automobile, Aerospace, Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW).

Harry Bridges, President, International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union.

Ken J. Brown, President, Lithographers and Photoengravers, International Union (AFL–CIO).

Clifton Caldwell, Vice-President, Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of North America (AFL–CIO).

Cesar Chavez, President, United Farm Workers of America (AFL–CIO).

Gerald R. Coleman, Executive Secretary, United Hatters, Cap & Millinery Workers International Union (AFL–CIO).

Leon J. Davis, President, National Union of Hospital & Nursing Home Employees, RWDSU (AFL–CIO).

Fileno De Novellis, Vice President, United Shoe Workers of America (AFL–CIO).

Jack Edwards, Vice President, United Automobile, Aerospace, Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW).

Abe Feinglass, Vice-President, Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of North America (AFL–CIO).

Murray Finley, Vice President, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America (AFL–CIO).

Albert Fitzgerald, President, United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America.

Moe Foner, Executive Secretary, National Union of Hospital & Nursing Home Employees, RWDSU (AFL–CIO).

Doug Fraser, Vice President, United Automobile, Aerospace, Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW).

Fred Fulford, President, United Furniture Workers of America (AFL–CIO).

Harold Gibbons, Vice President, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Director, Central Conference of Teamsters.

Louis Goldblatt, Secretary-Treasurer, International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union.

Patrick E. Gorman, Secretary-Treasurer, Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of North America (AFL–CIO).

Victor Gotbaum, Vice President, American Federation of State, County & Municipal Employees; President, District Council 37.

Pat Greathouse, Vice President, United Automobile, Aerospace, Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW).

Charles Hayes, Vice President, Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of North America (AFL–CIO).

Ralph Helstein, Vice President, Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of North America (AFL–CIO).

Dolores Huerta, Vice President, United Farm Workers of America (AFL–CIO).

David Livingston, Secretary-Treasurer, Distributive Workers of America.

William Lucy, Secretary-Treasurer, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFL–CIO).

Olga Madar, Vice-President, United Automobile, Aerospace, Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW).

James Matles, Secretary-Treasurer, United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America.

Emil Mazey, Secretary-Treasurer, United Automobile, Aerospace, Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW).

Anthony Mazzocchi, Legislative Director, Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers International Union (AFL–CIO).

William Michelson, Vice-President, Retail, Wholesale, & Department Store Employees Union (AFL–CIO).

Einar O. Mohn, Vice President, International Brotherhood of Teamsters; Director, Western Conf. of Teamsters.

Cleveland Robinson, President, Distributive Workers of America.

Frank Rosenblum, Secretary-Treasurer, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America (AFL-CIO).

Frank Salomone, Vice President; Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmetologists and Proprietors International Union of America (AFL-CIO).

Jack Scheinkman, Vice President, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America (AFL-CIO).

William Simons, Vice President, American Federation of Teachers, (AFL–CIO).

Donald W. Stone, Recording & Financial Secretary, Lithographers & Photoengravers International Union (AFL-CIO).

Leon Sverdlove, President, International Jewelry Workers Union (AFL-CIO).

Doris Turner, Vice President, National Union of Hospital & Nursing Home Employees, RWDSU (AFL-CIO).

Tom Turner, President, Wayne County, AFL-CIO (Michigan).

Myra K. Wolfgang, Vice President, Hotel & Restaurant Employees International Union (AFL-CIO).

Leonard Woodcock, President, United Automobile, Aerospace, Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW).

Jerry Wurf, President, International American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFL–CIO).

AIR VETERAN OF THREE TOURS IN VIETNAM IS HONORED

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, there are many applicants for appointment to the service academies. Candidates often have to pursue other studies before they receive selection.

Such was the case with a young man in my district whom I had the honor to appoint to the U.S. Air Force Academy several years ago. He had to wait 3 years for his acceptance.

Since graduating and being commissioned, Norbert J. Ostrozny, of Lackawanna, N.Y., has served his country well, recently being awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross for service in Vietnam.

Captain Ostrozny is on his third tour of duty in Vietnam, now serving as a B–52 airborne commander.

To me, one of the great privileges and pleasures of being a Member of Congress is to be able to watch the progress of service academy nominees. The service academies are tough, as they should be, and not every nominee makes the long haul.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at the fine record of Captain Ostrozny and the honor he has received. As part of my remarks, I include an article from the June 29 issue of the Buffalo Evening News:

AIR FORCE AWARDS DISTINGUISHED FLYING CROSS TO LACKAWANNA CAPTAIN

A Lackawannan who waited three years for an Air Force Academy appointment was recently awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross at Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Tex.

Capt. Norbert J. Ostrozny of 88 Center St., an Air Force Academy nominee for five years before he received an appointment was decorated for "extraordinary achievement while participating in aerial flight as a C–47 pilot near Dak-To, Vietnam."

The accompanying citation stated that Capt. Ostrozny flew—at low level and under marginal weather conditions—a 2-hour night psychological mission over enemy territory under constant threat of ground fire.

"His courage and dedication displayed in the face of known hazards, contributed immeasureably to the success of the defense mission," the citation concluded.

In 1959, after graduating from Canisius High School, Capt. Ostrozny enrolled in the State University of Buffalo where he participated in the Air Force ROTC program.

He studied there for three years until Rep. Thaddeus J. Dulski (D. Buffalo, 41st District) appointed him to the Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs, Colo.

Capt. Ostrozny is serving his third tour of duty in Vietnam as a B–52 airborne commander. He has flown over 370 combat missions and earned 11 Air Medals. His parents are Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Ostrozny.

EQUAL RATE STRUCTURE

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, our tax structure, though termed progressive, is proportionate. The relative tax burden of Americans whose incomes range from $2,000 to $25,000 a year varies only from 25.6 percent at the $2,000 level to 31.1 percent at the $25,000 level, according to Sterling Soderlind's informative article in the May 9 Wall Street Journal.

However, utility rate structure is not even proportionate. It is regressive. The poor pay more.

Utility rate structure varies from State to State. But typically a poor person who does not use much electricity, who does not care whether his line is underground or above ground, who lives in a congested area where cost of service is low, pays three times as much per kilowatt-hour as an industry which is creating both pollution and energy supply problems. And the poor person typically pays twice as much as the air-conditioned suburban homeowner who is demanding underground lines.

I am pleased to note that in some regulatory jurisdictions, including Michigan, Virginia, and the District of Columbia, public interest and low-income groups are at last making the case for an equal rate structure. Probably even an equal rate structure contains an element of subsidy of the affluent by the poor. But an equal utility rate structure would at least mitigate one of the most flagrant

examples of regressive pricing of essential services.

By having prices more nearly reflect cost of service, it is possible to curb waste of our dwindling energy resources while providing a fairer method of payment for low-income persons.

Recently I asked the Federal Power Commission to furnish me with the average cost of electricity per kilowatt-hour, according to use category, for the major investor-owned utilities. This study shows that, on the average, the costs per kilowatt-hour are as follows:

Residential, 2.22 cents.
Commercial, 2.08 cents.
Industrial, 1.02 cents.
Overall, 1.67 cents.

