UDALL, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. WINN, Mr. WYMAN, Mr. YATRON, Mr. VANIK, Mr. WAGGONNER, Mr. YATES, and Mr. ZABLOCKI):

H. Con. Res. 671. Concurrent resolution to collect overdue debts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISH:

H. J. Res. 1269. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim a "Vietnam Veterans Day," after the United States has concluded its participation in hostilities in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. J. Res. 1270. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim September 8 of each year as "National Cancer Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.J. Res. 1271. Joint resolution providing for annual health examinations for Members of Congress and publication of the results thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

H.J. Res. 1272. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide an age limit for Senators and Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROTZMAN (for himself, Mr. BELL, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. CONOVER, Mr. CURLIN, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. RIEGLE, and Mr. WOLFF):

H. Res. 1075. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on the Environment; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. Res. 1076. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13916) to impose a moratorium on new and additional student transportation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H. Res. 1077. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that the U.S. Government should seek the agreement of other governments to a proposed treaty prohibiting the use of any environmental or geophysical modification activity as a weapon of war, or the carrying out of any research or experimentation with respect thereto; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCLOSKEY:

H. Res. 1078. Resolution directing the Secretary of Defense to furnish to the House certain information respecting U.S. operations in North Vietnam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. Res. 1079. Resolution directing the Secretary of Defense to furnish to the House certain information respecting U.S. operations in North Vietnam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Res. 1080. Resolution to create a Select Committee on Aging; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 16177. A bill for the relief of Evangelia Maniedake; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 16178. A bill for the relief of Edna Eda Aluag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO (by request):

H.R. 16179. A bill for the relief of certain former employees of the Securities and Exchange Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H. Con. Res. 672. Concurrent resolution commemorating the 200th anniversary of Dickinson College; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

264. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Stanley Gaines, et al., Dallas, Tex., relative to a report of the Office of Economic Opportunity on the Dallas County Community Action Committee, Inc.; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

265. Also, petition of the Board of Supervisors, Tuolumne County, Calif., relative to the service of Congressman HAROLD T. "BIZZ" JOHNSON; to the Committee on House Administration.

266. Also, petition of Ralph Boryszewski, Rochester, N.Y., relative to Federal grand juries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

267. Also, petition of S. J. Oppong, Accra, Ghana, relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NEW ENGLAND ECONOMY

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the following is part II of a four-part series done by the Associated Press on the problems of the New England economy.

This segment deals with New England's declining industries. Among these are the leather, textile, and fishing industries.

Yet, these industries remain vitally important to the region's economy, employing thousands of workers. Special attention must be paid to the particular problems confronting New England's oldest industries.

I commend the following article to the attention of my fellow Members:

[From the Salem (Mass.) Evening News, July 25, 1972]

DECLINING INDUSTRIES SYMBOLIZE AREA'S MANUFACTURING PROBLEMS

(By Daniel Q. Haney)

BOSTON.—In the eyes of the businessman, New England's economy is shadowed by creaking old leather and textile mills whose layoffs eat up new jobs created by bright, expanding industries.

Although textiles and leather are not the region's only declining industries, they symbolize the problems of manufacturing in New England.

Since 1940, manufacturing in New England has been virtually stagnant, while nationally it has grown about 70 per cent. There were 1.3 million New England manufacturing workers in 1940, and now there are 1.4 million.

During that time, according to the Federal Reserve Bank, employment growth in New England has been maintained by the service industries—the insurance companies, universities, hospitals, consulting firms and other businesses that export assistance and knowledge, not gadgets.

Over the past decade, the number of New England jobs in leather and textiles has slid from 228,600 to 165,500. Plant closings are not uncommon; a Webster, Mass., shoe plant employing 300 will close in six weeks.

For much of the heavy industry that once thrived here, New England's location now makes it unappealing.

"The problem," according to Frederick Glantz, a Federal Reserve Bank economist, "is that New England is stuck way the hell up in the northeastern corner of the country, while the nation's center of population is moving westward." When the population was concentrated along the East Coast, shipping costs were minimal. Now, moving bulky, heavy merchandise to far-away customers makes up a big part of the item's final price.

New England has few natural resources, and it costs to bring raw materials in. High fuel prices, another product of the location, make it expensive to keep a plant running. And, compared to the South and foreign countries, labor costs here are high.

The evolution of New England's economy, spurred by the growing locational worries, has been interrupted twice over the past 40 years by military spending.

As the leather and textile industries began to weaken following the depression in the 1930s, World War II produced a demand for their products and halted the slip.

When that effect wore off in the 1950s, many textile mills moved to other areas or folded, and the leather industry—mainly shoes—began to feel the bite of foreign competition.

Again, the military stepped in and provided a new industry, the high technology firms that settled mostly in the two most populous states, Massachusetts and Connecticut.

Their primary customer was the government—Sophisticated weapons for the Pentagon and space ships for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

However, with a federal economy drive, a general economic downturn and shifting government values, defense and space spending have slowed, and New England and its high technology industries have suffered.

Other industries are also having their problems, among them fishing and farming.

A decade ago 21 companies lined Boston fish pier to process 115 million pounds of fish a year; now there are 14 companies which handle about 32 million pounds of fish a year. Heavy rains in Massachusetts and Connecticut this year have left dairy and tobacco farmers expecting their worst year in a long while.

Besides its location and reliance on defense spending, New England faces the problem of having a mature economy.

In a mature economy, says James Howell, chief economist at the First National Bank of Boston, "there is no inherent growth momentum. Economic vitality can be maintained only by carefully nurturing the industrial base."

Instead of that, some businessmen complain of a hostile business climate in New England.

"The result of our government process in this state," complains Richard D. Hill, president of the First National Bank of Boston, "has been to deeply divide the two essential partners, the owners and managers of capital

and those who possess the skills to do the work.

"Unless we are prepared to junk our private enterprise system for some as yet undiscovered superior system," Hill says, "it is clearly counterproductive to drive a wedge through the heart of the industrial partnership. Profits are not the antithesis of labor well-being."

Albert J. Kelley, dean of Boston College's School of Management, says complaints about the business climate amount to "a matter of confidence."

"Some businessmen feel that the high cost of doing business, such as new pollution control laws and rising taxes, are squeezing them pretty hard," Kelley said in an interview.

"They are uncertain about their future here. They say, "We don't know how hard we're going to be socked by increased costs of doing business."

"On top of this," Kelley said, "are thrown increases in welfare."

In Massachusetts, nearly half of the state's $2.2 billion budget goes toward welfare. In Connecticut welfare takes 28 per cent of the budget and in the northern New England states about 15 per cent.

AMERICAN SYSTEM OF COMMERCIAL BROADCASTING

HON. J. GLENN BEALL, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, increasingly the American system of commercial broadcasting is becoming a focal point for a controversy which, I am sure, will have far-reaching consequences on the field of communications in our Nation. I refer to the growing discussion surrounding the issue of counteradvertising, which raises the question as to whether broadcasters should be compelled to provide a free forum for attacks on broadcast advertising.

One of those best able to discuss the broadcaster's view on this matter is Dr. Frank Stanton, vice chairman of the Columbia Broadcasting Systems, Inc. Recently, Dr. Stanton addressed the general conference of CBS television network affiliates with respect to the issues raised by "counter-advertising."

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Stanton's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF FRANK STANTON

As we meet here today in this marvelous world of make-believe against the backdrop of the real world's threatening geopolitical problems, I suggest, if we can, that we set aside those momentous considerations and focus for the moment on an issue which goes to the very heart of the American system of commercial broadcasting. The subject is one that is fast becoming a political controversy of the first order. And as the debate intensifies, it is clear that what is at stake is the viability of broadcasting and hence our capacity to serve the public.

The issue is "counter advertising" and the central question is this: Should broadcasters be compelled to provide a free platform for attacks on broadcast advertising?

A peculiar coalition of the "New Populist" movement on the one hand and high-placed Washington officials on the other is becoming increasingly vocal in the affirmative. That any of these strange bedfellows comprehend the mischief they are concocting is uncertain. But as we all know, ignorance of the facts has frequently triggered bureaucratic decisions whose results have been far more damaging to society than the conditions they were supposed to remedy.

I would like to address the ramifications of the counter advertising dilemma quite specifically, and particularly the implications for the public in misguided Federal actions.

Under the Federal Communications Commission's Fairness Doctrine, broadcasters who present coverage of significant controversial issues are required to seek out and present contrasting viewpoints. Until five years ago it had never been supposed that Fairness Doctrine obligations would be called into play by the presentation of ordinary product advertisements.

In 1967, however, the FCC held that the advertisements for a single product—cigarettes—presented a unique case because the Congress of the United States had specifically found the normal use of cigarettes to be hazardous. The Commission ordered licensees to make free announcement time available for messages that cigarette smoking was dangerous to health. The FCC, when its order was appealed to the courts, stated its belief that "instances of the extension of the ruling to other products would be 'rare,' if indeed they ever occurred." The U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in turn emphasized that its "cautious approval of this particular decision does not license the Commission to scan the air waves for offensive material with no more discriminating a lens than the 'public interest' or even 'the public health.'"

Less than two years later, the same Court held that a station which continued to carry ordinary department store advertisements while a union-promoted boycott of the store was in progress, was implicitly expressing a viewpoint against the boycott.

And hence, said the Court, it was a controversial issue, as to which the opposing viewpoint should have been presented. Again, in the fall of 1971, the same Court held that commercials for high-powered cars and leaded gasoline implicitly expressed a viewpoint which, in the light of the supposed polluting effects of these products, put them in the same category as ads urging the purchase of cigarettes.

In both cases the court overruled the Federal Communications Commission, which sought to confine counter advertising to the one product it viewed as unique—cigarettes. It was in the climate that the FCC initiated a wide-ranging inquiry into all aspects of the Fairness Doctrine, including the appropriate treatment, under the Fairness Doctrine, of commercial advertisements.

This was the situation into which the Federal Trade Commission stepped, on January 6 of this year; when it filed with the FCC a statement in behalf of counter advertising to do things the FTC's own regulatory tools, it said, could not do. The FTC's petition stated that counter advertising would be appropriate to deal with ads that explicitly raised a controversial issue; ads that stress broad themes implicitly raising such issues; ads making claims based on disputed scientific information; and ads that are silent about negative aspects of the advertised product.

Having thus described the four categories, the FTC conceded that the last of them was all inclusive: "This list of examples could go on indefinitely," the FTC noted, "for the existence of undisclosed negative aspects or trade-offs of one sort or another, is inherent in all commercial products and, thus, in all advertising."