What the table does not show is the high cost per kilowatt-hour, under the prevailing block rate system, for the low-use—often low-income—residential user, whose monthly consumption may amount only to 250 or 300 kilowatt-hours, and which he pays for, typically, at a rate of 3 cents per kilowatt-hour or more.

Mr. President, I believe that the FPC tabulation can be most useful to State utility commissioners, who establish retail rates, and to parties in rate cases. Therefore, I insert the table at this point in the RECORD:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION—AVERAGE COST PER KILOWATT-HOUR 1970 CLASS A AND B UTILITIES, BY CLASS OF SERVICE

[Cents per kilowatt-hour]

Utility name	Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Overall sales
Alabama Power Co	1.7020	1.7336	0.8260	1.2681
Southern Electric Generating Co				
Alaska Electric Light & Power Co	3.7313		4.2371	4.0235
Arizona Public Service Co	2.3410	2.0114	1.2416	1.8771
Citizens Utilities Co	2.7931	3.2935	1.6688	2.4282
Tuscon Gas & Electric Co	2.6649	2.3294	1.0930	1.7420
Arkansas-Missouri Power Co	2.7653	2.6546	.9612	1.6337
Arkansas Power & Light Co	2.0726	2.0764	.8383	1.3743
Arklahoma Corp., the				
Pacific Gas & Electric Co	2.0680	1.7780	.9218	1.6584
San Diego Gas & Electric Co	2.1427	2.3341	1.2037	1.8046
Southern California Edison Co	2.4311	1.8525	.8858	1.6235
Home Light & Power Co	2.2015	2.2093	.1771	1.9494
Public Service Co. of Colorado	2.5842	1.9329	1.0579	1.8947
Western Colorado Power Co., the	2.1966	2.5728	1.4846	2.0749
Connecticut Light & Power Co., the	2.3320	2.3106	1.4011	2.0523
Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Co				
Hartford Electric Light Co., the	2.5125	2.1622	1.3738	2.0866
United Illuminating Co., the	2.1536	2.0722	1.2914	1.8772
Delmarva Power & Light Co	2.4211	1.9884	1.0122	1.5726
Potomac Electric Power Co	2.1992	1.9584	1.2730	1.8637
Florida Power Corp	2.1337	2.2287	1.0286	1.8525
Florida Power & Light Co	1.8904	1.9925	1.2992	1.8249
Florida Public Utilities Co	2.1481	2.5304	1.6396	2.1299
Gulf Power Co	1.7910	2.0321	.9264	1.5499
Tampa Electric Co	1.9956	1.9387	.8613	1.4542
Georgia Power Co	1.6465	1.8412	.9058	1.4034
Savannah Electric & Power Co	1.9181	1.9952	.7838	1.5697
Hawaiian Electric Co., Inc	2.4381	2.9739	1.3446	1.9905
Hilo Electric Light Co., Ltd	4.0359	4.4509	2.6794	3.9196
Maui Electric Co., Ltd	3.5846	4.7408	3.3532	3.8395
Idaho Power Co	1.6985	1.3691	.5151	1.0322
Central Illinois Light Co	2.5712	2.5103	1.1193	1.8222
Central Illinois Public Service Co	2.6744	2.5237	1.1278	2.0358
Commonwealth Edison Co	2.6189	2.2022	1.0903	1.9041
Electric Energy, Inc			.4943	.4943
Illinois Power Co	2.5337	2.8800	1.1765	1.8001
Mount Carmel Public Utility Co	2.4861	3.2741	1.7060	2.1890
Sherrard Power System	2.7014	2.7015		2.7050
South Beloit Water, Gas & Electric Co	2.4476	2.4780	1.4226	1.8470
Alcoa Generating Corp			.3775	.3775
Commonwealth Edison Co. of Indiana, Inc				
Indiana-Kentucky Electric Corp				
Indiana & Michigan Electric Co	1.6758	1.7612	1.0751	1.4481
Indianapolis Power & Light Co	1.9549	2.3041	1.1630	1.5888
Northern Indiana Public Service Co	2.4657	2.8380	1.0956	1.5045
Public Service Co. of Indiana, Inc	2.3801	2.0071	1.1383	1.7439
Southern Indiana Gas & Electric Co	2.2988	1.8357	1.0079	1.5904
Interstate Power Co	2.8142	2.7180	1.2229	2.1606
Iowa Electric Light & Power Co	2.3993	2.5520	1.3722	2.1539
Iowa-Illinois Gas & Electric Co	2.6993	2.0669	1.1505	1.8895
Iowa Power & Light Co	2.3793	2.4611	1.2754	2.0043
Iowa Public Service Co	2.7947	2.6818	1.6296	2.4514
Iowa Southern Utilities Co	2.7747	3.2984	1.5018	2.3844
Central Kansas Power Co., The	2.9856	1.9007		2.2161
Central Telephone & Utilities Corp	2.6736	2.6325	1.1171	2.0572
Kansas Gas & Electric Co	1.9954	1.9665	1.0247	1.5465
Kansas Power & Light Co., The	2.3056	1.7638	1.0981	1.7418
Kentucky Power Co	2.0316	2.0139	.9832	1.4054
Kentucky Utilities Co	2.2476	2.0977	1.1971	1.7498
Louisville Gas & Electric Co	2.0464	2.4944	.9893	1.4128
Union Light, Heat, & Power Co., The	2.2515	2.0572	1.0727	1.7795
Central Louisiana Electric Co., Inc	2.2979	2.4995	.9772	1.7532
Gulf States Utilities Co	2.2188	1.9493	.7288	1.1639
Louisiana Power & Light Co	1.9934	2.1391	.8127	1.4000
New Orleans Public Service, Inc	2.0349	1.8171	.8189	1.6150
Bangor Hydro-Electic Co	2.5757	2.4710	1.0490	1.7541
Central Maine Power Co	2.5840	2.5826	1.1184	1.9979
Maine Public Service Co	3.0260	3.2039	1.5004	2.4860
Rumford Falls Power Co			.6583	.6583
Baltimore Gas & Electric Co	2.3963	2.6127	1.2601	1.8930
Conowingo Power Co	2.0882	2.4765	1.2477	1.7929
Delmarva Power & Light Co. of Maryland	2.3786	2.5714	1.4830	2.1947
Potomac Edison Co., the	2.0142	1.8075	.8414	1.2980
Susquehanna Electric Co., the				
Susquehanna Power Co., the				
Boston Edison Co	3.2049	2.6161	1.5617	2.5678
Boston Gas Co	3.9568	2.8967	1.5781	2.3024
Brockton Edison Co	2.3763	2.0640	1.3936	2.2468
Cambridge Electric Light Co	2.7860	2.3130	1.3884	1.9979
Cape & Vineyard Electric Co	3.1540	2.8224	1.8489	2.8944
Canal Electric Co				
Fall River Electric Light Co	2.9197	2.2045	1.1471	2.3098
Fitchburg Gas & Electric Light Co	3.4254	4.4710	1.8226	2.6409
Holyoke Power & Electric Co			1.5464	1.5464
Holyoke Water Power Co			1.5285	1.5209
Massachusetts Electric Co	2.7359	2.4563	1.6189	2.3534
Montaup Electric Co				
New Bedford Gas & Edison Light Co	3.1014	2.5648	1.4549	2.4678
New England Power Co		1.0124	1.3346	1.2383
Western Massachusetts Electric Co	2.4172	2.2961	1.3360	2.0146
Yankee Atomic Electric Co				
Alpena Power Co	2.1901	2.6001	1.4817	1.9280
Consumers Power Co	2.2444	2.1784	1.2695	1.8061
Detroit Edison Co., the	2.3278	2.4822	1.1356	1.7555
Edison Sault Electric Co	1.7506	2.3986	1.3231	1.5975
Michigan Power Co	1.9722	2.1686	1.3107	1.7313
Upper Peninsula Generating Co			.7308	.7308
Upper Peninsula Power Co	2.5535	2.7782	1.8048	2.3236
Minnesota Power & Light Co	2.5338	2.6788	1.0851	1.5000
Northern States Power Co	2.3813	2.6974	1.4059	1.9682
Mississippi Power Co	1.7452	2.0325	.9338	1.4145
Mississippi Power & Light Co	1.7975	2.0138	1.1972	1.6209
Empire District Electric Co., the	2.4709	2.4962	1.0386	1.6751
Kansas City Power & Light Co	2.6266	2.1477	1.2348	2.0652
Missouri Edison Co	2.6580	2.5329	.9414	1.8114
Missouri Power & Light Co	2.7240	3.0450	1.3950	2.2418
Missouri Public Service Co	3.5992	2.7553	1.3089	2.6274
Missouri Utilities Co	2.7102	2.3708	1.0556	2.3537
St. Joseph Light & Power Co	2.5672	2.3108	1.3083	2.0834
Union Electric Co	2.4008	2.9917	1.1664	1.7413
Montana Power Co., the	2.2643	2.0414	.7024	1.2906
Nevada Power Co	1.1706	1.4429	.8515	1.2428
Sierra Pacific Power Co	2.2129	1.9242	1.0867	1.8231
Concord Electric Co	2.4014	2.7806	1.5295	2.2545
Connecticut Valley Electric Co., Inc	2.7375	3.2857	1.4385	2.1117
Exeter & Hampton Electric Co	2.8086	3.0112	1.5422	2.6052
Granite State Electric Co	2.7929	2.0586	2.0210	2.4713
Public Service Co. of New Hampshire	2.6416	2.9468	1.3037	2.0734
Atlantic City Electric Co	2.4313	2.4491	1.3663	2.1916
Jersey Central Power & Light Co	2.5577	2.3771	1.2228	2.1005
New Jersey Power & Light Co	2.3785	2.3317	1.3042	1.943R
Public Service Electric & Gas Co	2.5765	2.3278	1.2584	671.382
Pockland Electric Co	2.6462	2.5184	1.3849	2.8039
New Mexico Electric Service Co	2.4563	2.2247	1.0159	1.9996
Public Service Co. of New Mexico	2.3854	1.8660	1.0800	1.2561
Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corp	2.4460	2.5638	1.2737	1.0296
Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc	3.8730	2.9032	2.6347	2.9720
Long Island Lighting Co	2.4222	2.6770	1.7417	2.2162
Long Sault, Inc			.3896	.4067
New York State Electric & Gas Corp	2.4374	1.9156	1.0940	1.8921
Niagara Mohawk Power Corp	2.3115	1.8164	.8266	1.4754
Orange & Rockland Utilities, Inc	2.6019	2.6545	1.4610	2.2772
Rochester Gas & Electric Corp	2.3817	2.2889	1.6642	2.1513
Carolina Power & Light Co	1.6398	1.5216	.8904	1.2741
Duke Power Co	1.7264	1.4088	.7848	1.1735
Nantahala Power & Light Co	1.6639	2.1506	.8384	1.3825
Yadkin, Inc			.5359	.5359
Montana-Dakota Utilities Co	2.6962	3.5020	1.4944	2.5005
Otter Tail Power Co	2.8345	3.4733	1.8598	2.8071
Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co., the	2.4292	1.9606	1.1288	1.7302
Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., the	2.4572	2.0945	1.2414	1.7581
Columbus & Southern Ohio Electric Co	2.3470	2 6384	1.4228	1.8709
Dayton Power & Light Co., the	2.2076	2.0234	1.2496	1.7738
Ohio Edison Co	2.3850	2.2525	1.0450	1.7130
Ohio Power Co	1.8956	1.9251	.6813	.9879
Ohio Valley Electric Corp			.4221	.4221
Toledo Edison Co., the	2.3389	2.3576	1.1851	1.7116
Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co	2.2788	2.0657	.9862	1.7098
Public Service Co. of Oklahoma	2.3910	1.9216	1.0344	1.8141
California-Pacific Utilities Co	1.5913	1.9455	1.1936	1.6494
Pacific Power & Light Co	1.4114	1.5659	.7474	1.1919
Portland General Electric Co	1.1238	1.2079	.4386	.9615
Duquesne Light Co	2.5079	1.6333	1.0517	1.5789
Hershey Electric Co	2.0007	1.6062	1.0577	1.3686
Metropolitan Edison Co	2.3022	2.1615	1.1875	1.7063
Pennsylvania Electric Co	2.2813	2.1552	1.1978	1.7507
Pennsylvania Power Co	2.3923	2.2424	.9388	1.4496
Pennsylvania Power & Light Co	2.0709	2.0877	1.1655	1.7140
Philadelphia Electric Co	2.5438	2.8090	1.2208	1.7857
Philadelphia Electric Power Co				
Potomac Edison Co. of Pennsylvania, the	2.1179	1.9771	1.5144	1.9467
Safe Harbor Water Power Corp				