The concrete examples set forth by the FTC give a clear idea of the range of counter advertisements that it contemplates: "For example, in response to advertising for small automobiles, emphasizing the factor of low cost and economy, the public could be informed of the views of some people that such cars are considerably less safe than larger cars. On the other hand, ads for big cars, emphasizing the factors of safety and comfort, could be answered by counter ads concerning the greater pollution arguably generated by such cars. In response to advertising for some foods, emphasizing various nutritional values and benefits, the public might be informed of the views of some people that consumption of some other food may be a superior source of the same nutritional values and benefits. In response to advertising for whole life insurance, emphasizing the factor of being a sound 'investment,' the public could be informed of the views of some people that whole life insurance is an unwise expenditure. In response to advertising for some drug products, emphasizing efficacy in curing various ailments, the public could be informed of the views of some people that competing drug products with equivalent efficacy are available in the market at substantially lower prices."

The debate, clearly, could be endless. But would such debate between advertisers and counter advertisers serve the public interest?

No one who listens to radio or views television news and public affairs broadcasts is unaware of the vigorous discussion which is taking place as to the impact of various advertised products upon the environment and upon the public health and well being. It is because the debate is taking place there that the public has become concerned about such issues. But the question deserves to be asked whether the FTC's sweeping proposal would result in debate that was more meaningful and informative.

Turning to the basics of marketing, paid advertising is usually brief, it is costly and its purpose is to sell products or services. In the normal 30- or 60-second announcement the advertiser cannot effectively present both the competitive virtues of his product and a defense against any later objections to its social desirability that may be raised. Further, what an advertiser can say about the merits of his product is not given the full protection of the First Amendment but, rather, is limited by the vigorous truth-telling standards of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

The individuals and groups who would counter advertise would engage in these debates without any such restrictions. They need not pay for their time; they have no selling obligations; and they would not be restricted by the FTC in what they could say. The result would not be a debate, but what Dr. Clay T. Whitehead, Director of the Office of Telecommunications Policy, has called "a verbal stoning in the public square." Most of the organizations and groups which would counter advertise would not be financially responsible for the damage they might cause to the advertiser's enterprise and to his employees should their charges be false or irresponsible. Nor is it likely that the First Amendment would be held by the courts to permit the imposition of liability on them even if they were financially responsible.

Harmful as this unequal debate would be to advertisers generally, its detriment would be even greater to advertisers of new products and services. It would be especially harmful to products and services that promise some degree of environmental improvement. New products and services always provoke scepticism and for this reason advertising plays a critical role in efforts to obtain public acceptance. But claims of environmental improvement (which so often, in the nature of things, is improvement step by step in successive increments) could, like a lightning rod, attract the fierce attacks of impatient counter advertisers, dissatisfied with the nature or the pace of the improvement or that

it did not deal with "the real problem." The net result would be to discourage advertisements about product improvement related to environmental matters, since advertisers would be loath to purchase time which became an invitation to be attacked.

And what would counter advertising do to radio and television?

Recognizing its possible impact, the FTC has attempted to suggest that counter advertising could be limited. In this it is following in the dubious footsteps of the FCC, which once thought it could be confined to a single product. But bitter experience points in the opposite direction.

Almost every advertised product is susceptible to challenge, not from one, but from many different points of view. It has been observed that a 30- or 60-second commercial message featuring a new automobile being driven along a scenic highway could be challenged on the ground that the advertisement favors large cars over small ones, promotes expenditures on roads at the expense of other public facilities, encourages consumption of scarce resources, contributes to pollution of air and water, represents a less desirable expenditure than the consumer might otherwise make, or fails to disclose safety hazards or other allegedly undesirable features of the automobile. One group may demand access on behalf of small cars, another on the pollution issue, and another on behalf of the highway resource allocation issue.

Advertisers of products and services subjected to counter commercials would flee the broadcast media and make their expenditures in media which would not expose them to the same hazards. The case history of the only product yet subjected to counter advertising—cigarettes—offers dramatic support for the proposition that this is what would take place. The cigarette manufacturers, faced with counter advertising, aggressively supported legislation to prohibit cigarette advertising on television and radio in preference to exposing their product to increasing attack on the air.

Whatever dubious merit that might be assigned to counter advertising is dissipated and made into a destructive force when the mandate is applied exclusively to radio and television. It would be only a matter of time before there would be a substantial exodus of advertisers from broadcasting to print—just as in the case of cigarettes—only this transfer would be voluntary. And understandably, for who would blame the advertiser for wanting to avoid counter advertising.

But assume for the sake of discussion that today's advertisers would maintain their current schedules, and consider what would happen if counter advertising claims were limited to six product categories only—cereals, automobiles, gasoline and oil, drugs and detergents—which in 1970 accounted for about one-fourth of all television network sales. If replies had been presented in the form of free announcements occupying time otherwise sold, and if only one such counter advertisement had been presented for every five commercials—the same ratio the FCC applied to cigarettes—the 1970 loss to the three networks would have been about $68 million, or $18 million more than the combined pre-tax profits of the three networks. If counter advertising claims, on the same one-to-five ratio, were allowed with respect to all product categories, the loss to the three networks would have been about $220 million.

Those are network figures. But in no sense would individual stations be spared. Even by using a more lenient one-to-ten ratio, if counter advertising claims had been allowed in 1970 with respect to all product categories on all television stations, the loss in nonnetwork time sales would have been approximately $130 million. This represents almost one-third of all television stations' 1970 pretax profits.

In the face of these threats to the viability of commercial broadcasting, it is particularly pertinent to consider what such losses—either through the exodus of advertisers or the economic penalties of counter commercials—could mean for the very goal that is the asserted justification for counter advertising, the goal of informing the public.

This year broadcasters are spending millions of dollars to bring to the public the events, the issues and the personalities of a Presidential election year, from the primaries through the conventions and the campaign to the climactic counting of the ballots on Election Night. The financial resources that make this kind of public service possible come from advertising. This is the touchstone of our free competitive television service.

At stake here is a critical principle. If this country is to enjoy a full broadcast service that is not dependent upon government subsidies or subscription payments by each viewer or listener, the support of responsible advertisers marketing acceptable goods and services is the only practicable means of funding that free service.

With all its faults, with all its imperfections, the American system of television avoids the twin evils of government subsidy and control on the one hand, and direct public subscription on the other. Advertising is the foundation of a free press. Remove this source of support and the whole structure falls. It's as simple as that—and as threatening.

In this election year there will be many issues upon which the major political parties will be called to take an unequivocal stand. None is more important than a free broadcast press. It is an issue which affects every member of your audience. It threatens radio and television as vital instruments of informed self government. And so I urge you to take the initiative in persuading the writers, the builders of the party platforms, to incorporate planks that repudiate in straightforward language the whole counter-productive concept of counter advertising. And I urge broadcasters to take the fight against this concept elsewhere—to your elected representatives in Washingon, for example, where ultimately the issue must be resolved.

AHEPA CELEBRATES GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, the golden age of Greece, that unique period when pure democracy was as much a practice as an ideal, was the fountainhead for much of what free people everywhere hold precious.

We look back to classical times and the heritage of the Grecian city states of the Mediterranean as the foundation for our literature, architecture, the arts, and most importantly freedom.

As long as free people exist, they will always treasure the Hellenic heritage, uniquely as their own.

The American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, has dedicated itself in the best tradition of the Golden Age, making contributions for the betterment of all people.

This organization, of which I am proud to be an honorary member is observing its golden anniversary this year.

The Order of Ahepa was founded on July 26 1922, in Atlanta, Ga., and is composed of men of outstanding character and good will, who are citizens, or who have declared their intention to become citizens.

From its founding, the Order of Ahepa has grown into a network of 430 local chapters, which are providing fellowship and community service in 49 States, Canada, and Australia.

The strong heritage that fraternity and service is not limited to the male adult members of the family, but includes all of the family is reflected in the founding of satellite organizations by the Order of Ahepa members. These include: The Daughters of Penelope, senior women's auxiliary; the Sons of Pericles, the junior young men's auxiliary; and the Maids of Athena, junior young women's auxiliary.

The Order of Ahepa is guided by a nine-point list of high objectives, but Mr. Speaker, these ideals are made even more meaningful when the record of accomplishment of the order is recalled.

During its 50 years of existence, the Order of Ahepa has founded or provided financial contributions to many worthy endeavors on national and international levels, such as disaster relief projects, schools, hospitals, and memorials. During World War II, the Order of Ahepa sold $500 million in bonds as an official issuing agency of the U.S. Treasury.

On this their golden anniversary I take pride in wishing the members of the Order of Ahepa continued growth, progress, and success in building upon a remarkable record or accomplishment, fellowship, and service to humanity.

THE PERIPHERAL CANAL: THE CALIFORNIA MAJORITY VIEW

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in order that the record may be kept straight with respect to the proposed Peripheral Canal unit of the California State water project, I am including at this point the remarks of Mr. William P. Moses, a member of the California Water Commission.

Mr. Moses' remarks are particularly appropriate because in addition to his association with the water commission, he is a resident of Contra Costa County.

While many official and unofficial spokesmen from that county decry the Peripheral Canal as an attempted southern California rape of the delta region, Mr. Moses clearly points out the source of the problem.

Excerpts from his cogent remarks follow:

THE PERIPHERAL CANAL MINORITY VIEW, CONTRA COSTA STYLE*

(By William P. Moses)

These remarks have been entitled, "The Peripheral Canal Minority View, Contra Costa Style." You can read that two ways.

*Presented before the Water Problems Section of the Commonwealth Club, San Francisco, California, July 13, 1972.

The official position of the Contra Costa County Water Agency is certainly a minority position, statewide. My position, however, is in the minority in Contra Costa County, and that's the understatement of the year.

Unfortunately, years of emotional brainwashing have had their impact on the unsuspecting public, and any politician who has the temerity to even hint that he would consider any position but the traditional Contra Costa anti-State Water Project, anti-Peripheral Canal, as a matter of fact, anti-everything-position, is asking for early retirement, like at the next election.

Having no political ambitions, I shall then go on my uninhibited way, but not merrily or happily, unfortunately.

I am convinced that the people of my county have been and are presently the victims of a scandalous fraud. Let me share some thoughts with you, and then draw your own conclusions.

Events of recent days, witness the Isleton flood, have spot-lighted an almost ludicrous situation. The Contra Costa County Water District is now delivering the worst water ever delivered by any water district in California. Who says so? None other than John DeVito, General Manager of that very District. Why? Because the District's pumps are sucking up salt water at Rock Slough, despite the fact that the federal and state pumps at Byron and Tracy were stopped completely, and despite the fact that there were massive additional releases of water from upstream dams, including Shasta and Oroville.

I cannot resist pointing out that a certain congressman demanded the cessation of the pumping 3 or 4 days after those wearers of the black hats—the Feds and the Department of Water Resources people—had already voluntarily done so.

It is only because the other entity charged with providing water to the rest of my county, the East Bay Municipal Utility District, came to the rescue with millions of gallons of pure Mokelumme River water, that the people and industries of the eastern side of Contra Costa County have been saved from a disaster of rather serious proportions.

Why is this ludicrous? Well, because while East Bay Municipal Utility District and Contra Costa Water District do their job of providing water to Contra Costa County, the Contra Costa Water Agency, said congressman, and an aspiring politician or two striving for Sacramento, stand in the wings yelling, "Down with the Peripheral Canal."

The sad part of it is that the general public has been misled to the point that despite the fact that there is no Peripheral Canal—and that they almost didn't have water fit to drink coming out of the faucets—I'll give you odds that if a poll were taken, the vote would be overwhelmingly against the Peripheral Canal and to continue the traditional fight against sending water to Los Angeles.

In December of 1971, and again in May of 1972, I asked a number of questions of the Board of Supervisors of my county, who sit as the Contra Costa County Water Agency. They are good men, well intentioned, but gravely misled I am afraid, by their political instincts, and more to the point, by a publicity-conscious, flack-happy staff who has led them down the primrose path. A staff that works 24 hours a day grinding out publicity releases, opposing every positive program, attacking the motives of anyone who dares to disagree, and a staff that has never come up with one suggestion of a positive nature as a possible solution to the problem.

This is the same staff and congressman that say, "Don't worry. When the state and federal pumps start sucking up salt, we got 'em."

Well, I say that's fraud. The present situation proves it. Long before this happens, the district pumps at Rock Slough are out of business, and the eastern half of Contra Costa County is in trouble as it was last month until at least partially rescued by East Bay Municipal Utility District.

I say it's time for the people of Contra Costa County to wake up and say to the Agency, the congressman and the staff, "What goes here? What is your solution to the problem? How much water have you brought to the County? What water rights do you own? Whom are you really protecting? Is it the people of Contra Costa, or a few large landowners, all except one of whom reside outside the County?"

It's time to insist on an answer to the question, "If the Peripheral Canal isn't the answer, what is?"

It's time to say, "The pumps are there. The water is going south. How do you suggest we protect the Delta?" It's time to say, "The water quality criteria has been established by Decision 1379 of the Water Resources Control Board. Why do you delay the early implementation of these environment standards?"

It's time for them to stand up and explain what they are going to do to stop the damage to the Delta which is occurring right now, and there is no Peripheral Canal.

The chairman of that very Agency invited the people, by way of a press release, to come up to the Delta on Mother's Day because there was an extremely low tide then and they could see first hand the damage being done to the Delta today, yesterday and tomorrow. Somehow, we are led to believe that by stopping the Peripheral Canal this damage will stop, cease or go away.

When the explorers first moved up the Sacramento River, the Delta was a swamp. Contrary to the popular notion, the Delta is not a God-given creation of nature. Man has built the levees, reclaimed the land, and built flood control projects to protect the levees and the land. More than half of the Delta lies below sea level, like those islands which were flooded just last month—on the first day of summer in a dry year.

A recent article in a local newspaper told us that the land is subsiding at the rate of some 3 inches per year. Obviously, as the land goes down, the levees get higher. Obviously, this creates a strain on these levees that is creating a serious problem to prevent exactly what happened at Isleton last month.

I wonder what the Agency is doing about this. Are they suggesting legislation or other controls, or what? I am willing to give odds that they will say, "Stop the Peripheral Canal, and it will go away."

I used the term, "ludicrous," and I suggest to you that it's exactly that, because we have the following facts.

East Bay Municipal Utility District and Contra Costa Water District have water rights and are delivering water to Contra Costa County. Each is planning for the future: East Bay Municipal Utility District, with its American River Project which has had some difficulties lately, and the Contra Costa Water District, which is attempting to produce new water or re-useable water by participating in a pilot project in conjunction with the Central Sanitary District of the County with financial help from the state and federal governments. Each of these districts is fighting desperately to deliver good water to the people of Contra Costa County in its respective district by cooperating with the federal and state people.

On the other hand, Contra Costa Water Agency, with no water rights by its own admission, is opposing at every step of the way any proposed solution, and even worse, making no positive suggestions to solve the dilemma.

Some people charge that Contra Costa wants the extra flows through the Delta to flush out our own pollution. I asked them to comment on this in view of the fact that the Kaiser Report found that waste discharges from Contra Costa County exceeded that of any of the 12 counties in the Bay and Delta Areas.

I asked them to explain the cease and desist order issued by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board against Sanitary District Number 7–A operated by the Contra Costa County Water Agency which had been polluting Honker Bay since 1951 and as far as I know is still polluting the Bay right at this moment.

One question I asked really bothered me. The County issued a new brochure entitled, "A Disaster in the Making." Now, this brochure was issued after Decision 1379 which was rendered on July 28, 1971, and in the brochure they claimed a victory. But in their illustration, they showed the intrusion of sea water under the water quality standards advocated by the November 19, 1965 Memorandum of Understanding. Obviously, the Decision 1379, with the new water criteria requirements, abrogated the latter Memorandum which was then no longer applicable.

I consider this illistration the worst kind of fraud on the public, and a deliberate attempt to mislead them.

I suggested that the county was in a peculiar position in supporting Decision 1379, including spending money appearing in court in support of the decision, at the same time damning—if you'll pardon the expression—the Peripheral Canal, when the decision itself called for a trans-Delta facility.

One, Kerry Mulligan, former Chairman of the State Water Resources Control Board said, and I quote.

"You notice I keep saying 'trans-Delta facility', and that's what we said in our decision. What the decision says in my opinion, if we read between the lines, is just what I just said, it won't work. We cannot maintain the environment of the Delta. We cannot protect water quality and still meet the contractual obligations of the projects without a peripheral canal."

I find it inconceivable that a county can spend, by their own admission, almost $300,000 in attorneys fees to win a victory, and then fail to support an integral part of the machanics to insure the victory.

Regarding the law suit now on file in Sacramento on Decision 1379, the fraud is compounded, in my judgment, to a point where it can only be termed ridiculous and beyond the realm of comprehension. Why do I say that? Contra Costa County filed a counter claim, cross-complaint, call it what you want, bringing in the United States Government, to wit, the Department of Interior, Bureau of Reclamation.

Now, it doesn't take a knowledgeable person to know that when you sue the Federal Government, they are not about to let the state courts decide the matter. This will end up in the federal courts. I submit that by filing such a cross-complaint, Contra Costa is precipitating a legal battle that will make the famous Colorado River Case minute by comparison, both in time and in costs.

Some people far more qualified than I have warned against opening this Pandora's Box—the late, United States Senator Clair Engle, and the late, State Senator George Miller, to name two. They each termed such a proceeding as a "Legal Frankenstein."

I submit that we had a marvelous opportunity to find out whether our southern friends really mean it when they say they don't want to ruin the Delta. Here we had extended hearings before a knowledgeable board, and a decision had been reached which would give the protectors of the Delta assurance that water would only be exported when there was no damage to the Delta environment.

Why not put that legislation before the representatives from the south and make them "put up or shut up?" Support the legislation or prove what Contra Costa County is saying, that the south wants to rape the Delta by their refusal to vote for

writing into law these standards determined by a knowledgeable body charged with this duty by the legislature itself. But no, the Agency, by some devious reason which escapes me, opposes such legislation.

I eagerly await the explanation of how you can claim a victory, spend money defending it in court, delay the imposition of water quality standards by filing a cross-complaint, and finally, object to the writing of these very same standards into law as a further protection to the environment of the Delta.

One further matter that bothers me. You may or may not know that in 1959, which was even before the state pumps were in existence, Contra Costa went through the same problem that they just experienced in the last month. The Bureau, for reasons of its own, cut the releases of water from Shasta Dam. As a result, the Water District had serious salinity problems. Now, that was 13 years ago, and I suggest to you that there has been sufficient time to introduce legislation in Congress to protect the District from this type of action. Nothing, and I repeat, nothing, has been done.

ANALYSIS OF REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1972

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced legislation to establish a national development program designed to effect a better balance of economic and population growth throughout the Nation.

My bill calls for the establishment of a National Development Agency to coordinate and direct the work of a system of multi-State regional commissions, which in turn would be responsible for carrying out locally initiated development projects.

These projects, as I noted on Thursday when introducing the bill, would be concentrated in the areas of transportation, industrial growth, manpower training, education and health delivery services, housing construction, environmental protection and comprehensive planning.

My introductory statement of last Thursday provided only a cursory explanation of the basic purposes and structure of my proposal. At this time, for the benefit of my colleagues who have already expressed a great deal of interest in the measure and for those who may desire more detailed information, I would like to insert in the RECORD a section-by-section analysis of the bill, an estimated State-by-State distribution of funds authorized under the bill, and the complete text of the legislation itself:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF "REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1972"

TITLE I.—NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMISSIONS

Sec. 101(a). Establishes a National Development Agency in the executive branch which will be composed of the cochairman of the development commissions established under this legislation and an Administrator for National Development appointed by the President.

Sec. 101(b). Requires that decisions of the National Development Agency be approved by the Federal administrator and a majority of the commission cochairman.

Sec. 101(c). The purpose of the agency is to promote the purposes of the act and develop goals and general policy.

Sec. 101(d). The agency may make recommendations to the President, the Congress, the Governors, and appropriate local officials on ways to expend federal, state and local funds so as to further promote regional economic development.

Sec. 102(a). A development commission may be formed by the agreement of the governors of contiguous or otherwise closely related States. The National Administrator may disapprove a commission if he feels it is inconsistent with the purposes of this act.

Sec. 102(b). A regional commission will be composed of a Federal cochairman appointed by the administrator, and one member from each State in the commission. A State cochairman will be selected from among the State members.

Sec. 102(c). Decisions of a commission shall require the affirmative vote of the federal cochairman and of a majority of the State members (exclusive of members representing States delinquent under Sec. 105(a). The Federal cochairman shall consult with federal departments and agencies having an interest in the subject matter.

Sec. 103. Regional commissions created under Title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 will continue to operate until they are absorbed by commissions created under this legislation.

Sec. 104. The commissions are to:

1. Stimulate development through public works construction
2. Provide comprehensive planning for the region
3. Conduct an inventory and analysis of needs and sponsor demonstration projects.
4. Review Federal, State, local, and private programs to evaluate their effectiveness.
5. Work for interstate cooperation
6. Encourage the formation of development districts and their use as vehicles for local planning
7. Encourage private investment in industrial, commercial and recreational projects
8. Coordinate programs in the region
9. Promote the consideration of regional problems and solutions.