Utility name	Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Overal sales
UGI Corp	2.8279	2.4947	1.6046	2.4591
West Penn Power Co	2.1517	1.6884	.9195	1.3744
Blackstone Valley Electric Co	2.8298	2.3894	1.4834	2.0615
Narragansett Electric Co., the	2.7358	2.1320	1.5808	2.2640
Newport Electric Corp	2.5061	2.4714	1.3365	2.0373
Lockhart Power Co	1.7868	1.7388	.7766	.9543
South Carolina Electric & Gas Co	1.9047	1.6996	.8143	1.4251
Black Hills Power & Light Co	2.7385	2.7526	1.1507	2.1810
Northwestern Public Service Co	2.6310	2.6573		2.6196
Kingsport Power Co	1.3093	1.6393	.8890	1.1981
Tapoco, Inc			.2997	.2997
Central Power & Light Co	2.3437	2.0788	.8207	1.4757
Community Public Service Co	2.1907	2.1905	.6931	1.4906
Dallas Power & Light Co	1.7969	1.4208	1.0149	1.4786
El Paso Electric Co	2.1896	1.9122	.9841	1.6129
Houston Lighting & Power Co	1.8034	1.4787	.6407	1.0995
Southwestern Electric Power Co	2.3782	2.0052	1.1596	1.7711
Southwestern Electric Service Co	2.6107	2.5220	1.3157	2.0671
Southwestern Public Service Co	2.6978	2.0902	1.0032	1.5677
Texas Electric Service Co	2.0268	1.7656	.9192	1.4489
Texas Power & Light Co	2.1051	1.9513	.7812	1.4853
West Texas Utilities Co	2.6203	2.2206	1.2256	1.9500
Utah Power & Light Co	2.1007	1.9780	1.0379	1.5237
Central Vermont Public Service Corp	2.1642	2.9417	1.4724	2.0099
Green Mountain Power Corp	2.0131	1.9907	1.2623	1.8773
Vermont Electric Power Co., Inc				
Delmarva Power & Light Co. of Virginia	2.6960	2.1361	1.6252	2.2692
Old Dominion Power Co	2.0359	2.3438	1.2510	1.7832
Potomac Edison Co. of Virginia, the	2.1509	1.9691	1.2771	1.7929
Virginia Electric & Power Co	2.0157	1.7797	.9400	1.5766
Puget Sound Power & Light Co	1.1983	1.5546	.5953	1.1564
Washington Water Power Co., the	1.2543	1.3562	.6267	1.0773
Appalachian Power Co	1.8525	1.8010	.8788	1.3030
Monongahela Power Co	2.2001	1.8769	.8428	1.2788
Potomac Edison Co. of West Virginia, the	2.0510	1.8928	1.1170	1.6319
Wheeling Electric Co	1.9993	1.7745	.7626	1.0747
Consolidated Water Power Co	2.0138	1.8880	1.3381	1.4031
Lake Superior District Power Co	2.4201	2.8978	1.6321	2.2399
Madison Gas & Electric Co	1.8461	1.7563	1.2612	1.6776
Northern States Power Co	2.1654	2.8570	1.3415	1.9078
Superior Water, Light & Power Co	2.4793	2.6447	1.3872	1.7496
Wisconsin Electric Power Co	2.1596	2.3181	1.2881	1.9021
Wisconsin Michigan Power Co	2.3215	2.4752	1.3105	1.8331
Wisconsin Power & Light Co	2.3481	2.4296	1.3090	1.9825
Wisconsin Public Service Corp	2.3698	2.5042	1.3826	1.8581
Wisconsin River Power Co				
Cheyenne Light, Fuel & Power Co	2.3379	2.1383	1.1207	1.8345
U.S. Cumulative Average	2.2228	2.0812	1.0175	1.6711

PROTECTION OF THE LOWER ST. CROIX RIVER

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, it came as a surprise last April 14 that the U.S. Department of the Interior recommended to the Senate Public Lands Subcommittee that the Lower St. Croix River not be included in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Ten months earlier, in a Federal-State study team report, three agencies of that same Department had agreed that the river should become a part of the Federal system since it possessed "outstandingly remarkable scenic and aesthetic, recreational, and geologic values." Inexplicably, and unexpectedly, Interior has changed its mind.

Such inconsistency — undocumented and unsupported by new evidence—has not remained unchallenged. People back home have been disturbed and puzzled by the Interior Department's apparently illogical opposition to legislation placing the Lower St. Croix under National Park Service jurisdiction. An article in the Minneapolis Tribune of June 11, 1972, expresses the vexation of the people concerned, who find it difficult to understand why an agency of the Federal Government, which should serve their needs, chooses instead to ignore them.

As the article notes, a possible compromise is being considered which would place the area in the Federal park system, but under the administration of the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin. This is not the ideal solution, but may be the best possible one in view of Interior's reluctance to assume sole responsibility for the area. The Minneapolis Tribune article follows:

DELAY ON ST. CROIX BILL PUZZLING TO SUPPORTERS

(By Jim Kimball)

Anyone who has ever seen the lower St. Croix remembers it as a river that looks like rivers used to look. It has blue water instead of brown. Its banks are covered with newly green trees instead of apartment houses or factories. The fishing is still very good. Men in boats drift around on its placid surface, pulling in striped bass and walleyes, even an occasional sturgeon if they have the tackle for it.

Only a scattering of small river towns interrupt the forests and high bluffs along the river as it flows the 52 miles from Taylors Falls to a confluence with the muddy Mississippi at Prescott, Wis. Above Taylors Falls the river is virtually untouched, and this upper river has been included in the federal Wild and Scenic Rivers Act which will protect it from commercial exploitation and pollution.

But the lower river from Taylors Falls to the Mississippi is excluded from this protection. Jim Harrison wonders why. Harrison is executive director of the Minnesota-Wisconsin Boundary Area Commission located in Hudson, Wis. He and the commission have been fighting for passage of the Lower St. Croix River Act of 1971 (S. 1928) now being considered in the U.S. Senate. This bill would add the lower river to the national wild and scenic river system that already protects the upper St. Croix.

The bill is sponsored by Sen. Walter Mondale and Rep. Albert Quie of Minnesota and Sen. Gaylord Nelson and Rep. Vernon Thomson of Wisconsin.

"The people want it, so what's the problem?" Harrison asked, knowing better than anyone the answer to his question. "The problem" has been a rather puzzling decision by the Department of Interior to oppose passage of the bill.

(Although subject to approval by Interior Secretary Rogers Morton, a tentative compromise, reported Friday, could put part of the lower St. Croix under control of Minnesota and Wisconsin. An amendment to the bill still would be needed to make the remainder a national wild river.)

Harrison is the first to admit that the task of coordinating the river project would be immense. But he feels that this is all the more reason for federal management because only the federal government has the power to act quickly and without bias in organizing the land acquisition and easements needed on both the Wisconsin and Minnesota sides of the river.

Harrison said that with federal direction the project could be a model of true intergovernmental cooperative management. But the Department of the Interior had been the lone opposition force.

Harrison suspects that the problem is really bureaucratic rather than political. He said that the department's own favorable study was gathering dust while the negative decision was being made by the people in Washington "who have never even seen this river."

So, if Jim Harrison is right, perhaps one of the government's major environmental agencies had stumbled on its own bureaucratic tail. And instead of the government leading the people of the nation toward an enlightened environmental policy, Harrison suggested that in this case the people were more enlightened than the Department of the Interior.

THAD BEYLE AND GEORGE LATHROP LOOK AT PLANNING AND POLITICS

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Thad L. Beyle and George T. Lathrop have made a significant contribution to informed thought about the less than perfect relationship between planning and the American political system in their book, "Planning and Politics." An excerpt from the challenging introduction to their work follows:

PLANNING AND POLITICS: ON GROUNDS OF INCOMPATIBILITY?

(By Thad L. Beyle and George T. Lathrop)

Planning may well be impossible within the American governmental and political system. It has always been very difficult and there do not appear to be any major signs on the horizon which portend any changes in the situation. Not that politicians and planners don't plan. Both do, but there is a gap between what the politicians do and the planning that planners talk about when long-range, comprehensive planning is the subject.

Planning is impossible because of the very nature of our governmental system—fragmented both in structure and power. There

have been several interpretations of how our governmental systems operates: the three-tiered or layer cake model, the cooperative federalism model, the marble-cake model, the picket fence model, and the harlequin ice cream model. The underlying dynamics of each of these models are: an increasing realization that our governmental system is complex; that all levels of government—federal, state, and local—are involved to some extent in most government activities; that problems are so closely interrelated that they do severe damage to the niceties of governmental organization charts; that professionalism and self-interest have made autonomy and functional communication the key goals rather than integrated activity and system-wide communication; and that politics and politicians may be the only controls (and poor ones at that) over rampant protected and isolated bureaucracies.