Sec. 105 (a). All the administrative expenses of a commission for the first two fiscal years of its existence will be paid for by the Federal government. Thereafter, the States will pay 50% of the expenses, except for the Federal cochairman and his staff, who will be paid by the Federal government. Any State which does not pay its share of the commission costs will not be eligible to vote or receive the benefits of commission membership.

Sec. 105(b). A maximum of 2.5% of the funds authorized in Title V will be available to administer this section.

Sec. 106. Authorizes the regional commissions to make regulations, hire personnel, and enter contracts.

Sec. 107. Authorizes the commissions to hold hearings and gather information.

Sec. 108. Prohibits members and employees of the commissions from engaging in activities which would create a conflict of interest.

TITLE II.—GENERAL PUBLIC WORKS DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

Sec. 201(a)(1-4). Development commissions, subject to approval of the National Development Agency, are authorized to make four types of grants: 1) grants for public works construction; 2) supplementary grants to allow areas to participate in other grant-in-aid programs; 3) grants for the operation of projects constructed under Title I; and 4) demonstration grants.

Sec. 201(b). Except where otherwise provided, no grant in the section may be more than 50% of the project cost.

Sec. 201(c). Supplementary grants may be used in place of other Federal funds in a grant-in-aid project, or as an additional Federal contribution over and above the maximum permitted Federal contribution. The total Federal contribution in these cases is not permitted to be over 80% of the project cost.

Sec. 201(d). Grants for operating a facility may be 100% for the first two years the facility is operating, 75% for the next three years. No operation grants will be made after the first five years of a facilities operation.

Sec. 201(e). Demonstration grants may be up to 100% of project costs.

Sec. 201(f). At least 10, but not more than 20% of the grants in this section must be spent in areas meeting one of the following four conditions:

1. a large concentration of low-income persons
2. rural areas having a substantial outmigration
3. substantial unemployment
4. an actual or threatened abrupt rise of unemployment due to the closing or curtailment of a major source of employment.

Sec. 201(g). Grants made under the act will come from funds appropriated for the act.

Sec. 201(h). Federal grant-in-aid projects receiving funds under this section must meet the Federal grant program requirements. Grants in this section cannot be substituted for funds which would otherwise be available under Federal grant-in-aid programs.

Sec. 201(i). Projects will be carried out where possible by Federal, State or local governments.

Sec. 201(j). Grants may be made to State and local governments, development districts, or non-profit organizations.

Sec. 202. The submission of an application for a grant must go through the State member of the regional commission and must be approved by the development district where the grant is to be used.

Sec. 203. A project cannot be implemented without the approval of the regional commission. It must meet health, housing and other criteria. After July 1, 1974, the regional commissions are required to set up environmental, pollution and economic guidelines which a project would have to meet before it was approved. This approval would then be taken as proof the project satisfies the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

Sec. 204. In allocating grants, the regional commissions need to consider a project's effects on income, employment and public facilities, as well as its benefits in relation to its costs.

TITLE III.—SPECIAL RURAL DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

Sec. 301. Development districts are authorized to make grants of up to 100% for projects consistent with the rural economic development plans of the State or development district.

Sec. 302. Development commissions may make grants to local organizations or governments to permit them to meet matching grant requirements for Federal assistance programs.

Sec. 303. Defines the types of groups and organizations which may apply for the special rural development grants.

Sec. 304. The projects funded under Title III must be for rural areas. It is the responsibility of the development commissions to see that the rural development funds are used for the benefits of rural areas.

TITLE IV.—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 401. State expenditures must be maintained at a level which is the average of the two years prior to the passage of the act in order to be eligible for assistance under the legislation. The section describes how this average is to be computed.

Sec. 402. The consent of a State is required in order to receive benefits under the act.

Sec. 403. Assistance provided under the act cannot be used to relocate business establishments, finance the cost of capita goods, provide working capital, or finance the cost of facilities used to generate, transmit, or distribute electric power or gas.

Sec. 404. Title III, IV, V, VI and VII of the Public Works and Economic Development Act are repealed, except as provided in this legislation, and the remaining functions of the Economic Development Administration are transferred to the National Development Agency. The section defines the terms development district, standard metropolitan statistical area, rural area, rural per capita income, fiscal year, personal income and governor.

TITLE V.—AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS AND ALLOCATIONS

Sec. 501(a). Authorizes for Title I and II, $2 billion for fiscal year 1974, $2.5 billion for fiscal year 1975, and $3 billion for fiscal year 1976. Not more than 10% of the funds can be used for the pubic works development grants called for in Sec. 201(a)(3).

Sec. 501(b). Allocates Title I and II funds among the regional commissions.

Sec. 502(a). Authorizes $1 billion for Title III for fiscal year 1974.

Sec. 502(b). Allocates the funds for Title III among the States.

H.R. 16092

A bill to establish a national development program through public works, including a special component for the development of rural America, and to consolidate under the program so established certain existing development programs

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Regional Development Act of 1972".

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to effect a better balance of economic and population growth between urban and rural areas of the Nation by promoting through locally initiated and regionally coordinated projects, the development of improved transportation systems, industrial development manpower training, educational and health delivery services, housing construction, environmental protection, and comprehensive planning, in those areas where such public services and employment opportunities do not exist or are presently insufficient.

TITLE I—NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMISSIONS

SEC. 101. (a) There is established the National Development Agency (hereinafter referred to as the "Agency") which shall be an independent agency in the executive branch of the Federal Government. The Agency shall consist of each State's cochairman of the Development Commissions established under this Act and an Administrator for National Development (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator"), and may appoint such staff at such salaries as are necessary to carry out the duties of the Agency. The Administrator shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall be compensated as provided for level II of the Executive Schedule under section 5313 of title 5 of the United States Code.

(b) Each decision of the Agency shall be made with the concurrence of the Administrator and a majority of the States' cochairmen.

(c) It is the purpose of the Agency to provide a set of national economic development goals, and aid their implementation through projects described in section 203(a) and funded by development commission. The Agency shall coordinate the work of these commissions and shall focus on the problems of economic development, both rural and urban, and shall conduct research into the extent of and possible solution to these problems.

(d) The Agency may, from time to time, make recommendations to the President and the Congress, and to the Governors and appropriate local officials, with respect to the expenditure of funds by Federal, State, and local departments and agencies in the region in the fields of natural resources, agriculture, education, training, health, and welfare, and other fields related to the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 102. (a) Upon the joint notification to the President and Congress by the Governor of each of any number of contiguous or otherwise closely related States that such States have determined in accordance with their respective legal procedures to form a Development Commission for the purposes of this Act, a development region shall be recognized as established with respect to such States designated as such region in such notification, unless the Administrator determines that such region would be inconsistent with the purposes of this Act. It is the policy of the United States that such Development Commissions be established for all areas of the United States.

(b) Each such Commission shall be composed of one Federal member (hereinafter referred to as the "Federal Cochairman") appointed by the Administrator, and one member from each State in the region. Each State member may be the Governor, his designee, or such other person as may be provided for by the law of the State which he represents. The State members of the Commission shall elect a State cochairman from among their number. The Federal Cochairman shall be compensated by the Federal Government at the level provided for GS–18 under section 5332 of title 5 of the United States Code, and he may appoint such staff and at such salaries as will enable him effectively to carry out his reponsibilities under this Act. Each State member shall be compensated by the State which he represents at the rate established by the law of such State.

(c) Except as provided in section 106, decisions by a Commission shall require the affirmative vote of the Federal Cochairman and of a majority of the State members (exclusive of members representing States delinquent under section 106). In matters coming before a Commission, the Federal Cochairman shall, to the extent practicable, consult with the Federal departments and agencies having an interest in the subject matter.

SEC. 103. Regional Commissions established under title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 shall continue in operation as Development Commissions established under this Act until the States comprising such Region Commissions are included in Development Commissions established under this Act. Authorizations and appropriations for such title V commissions shall remain available for expenditures in affected areas until expended.

SEC. 104. In carrying out the purposes of this Act, each Commission shall—

(1) foster comprehensive programs implementing a policy for public works development which, through the management and control of physical development, will provide necessary public services, stimulate and channel physical and economic growth, optimize economic opportunities and choices for individuals, support sound land use, and protect and enhance the environment;

(2) develop, on a continuing basis, comprehensive and coordinated plans and programs and establish policies for the development of projects to receive assistance under this Act, giving due consideration to other Federal, State, and local planning in the region;

(3) conduct and sponsor investigations, research, and studies, including an inventory and analysis of the human and physical resources of the region, and, in cooperation with Federal, State, and local agencies, sponsor demonstration projects designed to foster development;

(4) review and study in cooperation with the agencies involved, Federal, State, and local public and private programs, and, where appropriate, recommend modifications or additions which will increase their effectiveness in the region;

(5) formulate and recommend, where appropriate, interstate compacts and other forms of interstate cooperation, and work with State and local agencies in developing appropriate model legislation;

(6) encourage the formation of development districts and their use as a primary vehicle for local planning and coordination of project requests;

(7) encourage private investment in industrial, commercial, and recreational projects;

(8) serve as a focal point and coordinating unit for programs in the region; and

(9) provide a forum for consideration of problems of the region and proposed solutions and establish and utilize, as appropriate, citizens and special advisory councils and public conferences.

SEC. 105. (a) For the period ending on June 30 of the second full Federal fiscal year following the date of establishment of a Commission, the administrative expenses of such Commission shall be paid by the Federal Government. Thereafter, such expenses shall be paid 50 per centum by the States in the region except that the expenses of the Federal Cochairman and his staff shall be paid solely by the Federal Government. The share to be paid by each State shall be determined by the State members of the Commission. No assistance authorized by this Act shall be furnished to any State or to any political subdivision or any resident of any State, nor shall the State member of a Commission participate or vote in any determination by the Commission while such State is delinquent in payment of its share of such expenses.

(b) Not to exceed 2.5 per centum of the funds authorized under title V of this Act shall be available to carry out this section.