Planning is impossible because there is a basic dichotomy between the political and the governmental administrative roles. The latter, represented by the various bureaucracies throughout the three levels of the federal system, actually do the things we think government does. And each of them develops individual styles, procedures, and communication patterns. Seldom does overlapping occur between these functional areas. In fact, each agency best represents its function and wants to make sure its seat at the government boarding table is kept in place if not substantially improved. Thus centralization around functional goals is sought and desired so that each "unit" in the system can call on its cohorts elsewhere for aid and protection.

Yet it is the former role, that of the political system, which actually authorizes and pays for the governmental goods and services. Styles, procedures, and communication patterns certainly vary with the levels of local, state, and federal government, as well as with chief executives, legislators, and judges. But these actors have completely different representational bases—a varying mix of people, interests, and geographic areas. And, in the nature of our political system, the trend is toward decentralization and dispersal of power toward the lowest levels of the system on a geographic base. Actors in the political system may have favorite agencies and programs which are followed closely, but the very nature of their roles forces on them a broader view or at least a need to grasp a wider range of responsibility.

Planning is impossible because our lower levels of government rarely, if ever, have sufficient funds to meet the expenditures necessary to keep them going. There is seldom enough money to make major commitments to large-scale investments for long-term results. The increasing pressure on local and state tax revenues promises no substantial change in this situation, unless the ever increasing amounts of federal grant money filtering down through the governmental system reduce this obstacle to planning. Federal grant money has been filtering down for many years, along with planning requirements, yet no one would say that the present state of our society, structures, and environment was consciously planned.

Planning is impossible because we have made sure that the political system must change, especially in the executive and the legislative branches, so that continuity in political leadership is (at best) impaired and continuing support for particular "planning" activities is uncertain. On the one hand there are the planners who want to remain free and autonomous. On the other hand there is a very uncertain marriage—uncertain since there is no assurance that the political partner will be in residence after the next election.

Planning is impossible because we have thrust the planner into the untenable middle. We have asked him to straddle the fence between the administrator and the decision-maker politician, telling him that he must be concerned with comprehensiveness and the long view, but that, at the same time, he must be responsive to the decisionmaker and, in fact, must concern himself with shorter range policy issues and decisions which are the bread and butter of the elected official. These issues may be, and frequently are, the major source and manifestation of his official power, which he guards zealously.

A PLANNER'S AUTHORITY BASE

Where does the planner fit in our governmental structure? Theoretically he is there to intervene, to do something that is not being done through the behavior of other actors and forces. Where does he get the authority to intervene? And, again theoretically if he legitimately has and uses this authority, his answers should prevail! Why don't they? Rein describes the planner's source of authority in a four-part taxonomy: expertise, bureaucratic position, consumer preference, and professional values. "Expertise" means that the planner and his solutions succeed on the strength of their merit. When stated so boldly the notion may appear naive, but this same attitude pervades in other professions. Who questions the medical doctor? And if he is questioned, it is generally to another medical doctor (a more "expert" expert!) that the questioner turns!

The planner's bureaucratic position gives him some of the authority of those who direct the bureaucracy and who are, in turn, either politicians or politically responsive appointees. The assumption in this concept of role and authority is that the planner becomes a staff agent to whom attention is paid because he is doing a job that is directly connected with a decision-maker politician who has a need for the planning services he can provide. The crux of this sort of assumption and hypothesis probably lies in the political reform movement which advocated the separation of politics and administration, and it is subject to all the flaws of that movement.

An increasing number of planners respond to the call of the consumer. For example, many transportation planners have planned and urged the construction of more and more elaborate highway and expressway systems. While there have been many vocal objectors, transportation planners have pointed out the market behavior of consumers who are buying more and more automobiles and driving them farther and farther each year. Still others have attempted to rely on public opinion polls, public hearings, and the voices of pressure groups, both the well-financed and recognized ones and those whose voices have been heard rarely in the past, to legitimize their solutions. They claim to be responsive to the public interest in one way or another, and the debate over the means of determining the public interest, even when accepted as a legitimate clientele for planning, has become nearly fratricidal.

Finally, the planning profession has its own set of values for many issues and it proposes policies and plans which arise from them, from the professional consideration of what is "right". While this orientation is obviously that of the middle-class, because of the background of most planners, the profession's self-consciousness has urged it to have sympathy, if not empathy, with a wide range of social and economic groups in urban society.

But a taxonomy of the sources of authority and legitimacy for the planner remains an effort to analyze the more fundamental question of how planners and their efforts relate governmental policies and programs to a relatively long-range and rational objective set. For decades an overriding concern of planners has been their allegiance to the "public interest," and it has been the widening of that "interest" and the planners' perception of where it lies, what it is, and how their own values affect their concepts of the "public interest", that has brought them to the broad concerns of the present.

Despite these broadened interests and concerns, and despite the various theories describing his roles and relationships, the fact remains that if the planner is planning, and not administering or advocating, he must, in the end, communicate effectively with the individuals who make the final allocative decision-politicians in either the legislative or executive branches. In this effort to communicate and, more importantly, to sell, convince, or persuade the politician, it is true that the context is of over-riding importance, regardless of the logic of the academic discussion of the planners' source of legitimacy or authority.

THE ROLE OF REFORM

What of the context? Are there signs pointing to trends in activities and relationships which may aid the planner in his search for his place in the system?

The argument is made that our governmental and political systems have been going through several waves of reform, each guided by a certain value orientation. They are the values of representation, neutral competence, and executive leadership. Each arises from the concept of responsibility and the question of who ultimately should be responsible for the activities of government.

For many years in our early history the trend was to invest ultimate responsibility in the legislative branch under the guise of broad representation for the people. Basically a reaction to the abuse of the imposed colonial governors, this soon gave way, however, to a drive to make our administrative branches of government freer of "political" domination by making them neutral in their administering activities. Civil service and merit systems began to replace the "to the victors belong the spoils" system. The goal was to replace "who you know" with "what you know."

The purpose of many of these changes was to place some governmental functions and agencies outside "normal" politics. The net effect was to further dilute executive control over personnel and certain parts of the governmental structure, while developing a new type of politics around these personnel systems and the newly established "independent" agencies. The heritage of such "neutral competence" today lies in agencies free of executive restraint, and in lock-step personnel systems which often seem unable to be moved with the needs of the day.

The third movement, toward the assertion of executive leadership, has been growing in importance in the twentieth century at all levels of our federal system. It is apparent in the increasing power of the executive in the budgetary area; in reorganization along functional lines of antiquated governmental structures resulting in stronger ties with the chief executive; increasing the tenure potential and administrative power of our governors and mayors (although some may argue that the former are becoming more powerful in their domain than are the latter in theirs); and in the increasing political power each chief executive has within his own geographical domain. The important facts

here are that neutral competence is administrative in character while the other two are political—again the dichotomy—and that the conflict is much broader than the fight between trends in a developmental sequence. It is the basic conflict over who is ultimately responsible for governmental activities in our system-politicians or bureaucrats?

With this in mind, we should also note a very real change in the role of the chief executive in our lower levels of government. The political and governmental roles have broadened from that of mayor, county executive, governor (with the textbook roles of chief administrator, chief legislator, chief party officer, etc.), to that of chief federal systems officers within the geographical territory they represent. They command (or try to command) not only the resources available at their particular level of government, but also have much to say about how the resources of the other levels of government are used within their domain.

In fact, this role may be the most significant one in our system today. It is grinding, with day-in, day-out responsibility and cannot be compartmentalized into the neat categories of bygone textbook descriptions. It is a bit of all roles, but more; and it is a major source of power for our chief executive—just as it is the source of some of his major constraints. This role is the key to effective governmental action as we move into the 1970's for there is the promise of more funds filtering down through the system and more areas with which government will be concerned. (Concern in government style means money and program and not necessarily a plan of attack.)

Reform is needed, as always, and the planner and the planning function may be in the forefront of reform. For planning must be moved out of its good-government economy and efficiency mold. Planning must be perceived as a political weapon, to be placed at the disposal of the politicians. The greatest reforms needed today are those that focus power where it should be rather than dissipate it. In a few words, let the mayors and governors govern. The check and balance for unwise use of power is to combat power with power rather than to fragment power, which makes many of our proposed solutions to problems ineffectual.

The focusing of executive power is ameliorated by the concomitant increase of the representative function, be it in the legislature, the city council, the courts, or the community action boards. Again, in a few words, let the people who are served be represented. Representation has been increasingly placed within the bureaucracies, as they have been able to withstand vicissitudes of political change, and they have been able to ensure the most adequate representation of their particular function or interest (which may or may not have anything to do with those being served). The solution should be found in politics.

WHITHER PLANNING?

Currently, planning is too often the captive of the bureaucracy, with its reports and data reflecting biases of past decisions and protection for the agency and the program in the future. In a sense, planning is one of the most conservative influences on government decision-making. The key to the rise of planning in the governmental and political firmament lies in its becoming politicized as a function and in the planners becoming more political. By political, we mean that planning must shake off the shackles of the past and of specialized professionalism, and become, as it should, continually critical, brooding, and involved.

But by what means can the planners achieve this? Certainly the history of such changes in direction and reforms is not one to make us comfortable with the results. Each time the reformers develop a new technique to gain control over the governmental world, it seems to be subverted and turned against the goals of reform. To look for a viable plan for reform is to look to the real world of government and politics. We have posited the newly developing role of our state and local government executives as the chief federal systems officers within their domains. Planners should aspire to be advisors to these chief executives—the mayors and the governors. For it is here that key decisions are made and actions are taken and where the best of advice is needed. Probably the crux of the situation is whether we want decisions made with conscious planning or whether we want decisions made on an ad hoc basis with no conscious overall plan or set of priorities. Many of our current problems and dilemmas flow from the latter approach to handling crises (on the volunteer fire department model). The answer, then, is obvious.

Several trends which are converging suggest the direction to be taken. First, the call for planning at the lower levels of our system is immense. One official estimated that "there the more than thirty planning assistance programs being administered by eighteen (federal) executive branch organizational units. There are nine separate (federal) programs which assist the comprehensive planning of social services, and five separate planning programs directed to urban development." In a study of planning grants, at the state level, it was estimated that "Nearly 100 grant-in-aid programs relate to state planning or have requirements for a 'state plan'." While the caliber of these plans is not necessarily high, as noted earlier, their presence demands that certain procedures, products, and processes be undertaken—under the rubric of planning. Therefore, demand for people called planners is high.

Second, as some of the selections in this volume indicate, the chief executives in our state and local governments are pulling the planners closer to them structurally and are working closely with the chief planner. Planning there will be, but who will be the planners—professionals trained in the art of political appointee of unknown quality?

Third, an entirely new form of patronage in our political system has been developing over the past few decades. Instead of jobs being rewarded to the faithful, we now find that grants, projects, and programs are the reward. Some jobs are still available and attractive, but much more attractive is a major facility, or service, or program which will help a community, be it town, county, multi-county, state, or multi-state. Thus, the old style of patronage has declined in its relative importance to governing, and the provision of goods and services, government style, has become the trading card. It is the planners and the chief executives who develop and pass on the mode of dispensing these rewards. For these new rewards are keyed to a plan and something called a planning process. It is not surprising that a new role has been added in the mayors' and governors' offices—that of the grantsman—the person who makes sure that all monies and programs possible are brought into the particular unit of government. And it is the person who fills this role who attempts to match need with program. It is this grantsman who, because of the rewards he can promise, negotiates with recalcitrant legislators and councilmen on the executive program.

Since plans or a planning process are called for by statute and guideline, does this mean that it is the planner who becomes the new political grantsman? Or is his role more as the advisor who sets the process in motion and provides the broader planning inputs which allow that what, where, and when of this patronage to be made on other than crass "votes delivered" criteria?

The roles seem self-evident and, in the continuing process of self-definition, the challenge is to the planner, for the executive needs the aid and will turn elsewhere for staff if those called planners do not produce. Planning there must and will be, and it will be a politicized planning responsive to its client and stripped of many of the liabilities of bureaucratization. The client may well be the mayor or governor. But it may well be the responsiveness to an empathy with the client is what advocate planning is all about! Could the various planners and the political scientists be saying the same thing???

GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD material concerning the plight of Foreign Service employees at the Department of State who, for a number of years, have been trying to obtain some degree of due process in their grievance procedures. Recent developments, coupled with proposed legislation now before Congress indicate that perhaps corrective action will soon be forthcoming. In 1968 I proposed legislation which would establish an independent body, outside the jurisdiction of the State Department, which would make the final judgment on grievances of Foreign Service employees. Other legislation proposes a panel in which a member of an employee group with exclusive representation rights would serve as a panel member. Under EO 11636 such an organization is authorized and as yet has not been selected.

The American Foreign Service Association, with its 7,000 members, is one organization which is seeking exclusive representation rights under the Executive order. If chosen, the importance of AFSA's role in serving as the voice of the Foreign Service community cannot be overemphasized when one reviews the high-handed treatment accorded Foreign employees in the past.

One member of AFSA who was drummed out of the Foreign Service and who after a long battle finally succeeded in obtaining a grievance hearing, still in progress, is John D. Hemenway. Because of his long and bitter experience with the State Department hierarchy his interest in fair and equitable grievance procedures is active and compelling. On June 29 of this year he addressed a letter to the Chairman of the Board of Directors of AFSA concerning certain aspects

of that organization's procedures. Mr. Hemenway's letter follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 29, 1972.

AMERICAN FOREIGN SERVICE ASSOCIATION,
Chairman, Board of Directors,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The purpose of this letter is to give you due notice concerning voting procedures when the general membership votes on proposed constitutional amendments raised at the general business meeting yesterday, 28 June, 1972. As an AFSA member I shall insist that this vote is conducted properly with all recognized safeguards. Such safeguards were singularly lacking during the December voting which elected you and the present Board.