SEC. 106. To carry out its duties under this title, each Commission is authorized to—

(1) adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the conduct of its business and the performance of its functions;

(2) appoint and fix the compensation of an executive director and such other personnel as may be necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its functions, except that such compensation of any individual on the staff shall not exceed the maximum scheduled rate for grade GS–16 under section 5332 of title 5 of the United States Code. No member, officer, or employee of the Commission, other than the Federal Cochairman of the Commission, his staff, and Federal employees detailed to the Commission under paragraph (3) shall be deemed a Federal employee for any purpose;

(3) request the head of any Federal department or agency (who is hereby so authorized) to detail to temporary duty with a Commission such personnel within his administrative jurisdiction as the Commission may need for carrying out its functions, each such detail to be without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status;

(4) arrange for the services of personnel from any State or local government or any subdivision or agency thereof, or any intergovernmental agency;

(5) make arrangements, including contracts, with any participating State govern-

ment for inclusion in a suitable retirement and employee benefit system of such of its personnel as may not be eligible for, or continue in, another governmental retirement or employee benefit system, or otherwise provide for such coverage of its personnel. The Civil Service Commission of the United States is authorized to contract with the Commission for continued coverage of Commission employees, who at date of Commission employment are Federal employees, in the retirement program and other employee benefit programs of the Federal Government;

(6) accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible;

(7) enter into and perform such contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, or other transactions as may be necessary in carrying out its functions and on such terms as it may deem appropriate, with any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States or with any State, or any political subdivision, agency, or instrumentality thereof, or with any person, firm, association, or corporation; and

(8) take such other actions and incur such other expenses as may be necessary or appropriate.

SEC. 107. In order to obtain information to carry out its duties, each Commission shall—

(1) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and print or otherwise reproduce and distribute so much of its proceedings and reports thereon as it may deem advisable, a Cochairman of the Commission, or any member of the Commission designated by the Commission for the purpose, being hereby authorized to administer oaths when it is determined by the Commission that testimony shall be taken or evidence received under oath;

(2) arrange for the head of any Federal, State, or local department or agency (who is hereby so authorized to the extent not otherwise prohibited by law) to furnish to the Commission such information as may be available to or procurable by such department or agency; and

(3) keep accurate and complete records of its doings and transactions which shall be made available for public inspection, and for the purpose of audit and examination by the Comptroller General or his duly authorized representatives.

SEC. 103. (a) Except as permitted by subsection (b) hereof, no State member and no officer or employee of any Commission nor any State cochairman in his capacity as member of the Agency shall participate personally and substantially as member, officer, or employee, through decision, approval, disapproval, recommendation, the rendering of advice, investigation, or otherwise, in any proceeding, application, request for a ruling or other determination, contract, claim, controversy, or other particular matter in which, to his knowledge, he, his spouse, minor child, partner, organization (other than a State or political subdivision thereof) in which he is serving as officer, director, trustee, partner, or employee, or any person or organization with whom he is serving as officer, director, trustee, partner, or employee, or any person or organization with whom he is negotiating or has any arrangement concerning prospective employment, has a financial interest. Any person who shall violate the provisions of this subsection shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than two years, or both.

(b) Subsection (a) hereof shall not apply if the State Cochairmen, member, officer, or employee first advises the Commission and the Agency of the nature and circumstances of the proceeding, application, request for a ruling or other determination, contract, claim, controversy, or other particular matter and makes full disclosure of the financial interest and receives in advance a written determination made by the Commission that the interest is not so substantial as to be deemed likely to affect the integrity of the services which the Commission may expect from such State member, officer, or employee.

(c) No State member shall receive any salary, or any contribution to or supplementation of salary for his services on the Commission or the Agency from any source other than his State. No person detailed to serve a Commission under authority of paragraph (4) of section 107 shall receive any salary or any contribution to or supplementation of salary for his services on the Commission from any source other than the State, local, or intergovernmental department or agency from which he was detailed or from the Commission. Any person who shall violate the provisions of this subsection shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

(d) Notwithstanding any other subsection of this section, the Federal Cochairman of a Commission, his staff, and any Federal officers or employees detailed to duty with it pursuant to paragraph (3) of section 107 and all officers and employees, except the States Cochairmen, of the Agency shall not be subject to any such subsection but shall remain subject to sections 202 through 209 of title 18, United States Code.

(e) A Commission or the Agency may, in its discretion, declare void and rescind any contract, loan, or grant of or by the Commission in relation to which it finds that there has been a violation of subsection (a) or (c) of this section, or any of the provisions of sections 202 through 209, title 18, United States Code.

TITLE II—GENERAL PUBLIC WORKS DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

SEC. 201. (a) Each Development Commission is authorized, subject to the approval of the Agency—

(1) to make direct public works development grants for the acquisition or development of land and improvements for public works, public service, or development facilities, including open space, and the acquisition, construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of such works or facilities, including related machinery and equipment;

(2) to make supplementary public works development grants in order to enable eligible grantees to take maximum advantage of all existing or future Federal grant-in-aid programs assisting in the construction or equipment of facilities or the acquisition of land and grants under paragraph (1) of this subsection;

(3) to make public works development grants for the operation of projects assisted under paragraphs (1) or (2) of this subsection, including the provision of community or outreach services; and

(4) to make grants for demonstrations of the value of adequate facilities and services to the development of regions, including the acquisition of land and the construction of facilities incident thereto.

(b) Except as provided in subsections (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g) of this section, no grant under this section shall exceed 50 per centum of the cost of such project.

(c) (1) Supplementary development grants may be made for all or any portion of the basic Federal contribution to projects under Federal grant-in-aid programs, or for the purpose of increasing the Federal contribution to projects under such programs above the fixed maximum portion of the cost of such projects otherwise authorized by the applicable law. The Federal portion of project costs shall not exceed the percentage of project costs established by the Commission, and shall in no event exceed 80 per centum thereof.

(2) Supplementary grants shall be made by the Development Commission in accordance with such regulations as it shall prescribe, by increasing the amounts of direct grants authorized under this section or by the payment of funds appropriated under this Act to the heads of the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government responsible for the administration of the applicable Federal programs. Any findings, report, certification, or documentation required to be submitted to the head of the department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government responsible for the administration of any Federal grant-in-aid program shall be accepted by the Federal Cochairman with respect to a supplementary grant for any project under such program.

(d) Grants for operation of any project (including initial operating funds and deficits, comprising among other things the cost of attracting, training, and retaining qualified personnel) may be made for up to 100 per centum of the costs thereof for the two-year period beginning, for each component facility or service assisted under any such operating grant, on the first day that such facility or service is in operation as a part of the project. For the next three years of operation, such grants shall not exceed 75 per centum of such costs. No grant for operation of any project shall be made unless the facility is not operated for profit. No grants for operation of any project shall be made after five years following the commencement of the initial grant for operation of the project. No such grants shall be made unless the Development Commission is satisfied that the operation of the project will be conducted under efficient management practices designed to obviate operating deficits.

(e) Demonstration grants may be made for up to 100 per centum of the costs of any project. The Federal contribution may be provided entirely from funds authorized under this section, or in combination with funds provided under other Federal programs.

(f) (1) Notwithstanding section 203 or 204 of this Act, not less than 10 per centum nor more than 20 per centum of the funds appropriated to carry out this section for any fiscal year shall be available to provide grants under this section for any community or neighborhood (defined without regard to political or other subdivisions or boundaries) which the applicable State and Commission determine have one of the following conditions:

(a) a large concentration of low-income persons;

(b) rural areas having a substantial outmigration;

(c) substantial unemployment; or

(d) an actual or threatened abrupt rise of unemployment due to the closing or curtailment of a major source of employment;

if the State and Commission find that the project for which a grant is requested will fulfill a pressing need of the neighborhood or community in which it is, or will be located, and will provide immediate useful work to unemployed and underemployed persons in that community or neighborhood.

(2) Grants under this subsection may be made for up to 100 per centum of the cost of a project in the case of a grant to any State or political subdivision thereof which the Development Commission determines has exhausted its effective taxing and borrowing capacity.

(g) Grants under this section shall be made solely out of funds specifically appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this Act and shall not be taken into account in the computation of the allotments among the States made pursuant to any other provision of law. Funds appropriated to carry out this Act shall be available without regard to any limitations on authorizations for appropriation in any other Act.

(h) In the case of any project for which all or any portion of the basic Federal contribution to the project under a Federal grant-in-aid program is proposed to be made

under this section, no such grant shall be made until the responsible Federal official administering such grant-in-aid Act certifies that such project meets the applicable requirements of such grant-in-aid Act and could be approved for Federal contribution under such Act if funds were available under such Act for such project. Funds may be provided for projects in a State under this section only if the Commission determines that the level of Federal and State financial assistance under Acts other than this Act, for the same type of programs or projects in the State will not diminish in order to substitute funds authorized by this title.

(i) To the maximum extent possible, projects assisted under this Act shall be carried out through departments, agencies, or instrumentalities of the Federal Government or of State or local governments.

(j) Grants under this title may be made to any State or political subdivision thereof, private or public nonprofit organization, or development district.

SEC. 202. (a) An application for a grant or other assistance under this title shall be made through the State member of the Commission representing such applicant, and such State member shall evaluate the application for approval. Only applications for programs and projects which are approved by the State member as meeting the requirements of the planning process established under this title and as eligible for assistance under this title shall be approved for assistance.

(b) No grant shall be made under this title unless the project for which assistance is intended by such grant is approved by the appropriate development district as consistent with its development plan.

SEC. 203. (a) No project authorized under this title shall be implemented until the Commission has approved such project and has determined that it meets the requirements of the planning process established under title I and has significant potential for development to further such purposes as income improvement; provision of decent, safe, and sanitary housing; health care; child care; services to the aged; air and water quality protection and enhancement; job opportunity and employment; availability of trained labor force, including vocational education; improved education opportunity; transportation services; recreational opportunity; effective land utilization; balance industrial, commercial, and residential use; resource conservation; and cultural and community improvement.

(b) (1) Not later than July 1, 1974, each Development Commission, after consultation with the Environmental Protection Agency and appropriate Federal and State officials, shall promulgate guidelines designed to assure that possible adverse economic, social, and environmental effects relating to any proposed project have been fully considered in developing such project. No project shall be approved unless the Commission determines that the project is in accordance with the guidelines, taking into consideration the need for development, the cost of eliminating or minimizing such adverse effects, and the following:

(A) air, noise, and water pollution;

(B) destruction or disruption of man-made and natural resources, esthetic values, community cohesion, and the availability of public facilities and services;

(C) any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed project;

(D) adverse employment effects and tax and property value losses;

(E) injurious displacement of people, businesses, and farms; and

(F) disruption of desirable community and regional growth.

Such guidelines shall apply to all projects approved by the State after the issuance of such guidelines.

(2) Any project for which a grant is made under paragraphs (a)(1), (a)(3), and (a)(4) of section 201 of this Act after the promulgation of such guidelines which has been approved by the State and the Development Commission as complying with such guidelines shall be deemed to have satisfied the requirements of section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (83 Stat. 852).