This letter does not, in itself, constitute my statement of opposition specifically authorized by Article XI, paragraph 3 of the present Constitution, or, if you prefer, "By-laws."

The coming vote will be especially important because one of the proposed amendments to the Constitution changes the manner of amending the Constitution. If accepted, this change will give you and the Board new powers to act without any check from the general membership. Further, under the amendments you propose, no longer will our membership in the field have the right to be informed of what you are doing in their name unless you so wish to inform them. While the Board is given a free hand by these changes, opposition to the Board is made much more difficult.

On 28 June, only 34 persons stayed to the end of the business meeting. You had arranged to read reports for the first hour—time which might better have been spent in explaining the impact of the proposed Constitutional amendments. Not everyone could stay for 2¼ hours in the middle of the day, without lunch; therefore, by the time the critical votes were taken, I must report that only 34 persons, not all of whom were active members, remained to vote. We have no way of knowing who the 34 persons were in attendance at the end of the meeting during the voting, because membership qualifications were not examined. (A member of the legal committee suggested care in taking and registering the vote, but this advice was ignored.)

The fact that only 34 persons remained 2¼ hours through the most important votes of the annual business meeting of an organization claiming a membership of over 7,000 says something about your claims that the membership supports turning AFSA into a "union". Rather, it demonstrates, I think, apathy. That a vocal clique should be given mandatory and exclusive rights to represent all employees in the Department of State as if they were a genuinely free and democratic trade union truly representing the interests of the employees frightens me. Even if all of those voting for the Constitutional amendments among the 34 present were legitimate active members, this would still represent far fewer than ½ of 1% of the total membership.

You challenged the credentials of only one person of the 34 remaining to the very end of the meeting. That person counter-claimed (amidst loud laughter) that he had been a member longer than you. You never did receive any information concerning his membership status. Like me, that man challenged the wisdom of your constitutional amendments and I believe that is the reason you challenged him. Another person present volunteered that she was not qualified to vote (and she did not, I think.) Personally I recognized a number of persons among the 34 present who can be said to belong to top State Department management. Their participation in a general business meeting cannot be said to be illegal, but it is significant, I think, when attendance is so small and the major constitutional issue is to facilitate the conversion of AFSA into a "front" for a management-oriented group under EO 11636. For example, Assistant Secretary Martin Herz was present. He was Chairman of the election committee during the election campaign that elected you. Among the 34 persons who stayed to the end must also be counted the non-member parliamentarian, the Board member who attended, AFSA officers, like the manager, as well as the number of senior retirees like Amb. Riddleberger. The June Foreign Service Journal explained that one of the purposes of the amendments is to "regularize" payment of salaries. Mr. F. Allen Harris, already on the payroll in a non-authorized (under the Constitution) position of paid "Counsellor" was of course on hand to watch over the "regularization" of his salary.

Under such circumstances, I was not prepared to rule out the possibility that the 34 persons present to the end might not be representative of the entire 7,000 membership. It is, at least, a consideration that must be kept in mind.

The present Constitution very wisely requires that the entire membership be alerted to all of the issues before a vote changing the Constitution is permitted. When the question of a quorum arose, the parliamentarian said that as few as two (2) would constitute a quorum; the question was therefore moot. You will recall that the 28 June meeting took note of the requirement under the Constitution that I be given the opportunity to present the case against these Constitutional amendments to the general membership. I would appreciate being informed, therefore, on a timely basis of your plans to submit the question to the general membership for a vote—having all recognized safeguards—so that I can submit my material to you for distribution to the membership.

No stenographic record was made of the procedures at the 28 June business meeting. Since I have a complete record of what was said at the meeting, if you are vague on any details, I would be pleased to provide you with any information you may find helpful in fulfilling your duties to the full membership under the Constitution.

In that regard, I think you should consult with members of the Board concerning another special problem that seems certain to come up. I raise it only because it strikes me as particularly difficult and I do not see a ready solution, if the constitutional amendments you proposed are passed. It concerns the rather special status of members of AFSA who also are employees of CIA, DIA, NSA and related agencies. At the general meeting you will recall that I had suggested that some of the proposed constitutional language was unnecessarily vague. In my own opinion it was no improvement over the original Constitution for which it was a substitute. My suggestion had been that we specify the agencies AFSA specifically proposes to encompass, i.e., AID, USIA, the Department of State, and perhaps others like ACDA. My view was defeated by a very few votes—fewer than 25 voted on that issue (out of our membership of 7,000!) Whatever the merits of that issue, we are left with the problem of what to do with the votes of large numbers of CIA officers (and others) sprinkled about in the Foreign Service, many of whom are members of AFSA, when the issue of EO 11636 comes up and, in fact, is actively being prepared for by these Constitutional amendments.

We are, of course, proud to claim these people as AFSA members. Additionally, EO 11636 is not a matter we must face immediately—perhaps for another 90–120 days. As I understand the legal implications of elections under EO 11636, however, these persons are not permitted to vote in selecting a labor union in a Department of the Government in which they are not actually employed. It disturbs me, therefore, to hear rumors of "secret agreements" between AFSA and management officials at the Department of State concerning the voting rights of such AFSA members. Surely such "deals" are far too primitive to pass even flimsy legal standards. I hope you can write me to confirm that no such arrangements have been made or are planned officially or unofficially by any authorized person. If you can not, how will you hope to conduct an election in which we have "recognized safeguards", to use the language of EO 11636?

We did not have the benefit of advice from our regular attorneys, Covington and Burling, at the annual meeting. You informed those present that you did not want AFSA to expend the money necessary to cover the attendance fee Covington and Burling would charge for appearing at the annual business meeting. I could not understand that remark, since money appears available for Mr. Harris who did not, however, offer any advice in this matter. I also do not understand the propriety of Mr. Harris, a lawyer, and now "Counsellor" of AFSA, sitting on the Board in judgment of his own advice. I worry less about AFSA being its own lawyer and frankly a good deal more about the 7000 clients who are played for fools.

I am not an attorney, so I can only apply common sense to some of the pseudo-legal activities I witness in AFSA. Further, I cannot judge how difficult these legal matters are to surmount. It seemed prudent to call your attention to this matter in this letter and I now have done so.

Regarding the upcoming vote on the Constitutional issues, I will expect to hear from you within a few days. I hope you will make suggestions to facilitate the requirements of Article XI, paragraph three of the present By-Laws (Constitution) which are fair so that I feel that I can agree to them. That provision, as you know, was written so that the Washington-based members of AFSA can sound the signals of alarm to the field by providing all of the membership with informational handouts on proposed constitutional changes. It certainly is serving that purpose in this case; I hope not for the last time.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN D. HEMENWAY.

COMMENCEMENT REMARKS BY PAUL GOUVEIA AT MAUI HIGH SCHOOL ON JULY 6, 1972

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the remarks by Paul Gouveia, valedictorian of the class of 1972 at Maui High School in Hawaii, at the recent commencement exercises of the class.

Mr. Gouveia, an exemplary student, showed great insight and judgment as he spoke to his classmates, their parents, and others present at this occasion. Because of the merit of his talk, I have

asked that it be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues and others who receive this publication.