SEC. 204. Each Development Commission in allocating funds appropriated under this title shall consider:

(1) the potential for increasing the income levels of families within the region;

(2) the potential for reducing the rates of unemployment within the region;

(3) the relative needs for public works, facilities, and services of areas within such region; and

(4) the value of any class of projects in relation to other classes of projects which may be in competition for the same funds in realizing the purposes of this Act.

TITLE III—SPECIAL RURAL DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

SEC. 301. Each Development Commission is authorized, subject to the approval of the Agency, to make special grants to any entity within a State which is eligible to make an application under section 303 of this title for assistance under this title, in order to fund up to 100 per centum of the cost of projects which are consistent with the rural economic development plans of that State and of the development district, by or with the approval of which application for such grants was made.

SEC. 302. Each Development Commission is authorized to make special grants to any entity with a State which is eligible to make an application under section 303 of this title for assistance under this title in order to enable such entity to take maximum advantage of all Federal grant-in-aid programs for which it is eligible, but for which, because of its economic situation, it cannot supply the required matching share or local contribution, whether or not such programs are created on, before, or after the date of the enactment of this Act, and the funds so granted shall be used as such required matching share or local contribution and considered as such by the department, agency, or other instrumentality of the Federal Government administering the Federal grant-in-aid program involved.

SEC. 303. Entities which may make an application for assistance under title II of this grant shall be eligible to make an application for assistance under this title if—

(1) they are located in a development district which is composed of counties or similar political subdivisions each one of which has either a population density of less than one hundred persons per square mile or is not included in a standard metropolitan statistical area as defined in section 405 of this Act; or

(2) they are located in a development district which is certified to the Commission by the State member as being of a distinctly rural, and not urban or suburban character.

SEC. 304. It shall be the responsibility of each Development Commission to see that all projects funded under this title are for the benefit of rural, as distinguished from urban or suburban, areas, whether or not such projects are geographically centered in such rural areas.

SEC. 305. The method of application for assistance under this title and procedures in handling such applications and the implementation of such assistance shall be those provided in title I with respect to assistance under that title, except as specifically modified by the provisions of this title.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. No State and no political subdivision of any State shall be eligible to receive assistance under this Act unless the aggregate expenditures of State funds, exclusive of Federal funds, for the benefit of the area within the State eligible for such assistance are maintained at a level which does not fall below the average level of such expenditures for its last two full fiscal years preceding the date of enactment of this Act. In computing the average level of expenditure for its last two fiscal years, a State's past expenditure for participation in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways shall not be included. The Commission may substitute a lesser requirement when it finds that a substantial population decrease in the portion of a State eligible for assistance under this Act would not justify a State expenditure equal to the average level of the last two years or when it finds that a State's average level of expenditure, within an individual program, has been disproportionate to the present need for that portion of the State which is eligible for assistance under this Act.

SEC. 402. Nothing contained in this Act shall be interpreted as requiring any State to engage in or accept any program under titles II and III without its consent.

SEC. 403. No financial assistance shall be authorized under this Act to be used (1) in relocating any establishment or establishments from one area to another; (2) to finance the cost of industrial plants, commercial facilities, machinery, working capital, or other industrial facilities or to enable plant subcontractors to undertake work theretofore performed in another area by other subcontractors or contractors; (3) to finance the cost of facilities for the generation, transmission, or distribution of electric energy; or (4) to finance the cost of facilities for the production, transmission, or distribution of gas (natural, manufactured, or mixed).

SEC. 404. (a) The functions conferred on the Secretary of Commerce under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 are transferred to the Agency.

(b) Titles III, IV, V, VI, and VII of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 are repealed except as provided in section 103 of this Act.

(c) Paragraph (120) of section 5316 of title 5 of the United States Code (relating to the salary of the Administrator of Economic Development) is repealed, and section 5313 of such title is amended by adding a new paragraph, as follows:

"(21) Administrator for National Development."

SEC. 405. As used in this Act, the term—

(1) "development district" means an entity composed of counties or similar political subdivisions having a charter or authority that includes the economic development of counties within such entity and such entity is one of the following:

(A) a nonprofit incorporated body organized or chartered under the laws of the State in which it is located;

(B) a nonprofit agency or instrumentality of a State or local government; or

(C) a nonprofit association or combination of such bodies, agencies, and instrumentalities.

(2) "standard metropolitan statistical area" is used as that term is used and defined by the Office of Management and Budget.

(3) "rural population" means the total resident population, as defined and used by the United States Bureau of the Census, of any county or similar political subdivision which either has a population density of less than one hundred persons per square mile or is not included within a standard metropolitan statistical area.

(4) "rural per capita income" means the average personal income of the rural population of a State.

(5) "fiscal year" means the fiscal year of the Government of the United States.

(6) "personal income" is used as that term is used and defined by the Office of Business

Economics of the Department of Commerce; and

(7) "Governor" means the chief executive authority of each State.

TITLE V

AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS AND ALLOCATIONS

SEC. 501. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Agency for the Development Commissions to remain available until expended for the purpose of carrying out titles I and II of this Act not to exceed $2,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; $2,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975; and $3,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, of which not to exceed 10 per centum of the funds appropriated shall be available for the purposes of carrying out section 201(a)(3).

(b) The Agency shall promptly apportion to the Commissions the sums appropriated under this section for any fiscal year, as follows:

(1) 10 per centum of such sums in the ratio that the land area of each Development Commission bears to the land area of the United States;

(2) 10 per centum of such funds in the ratio that the quotient obtained by dividing the general revenues of the States of each Development Commission by the total personal income of the States of each Development Commission bears to the sums of such quotients for all the States;

(3) 40 per centum of such sums in the ratio that the population of each Development Commission bears to the population of all the United States; and

(4) 40 per centum of such sums in the ratio that the quotient obtained by dividing the per capita income of the United States by the per capita income of each Development Commission bears to the sum of such quotients for all the States.

SEC. 502. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Agency for the Development Commissions to remain available until expended for the purpose of carrying out title III of this Act not to exceed $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and such sums thereafter as may be necessary.

(b) The Agency shall promptly apportion to the Commissions the sum of the shares of the States in each such Commission, the sums appropriated under this section for any fiscal year, and the share of each State shall be used by the Commission only with respect to projects and programs in such State. Each State's share shall be—

(1) an equal portion of 1 per centum of the amount appropriated for such fiscal year; plus

(2) a portion of the remaining amount appropriated computed as follows:

(A) Each State shall be entitled to receive an amount equal to 50 per centum of such remainder multiplied by a fraction the numerator of which is the rural population of such State at the most recent point in time for which appropriate statistics are available and the denominator of which is the sum of the rural populations of all States at the same point in time;

(B) each State shall be entitled to receive an amount equal to 25 per centum of such remainder multiplied by a fraction the numerator of which is the average of per capita incomes of all the States at the most recent point in time for which appropriate statistics are available less the rural per capita income of such State at the same point in time, such difference to be multiplied by the rural population of such State at the same point in time, and the denominator of which is the sum of such positive differences for each State multiplied by that State's rural population; except that, if the rural per capita income of a State is greater than the average of per capita incomes of all States, the differences stated above shall be considered zero; and

(C) each State shall be entitled to receive an amount equal to 25 per centum of such remainder multiplied by a fraction the numerator of which is the percentage change in population of all the States less the percentage change in rural population of such State, such difference to be multiplied by the rural population of such State during the most recent and appropriate time period of which statistics are available, and the denominator of which is the sum of such positive differences for each State multiplied by that State's rural population; except that, if the percentage rate of change of rural population of a State during such period is greater than the percentage rate of change of the populations of all States during the same period, the differences stated above shall be considered zero.

State-by-State authorization under title II.—Estimated amounts

(In millions of dollars)

Alabama	$38.8
Alaska	49.2
Arizona	32.6
Arkansas	33.4
California	102.8
Colorado	32.6
Connecticut	26.2
Delaware	18.6
District of Columbia	15.6
Florida	48.2
Georgia	40.8
Hawaii	19.6
Idaho	28.2
Illinois	61.2
Indiana	39.8
Iowa	32.6
Kansas	31.2
Kentucky	36.0
Louisiana	38.6
Maine	25.8
Maryland	32.0
Massachusetts	38.6
Michigan	54.8
Minnesota	37.8
Mississippi	36.4
Missouri	39.8
Montana	30.8
Nebraska	28.4
Nevada	23.8
New Hampshire	21.4
New Jersey	43.4
New Mexico	33.0
New York	89.2
North Carolina	42.8
North Dakota	29.6
Ohio	60.2
Oklahoma	34.0
Oregon	32.0
Pennsylvania	65.2
Rhode Island	20.8
South Carolina	33.4
South Dakota	28.2
Tennessee	38.4
Texas	76.8
Utah	29.6
Vermont	21.6
Virginia	38.6
Washington	34.6
West Virginia	30.2
Wisconsin	39.0
Wyoming	27.8
Puerto Rico	55.6
Total	2,000.0

ESTIMATED STATE-BY-STATE AUTHORIZATION UNDER TITLE III (RURAL DEVELOPMENT FUND)

[In millions of dollars]

	1 percent equally divided among States (sec. 502(b)(1))	Rural population element—50 percent of remainder (sec. 502(b)(2)(A))	Change in rural population element—25 percent of remainder (sec. 502(b)(2)(C))	Total, cols. 1, 2, 3 (secs. 502(b)(1) and 502(b)(2)(A) and (C))
Alabama	0.2	13.2	8.1	21.5
Alaska	.2	1.4	.2	1.8
Arizona	.2	3.4	.5	4.1
Arkansas	.2	8.9	6.4	15.5
California	.2	16.7	18.0	34.9
Colorado	.2	4.4	1.7	6.3
Connecticut	.2	6.3	----------	6.5
Delaware	.2	1.4	.7	2.3
District of Columbia	----------	----------	----------	----------
Florida	.2	12.0	5.0	17.3
Georgia	.2	16.7	6.4	23.3
Hawaii	.2	1.2	1.2	2.6
Idaho	.2	3.0	2.3	5.5
Illinois	.2	17.3	10.6	28.1
Indiana	.2	16.7	5.9	22.8
Iowa	.2	11.1	8.4	19.7
Kansas	.2	7.0	6.3	13.5
Kentucky	.2	14.1	11.8	26.1
Louisiana	.2	11.3	4.4	15.9
Maine	.2	4.5	1.7	6.4
Maryland	.2	8.4	1.6	10.2
Massachusetts	.2	8.1	2.9	11.2
Michigan	.2	21.3	1.6	23.1
Minnesota	.2	11.7	6.4	18.3
Mississippi	.2	11.3	9.7	21.2
Missouri	.2	12.9	8.0	21.1
Montana	.2	3.0	1.9	5.1
Nebraska	0.2	5.2	4.9	10.3
Nevada	.2	.8	.1	1.1
New Hampshire	.2	3.0	----------	3.2
New Jersey	.2	7.3	----------	7.5
New Mexico	.2	2.8	2.0	5.0
New York	.2	24.2	5.4	29.8
North Carolina	.2	25.7	11.5	37.4
North Dakota	.2	3.2	3.5	6.9
Ohio	.2	24.1	10.6	34.9
Oklahoma	.2	7.5	5.2	12.9
Oregon	.2	6.3	2.5	9.0
Pennsylvania	.2	30.9	10.3	41.4
Rhode Island	.2	1.1	.3	1.6
South Carolina	.2	12.5	7.8	20.5
South Dakota	.2	3.4	3.1	6.7
Tennessee	.2	14.8	10.2	25.2
Texas	.2	20.9	14.4	35.5
Utah	.2	1.9	1.5	3.6
Vermont	.2	2.8	----------	3.0
Virginia	.2	15.7	6.3	22.2
Washington	.2	8.6	3.5	12.3
West Virginia	.2	9.8	7.6	17.6
Wisconsin	.2	13.9	4.2	18.3
Wyoming	.2	1.2	1.0	2.4
Total	10.0	495.0	247.5	752.5

Source: Congressional Research Service table, June 22, 1972.