His speech expressed the belief that what we make of ourselves is important, but so is what we make of society:

We must accept (life) for what it is if we have no plausible solutions.

This young man plans to attend the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, majoring in mathematics and computer science and research for new products. While at Maui High School, he was president of the National Honor Society and received the Principal's Award, Outstanding Science Student Award, and Reader's Digest Award. He is chairman of the Maui Youth Council and on the traffic division. In addition, he is an Eagle Scout and with the medical explorers.

Paul is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Alfred Gouveia of Paia on the island of Maui. His father is employed by the Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Co. as a crew chief. His mother is proprietor of Economy Store. Both parents have every right to be proud of the accomplishments of their youngest son and to be confident that he will continue his achievement and success in his future endeavors.

Because of Paul's concern about others and his involvement in community betterment, I share the happiness of his many friends and acquaintances in wishing him well. As a former graduate of Maui High School, I know that he represents an outstanding group of students and faculty.

The speech follows:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY PAUL GOUVEIA

Good evening. In opening my address tonight, I would like to say that being named valedictorian is certainly an honor in that what I say should be representative of the entire graduating class. Over the past four years at Maui High, it was these seniors who created the greatest impressions in my inner self. Therefore, I think it improper to speak in terms of "I", but instead of "us."

Graduation is a turning point in all of our lives. In some ways it comes much too rapidly, we realize we can no longer continue our friendships as we've known them in the past. But in addition, many of us have expressed our concern in something far more important in the long run. We are contemplating the question of survival—survival in the sense of making it in the outside world. We often ask ourselves. "Where do we fit in?" and "How and when do we discover our true identities?"

Many students will be entering the armed forces because they are yet undecided as to what to make of their lives. Granted, the armed forces does offer careers, but these people will be expected to support the effort our country places on Viet Nam. We find it difficult to believe the philosophy of wars for peace. Troops are being withdrawn and cutbacks made, but then, when will the line be drawn?

Another sector of our class has decided to seek employment, to become a part of our labor force. But then, jobs are now a scarcity and it seems the unemployment rate keeps growing. These students will be working at jobs with no real future because they have no choice. Our parents had more to look forward to, especially if they were high school graduates. Times have changed.

Others will seek higher education on Maui, the outer islands and on the Mainland. I have chosen to attend a university in the Midwest where the student body averages 78,000. In some ways I fear the shock I will experience during the first few weeks, but then I realize this is something my fellow classmates will also encounter—the transition to a higher institution of learning. We are faced with the burden of success because our parents supply the funds for our education. We accept the responsibility and realize that we must do well. But, what happens after completion there? We must also experience the endless searching for employment that our other friends have.

It appears from what I have said that we are caught in a dilemma, and I would hate to end on such a solemn note. But this is life, and we must accept it for what it is if we have no plausible solutions. We hope that you will come to understand our concern toward the years ahead.

We have learned through our sociology classes that ours is a society based on competition. This idea does furnish the results, but cooperation is another factor that must be stressed to a greater degree. Whatever the case may be, when we become the working parts of society, we will make it what we see fit. And remember fellow classmates, what we make of ourselves is important, but so is what we make of society.

At this time we would like to express our thanks to the following people before we leave—the honorable Mayor Elmer F. Cravalho to whom we have been fortunate to have as a speaker this evening—he is a former graduate of Maui High School and we know that he supports youth and youth-oriented activities, next to the staff for encouraging and guiding the development of our minds in preparation for our future years, and finally to our parents who have tolerated our somewhat strange changes in behavior toward becoming adults. We admire all of you for being with us in heart and soul, and to you we extend our deepest thanks and farewell.

RETIREMENT OF GEN. WILLIAM C. WESTMORELAND

HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of the Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, Gen. William Childs Westmoreland, marks the departure from active military duty of a man who has contributed far more to this great country than was ever called for in the mere performance of duty. General Westmoreland's name has become a household word across our Nation today because his contribution is significant with the highest ideals of any patriot America has ever produced.

Although most of us are familiar with his record of service, some of the highlights of a long, distinguished career read as follows:

William C. Westmoreland was commissioned as a second lieutenant in the Field Artillery upon graduation from the U.S. Military Academy on June 12, 1936. His brilliant career has led him through the World War II campaigns in north Africa, Sicily, France, Belgium, and into Germany. After World War II, General Westmoreland entered upon a series of assignments that took him to Fort Benning, Ga.—where he earned the Parachutist and Glider Badges—and, to the Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.

When the fighting in Korea erupted, General Westmoreland assumed command of an airborne regimental combat team, and was promoted to brigadier general at the amazingly young age of 38.

When William Westmoreland was awarded his second star, in December, 1956, he became the youngest major general in the Army at that time.

It was certainly a good development for western Kentucky when General Westmoreland assumed command of the 101st Airborne Division—the famed "Screaming Eagles"—at Fort Campbell, Ky., on April 2, 1958.

We, in Kentucky, try to make the military assigned to duty in Kentucky feel like they both belong and are wanted; the citizens around Fort Campbell and the division commander, General Westmoreland, shared of their time and efforts in making base and community relations a high level of understanding and respect. Additionally, such relations were constantly reviewed to insure that the men and women of Fort Campbell might know that they did, indeed, "belong in Kentucky."

The people of Kentucky, especially those around Fort Campbell—my own district, Mr. Speaker—feel a very special sort of pride that William C. Westmoreland went on to assume command of the U.S. Military Assistance Command in Vietnam, and that he later became Chief of Staff of the Army in 1968. General Westmoreland never forgot Fort Campbell and its environs. We are proud that he still comes back from time to time to visit long-time friends in our area, and we trust such visits will continue and, hopefully, for more leisurely periods from this point on.

William Childs Westmoreland served his country as he best knew how—as a fighting man—and he never let the changing currents of politics or the attacks of a brutal enemy deter him from the performance of what he saw as the soldier's first and foremost duty—to carry out the will of the American people as expressed through the orders of the Commander in Chief. He has put love of country and respect for the flag ahead of personal comfort or the pursuit of what might have been a more lucrative career in business or commerce. He chose to serve his Nation in times of both peace and war, and the American people are richer for having had him in command when the going was at its hardest.

Kentucky—indeed, all America—wishes you well in retirement, General Westmoreland, and we salute you as a true patriot at a time when patriotism has never been more needed.

SALUTE TO EDUCATION

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1972

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, a famous British author spent many years attempting to compile a complete "Outline of History." When he finally completed his work in 1920, the author, H. G. Wells, considered all he read and learned in his vast study of the history of the world, and included in his "Outline" this observation:

Human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe.

Never has that statement been more true than in 1972 when mankind has the power to destroy the world or to improve it, whether that destruction or improvement be through the awesome power of nuclear energy, the use or misuse of our natural resources, or through negelect in guarding the basic rights of all human beings.

It is with this in mind that I take this opportunity to pay tribute to our Nation's educational system and to the teachers of America whose responsibilities are as important as those of any other vocation in our society. As the student population has grown to 48 million, teachers have met the new and growing challenges of the classroom with skill and dedication that deserve the admiration and gratitude of all Americans. The future of the Nation is truly in their hands.