Note: Distribution of additional $247,500,000 subject to final compilation of rural per-capita income based on 1970 census.

WHO IS DESTROYING OUR ARMED FORCES? (II)

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, recently I explained how it has become the official policy of our Government and of the military services not to inform our fighting men about the nature of their Communist enemy, but instead to make increasing use in military educational programs of writers who do not regard communism as an enemy. The U.S. Army contemporary reading list reflects this trend.

Along with George Ball, described in the preceding newsletter, the names of A. Doak Barnett and Harlan Cleveland appear on this list. Barnett totally opposed any bombing of Hanoi or Haiphong, and is a long-time advocate of the recognition of Red China and the surrender of the Nationalist-held offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu to the Communist regime in Peking. Cleveland, author of "The Obligation of Power" which appears on the Army reading list, has a long record of hostility to the military and affinity for security risks. "The Ordeal of Otto Otepka"—505 pages of documented exposure of Communist and pro-Communist influence in our Government—gives his background. While at Princeton, Cleveland was president of the campus Antiwar Society and fought bitterly against the ROTC program. His Antiwar Society won the praise of Champion of Youth, official organ of the Young Communist League. He was brought into the Kennedy administration as Assistant Secretary of State for International Affairs on a security waiver signed by Dean Rusk. Otepka states that Cleveland not only tried to have one identified security risk hired, but when that failed actually asked:

> What are the chances of getting Alger Hiss back into the government?

After recovering from the shock, Otepka replied:

> He [Hiss] was convicted of perjury, which is a felony, in a case involving the national security.

As a Marine Corps Reserve officer and formerly, while on active duty, an instructor in an anticommunism course at El Toro Marine Corps Air Station Leadership School, I had hoped that the Marines at least were not following the Army's bad example in the kind of reading they were recommending to their men. When I taught this course at El Toro, the writings of J. Edgar Hoover and several well-known anti-Communist authors, along with material from the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, were regularly used to help the leathernecks know their enemy.

What I actually found was appalling. On February 1, 1972, what is now the 1st Marine Division—the very same division that turned the tide of World War II in the Pacific at Guadalcanal, that fought the Communists to a standstill at the Pusan perimeter in Korea and in the magnificent retreat from the Chosin Reservoir smashed an entire Chinese army corps whose commander thought he had closed a trap around them, that held Khesanh in Vietnam against the worst Hanoi could do—launched a new educational program outlined in a standard operating procedure for human affairs. The reading list attached to that official document would be incredible to me if I had not seen it with my own eyes.

Here are just a few of the authors it recommends to young marines of one of the greatest fighting divisions in the history of our country or any other: Herbert Aptheker, member of the Central Committee of the U.S. Communist Party and a party member since at least 1939; Sally Belfrage, who attended the Communist Youth Festival in Moscow in 1957, and is the daughter of Cedric Henning Belfrage, alias George Oakden, who was deported from the United States for Communist activities; Stanley Steiner, member of the U.S. Communist Party for at least 20 years under the name of Mike Newberry; W. E. B. DuBois, writer and historian who joined the Communist Party in 1961 and died in Ghana—and also his wife, Shirley Graham; Lorraine Hansberry, member of the Communist Party at the time of her death; and finally Eldridge Cleaver and Bobby Seale, well-known Black Panther leaders.

There are even more writers of this kind on the list, but space precludes extending it. According to this document—pages 4–5—reading their works will help attain the objective of "through education, insuring more constructive relationships among marines and with people outside the Marine Corps."

Many have recognized that if we had an educational program for our fighting men and the rest of our people clearly showing the real nature of aggressive international communism, there would be such a clamor to defeat communism that the leaders of our Nation could not halt a drive for victory. But the truth is being kept from our men who are actually fighting or may well have to fight this enemy, while they are being directly exposed to his propaganda in our own military education programs such as that of the 1st Marine Division at Camp Pendleton. As a result, we are sending men into battle intellectually disarmed. A Chinese Communist document captured in Korea stated that American soldiers could be easily manipulated because most of them had not been taught enough about their own country's history and the foundations of its way of life. Now we have the unique distinction of finding our military learning history from the standpoint of identified Communists.

INTRODUCING BILL RELATED TO AIRCRAFT PIRACY

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to reduce airplane skyjacking—a form of violent crime which has increased in recent years to an intolerable amount.

My bill would close all American airports to any international airline operating in any country that refuses to prosecute or extradite accused skyjackers. In effect, it would isolate any nation, such as Algeria, which refused to cooperate in efforts to curb airline piracy.

Increasing numbers of skyjacking incidents demand tough legislation. There have already been 28 skyjacking attempts and four deaths in just over one-half of this year, which is an increase of 100 percent over 1971, when during the entire year there were 27 attempts and four deaths. Further, ransom losses have increased 650 percent since 1971.

Although I fully support The Hague and Montreal Conventions aimed at winning international agreements on the handling of skyjackers, I fear that these efforts cannot be effective until all nations join. At this time, I doubt that diplomatic efforts alone will win the cooperation of certain recalcitrant nations, and I therefore urge the passage of this legislation.

This bill is absolutely consistent with the recommendations of the Air Line Pilots Association. It is similar, though not identical to legislation introduced by Senator MAGNUSON and recently ordered reported by the Senate Commerce Committee.

IN DEFENSE OF FOOD PRICES

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, we all know that over-the-counter food prices have been going up over the years, and we do a lot of talking and complaining about it, but we seldom stop to think that wage increases have far outstripped food price rises.

I recently read an article by Sylvia Porter, newspaper syndicate economic columnist, on this subject, which, with your permission, I would like to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that my colleagues, and other RECORD readers who may have missed it, may benefit from her exposition:

IN DEFENSE OF FOOD PRICES

(By Sylvia Porter)

Q. Are you old enough to remember what a loaf of bread cost a half century ago?

A. About a dime.

Q. Can you recall what a pound of steak cost 50 years or so ago?

A. Less than 40 cents.

Q. What about a quart of milk?

A. About 15 cents—delivered, of course—in 1919, when the Bureau of Labor Statistics started publishing consumer prices for its basic food "marketbasket."

Since 1919 the average price of bread and of milk has more than doubled; the average price of round steak has nearly quadrupled.

And the latest cost of living statistics hardly give cause to cheer about food prices.

But wait! We must look behind these figures for a far more real-life perspective:

While the total cost of the BLS's basic marketbasket of a dozen food items has risen 81 percent since 1919—an average of

only 1.53 percent a year, by the way—the prices of two items, eggs and magarine, actually have declined. And there are times even these days when by shopping sales you can beat the 1919 prices for at least three more items—bacon, cheese and canned tomatoes.

In the same span, the average hourly wages of factory workers have soared 661 percent—about eight times as fast as the rise in our food costs.

In 1919 the factory worker earned an average of $4.70 for a 10-hour day of work; in 1972, this worker earns an average of $28.75 for an eight-hour day.

What this all adds up to is the crucial point that today you are spending an average of only 15.6 cents of your after-tax income $1 for food.

This is a record low in this country, comparing with 20 cents in 1960, and not equaled by any other major nation.

In Greece and Italy the share going for food is about 37 cents; in the United Kingdom it's 24 cents; in Bulgaria it's 54 cents; in Ghana it's 60 cents.

What's more this is the proportion of take-home pay spent for food at home and in restaurants.

If you count only home eating, an even smaller percentage of your paycheck goes for food.

Here is a table showing the changes in food prices vs. hourly wages since 1919:

[In cents unless otherwise indicated]

Item	1919	April 1972
Milk, qt., del	15.5	34.4
Eggs, doz	62.8	50.0
Oranges, doz	53.2	88.2
Potatoes, lb	3.8	8.3
Tomatoes, No. 303 can	16.2	22.6
Margarine, lb	41.3	33.3
Bread, wht., lb	10.0	24.7
Rd. steak, lb	38.9	$1.47
Pork chops, lb	42.3	$1.17
Sl. bacon, lb	55.4	92.5
Butter, lb	67.8	87.4
Cheese, lb	42.6	$1.08
Total	$4.50	$8.13
Wages, 1 hr	.472	$3.59

Here is a rundown on the amounts of other items you can now buy with one hour of work—vs. 1919:

Item	1919	April 1972
Round steak, lb	1.2	2.6
Pork chops, lb	1.1	3.2
Sl. bacon, lb	.9	4.1
Butter, lb	.7	4.3
Cheese, lb	1.1	3.5
Potatoes, lb	12.4	45.4
Margarine, lb	1.1	11.3
Eggs, fresh, doz	.8	7.5
Oranges, doz	.9	4.3
Tomatoes, No. 303 can	2.9	16.7

TRENT WILLIAMS

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, Trent Williams, of New Tazewell, Tenn., has successfully combined our free enterprise system with individual initiative in order to gain a college education. The story of this young Tennessean's quest for a college degree is another shining example of how the youth of Tennessee stand out as the finest in the Nation.

The parents of Trent Williams and the educators at Lincoln Memorial University in Harrogate, Tenn., are to be congratulated for developing outstanding young Americans such as Trent Williams.

The following is an excerpt from the Lincoln News which I would like to share with my fellow Members of Congress.

The excerpt follows:

TRENT WILLIAMS

Blackberries did it! Well, they went a long way toward helping to get the job done. Trent Williams, a fine farm lad from New Tazewell, Tennessee, believes so. The chemistry major graduates from Lincoln Memorial in August, 1972. Much credit goes to *blackberries*, too. Blackberries are wild and prolific in the beautiful, rugged mountains and valleys in Claiborne County, Tennessee. Thorny briars, verdant thickets, tall green grasses, tantalizing ticks and chiggers, copperheads and rattlesnakes, pricked hands and arms—none of these toppled young Trent. For Trent Williams was determined to earn money for a college education at Lincoln Memorial. Pickin' and peddlin'. Blackberries, that is. Up before daylight. Trudging and trekking through thickets and thorns. To the berry patches. With buckets and baskets, cans and containers. (A different, unique type of high adventure!). The picking began at crack-of-dawn and continued till high noon. The journey by faithful 'ol farm truck miles and miles away to Knoxville, Tennessee. House to house, street to street peddlin' blackberries. A "yes" here, a "no" there—"thank you ma'm" until all were sold. Home again by 11 at night. Next day, same cycle until the crop of blackberries were depleted, year after year. Gallons and gallons of blackberries. Money earned and saved for a college education. President Lincoln split rails, read by flickering firelight, performed varied tasks. And learned. Trent Williams picked and peddled blackberries. He's grateful for blackberries. The dignity and rewards of hard work—how does one measure them? I know one young lad with a mighty big measuring stick. Proud, too! Some view the handwriting on the wall and do little but criticize the penmanship; Trent read the writing, built a better "blackberry" mousetrap; succeeded.

IN MEMORIAM TO THE CHAMPION OF DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, THE HONORABLE JOHN W. BILL

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, my congressional district, our State of New Jersey, and the Nation recently lost our most distinguished DAV'er—the Honorable John W. Bill—who provided a lifetime of outstanding public service to the men who served our country in battle since World War I and was especially dedicated to, and championed the noble cause of disabled American veterans and their families, constantly seeking legislative and administrative processes to assure them of our country's appreciation for their service and personal sacrifice.

Comdr. John Bill went to his eternal reward June 9, 1972 and we extend our heartfelt sympathy to his wife Helen and daughter Joann.

Mr. Speaker, Commander Bill was indeed a most admirable and compassionate man who gave readily and willingly of himself in all of his life's endeavors in pursuit of a better life for all mankind. The quality of his leadership and the richness of his wisdom are now lastingly etched in the creed and purpose of the Disabled American Veterans.

May I present to you and our colleagues the farewell message to John Bill which was forwarded to me by the Honorable Lloyd Marsh, commander of Passaic Chapter No. 1 of the Disabled American Veterans and appeared in the June 15, 1972, issue of the prestigious newspaper in our congressional district, the Passaic Citizen.

A MAN TO REMEMBER

John W. Bill, one of the most beloved men in New Jersey, cast a giant shadow over his time and beyond it, because his life was a service to others.

Veterans and friends attended services Monday night for the 75-year-old organizer of the Disabled American Veterans in New Jersey, who died Friday in Toms River.

Mr. Bill, a native-born Passaic man, was the retired National Service Officer of Newark regional office, DAV. Back in 1921, several years after World War 1, he met with 12 disabled veterans in the old municipal building on Howe Ave. He had just returned from Cincinnati, Ohio, after taking part in organizing and founding the National Disabled American Veterans Association.

The birth of the DAV in New Jersey started with Passaic Chapter 1 and was properly headed by Mr. Bill as its first commander.

Under the dedicated guidance and leadership of John Bill, the chapter moved ahead. Now it has a membership of 450.

In 1922 he became the first state DAV Commander. In this capacity, he was instrumental in establishing the national service organization, which is now recognized as one of the finest and most successful service departments in the nation.

After more than half a century of devotion and service to the DAV, Mr. Bill retired three years ago as the National Service Officer. But he stayed active in DAV affairs. At the time of his death, he was chairman of the state DAV Legislation and Civil Service Committee.

The officials and members of National State and Chapters of the DAV who met Monday night to take part in memorial services for John Bill at the Kedz Funeral Home in Toms River, are an indication of the high esteem in which he was held.

People, whether veterans or non-veterans, responded on a personal basis to John Bill. He was instantly likeable to vast numbers of people.

And it was this personal quality, as much as his good ideas and his energetic follow-through, that made it possible for him to achieve so much on behalf of the Disabled American Veterans he served for half a century.

The Disabled American Veterans are in his debt for the many benefits he, working with other leaders around the nation, was able to get on the books. Countless thousands of veterans' families are much better off today because of what he has done, especially in the early days when everything was new and untried and there were no guidelines for veterans leaders to follow.

Now, thanks to John Bill, there are guidelines, so that those who follow have clear paths toward worthwhile objectives that aid the Disabled Veterans. Those same guidelines are used, in principle, by leaders in other veteran organizations. One may say with truth that all veterans and their families today enjoy better lives because of what John Bill stood for and because of what he did.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join with me in silent prayer to the memory of John Bill. May his family soon find abiding comfort in the faith that God has given them and in the knowledge that Commander Bill is now under His eternal care. May he rest in peace.

THE JOB OF PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER IS HAZARDOUS

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the job of the public safety officer in this country is a very hazardous one indeed. Having been a police officer in New York for 23 years, I am well aware of the dangers which these men face every day. I have, therefore, introduced legislation which would grant to police officers, firemen, correction officers, auxiliary police, and volunteer firemen, a $50,000 death benefit to their beneficiaries in the event they are killed in the line of duty. Second, my bill would provide for a $50,000 gratuity to police officers, auxiliary police, and volunteer firemen who are totally disabled as a result of injuries received in the line of duty. A proportionately reduced amount would be awarded these officers in the event they suffer a partial disability which arises from injuries received in the line of duty.

That is the substance of the bill, but let us take a look at the substance of the problem.

In testimony before the House Judiciary Committee virtually every witness, including myself, pointed to the shocking statistics concerning this problem. In 1969, for example, a total of 35,202 policemen were stabbed, beaten, shot by a firearm, or otherwise assaulted while performing their duties. Moreover, 126 local, county, and State law-enforcement officers were killed as a result of felonious criminal action last year.

In addition, 115 professional firemen died in the line of duty and 38,583 firefighters were injured. The same situation exists for the auxiliary police, volunteer firemen, and correction officers.

While these statistics point out the extent of the problem numerically, they do not explain the suffering and the heartbreak sustained by the families of these men. They do not explain the financial difficulties which follow these tragedies. This is the problem which my bill is designed to correct. It is quite easy to bestow awards on these grief-stricken widows and children, but it would be far better to express our appreciation in more practical terms—by enacting legislation which would provide for their financial security.

Mr. Speaker, when I reintroduced my bill on June 29, 1972, I expanded the coverage of its provisions to include not only full-time policemen and firemen, but also to correction officers, auxiliary police, and volunteer firemen who have been the victims of violent acts.

In our large cities across the country, there are numerous units that are becoming a necessary addition to our overworked police officers and firemen. These are the men who make up the auxiliary police and fire forces. In today's hostile world, these men are called upon to face the same dangers encountered by our regular police and fire forces and they too can become victims of the same dastardly acts. Perhaps because of voluntary service—performed without compensation—their cause is even more deserving. In addition my bill also covers correction officers. The uprising at Attica last September where 11 guards were killed, is an example of the necessity of including these men under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, last year more than 120 families of police officers alone suffered personal agonies aand financial hardships caused by an assassin's bullet or knife. While we all hope for the sake of the country that this figure is reduced radically in the coming years, preliminary statistics appear to dim our hopes in this regard.

I urge the Judiciary Committee to report out this legislation and give my colleagues a chance to vote on this measure. The police officers, firemen, correction officers, auxiliary police, and volunteer firemen of this Nation and their families deserve a program such as I have described. They have done a terrific job of protecting the public and this is the least that we can do in return.

NATIONAL INCONVENIENCED SPORTSMEN'S ASSOCIATION

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports is supporting a most worthy new organization named the "National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association." The word "inconvenienced" includes amputees, blind, deaf and neurologically damaged.

Traditionally programs of assistance "handicapped" Americans are oriented toward medical aid, formal education, counseling and financial assistance. Although numerous national organizations exist to support the "inconvenienced," little is being done to provide frequent sports participation opportunities. Sports participation has provided many people the psychological vehicle to return from the point of traumatic depression to healthy productive citizenry. The opportunity for thousands of needy Americans, be they amputees, blind, deaf or neurologically damaged, to have an equal chance is everyone's responsibility.

I have introduced H.R. 15453, to incorporate in the District of Columbia, the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association. Because this legislation has been classified, under parliamentary procedure, as private rather than public, it is not possible for other Members to cosponsor. However, the following Members have asked to be listed as endorsing this bill: Mr. BLANTON, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GUDE, Mr. LINK, Mr. MIKVA and Mr. SHOUP.

The Subcommittee on Judiciary of the District of Columbia Committee has scheduled a hearing for Tuesday, August 8 at 10:30 a.m. in the committee room.

IMPROVING CONGRESSIONAL PERFORMANCE

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe it to be a continuing responsibility of Congress to avoid unnecessary secrecy, patent infirmity or nondisclosure of personal financial interests that involve demonstrable conflict of interest. Accordingly, I am today introducing four bills to meet minimum requirements in these categories in the following respects:

First. To require annual physical examination of all Members of Congress, which shall be a public record.

Second. To require disclosure of any financial interest in excess of $25,000 in any property subject to government regulation and control, on a continuing basis and as a matter of public record.

Third. To encourage voluntary retirement of Members who have attained their 70th birthday, and by constitutional amendment to make mandatory the retirement of Members after their 75th birthday by making individuals of that age ineligible for election or appointment.

The matter of physical condition should be a public record. Those who do not want their physical condition known have an easy solution—do not be a candidate for public office. It is a part of the job and a part of responsibility to constituents to keep them advised concerning the actual physical condition of those who seek election as Members of Congress. The President's condition is an open book, as it rightly should be. The same should apply to lesser elected officials who ask public endorsement to make the policy and programs of our Government.

Hopefully, the committee to which this legislation is assigned will see fit to add a similar requirement for nonincumbent candidates for the Senate and House applicable in general elections if not in primaries.

I urge adoption of these proposals as a matter of genuine urgency in the interests of improving congressional reputation and performance.

The text of the separate bills is as follows:

H.J. RES. 1271

Joint resolution providing for annual health examinations for Members of Congress and publication of the results thereof, and for other purposes

Whereas, the problem of physical and mental qualification for high public office

is a recurring one and of profound public importance; and,

Whereas, in addition to educational and professional qualifications, the public is entitled to assess the physical and mental qualifications of those holding high public office; and,

Whereas, it is in the public interest that no person who is in serious ill health, from whatever cause, shall or should, hold high public office whether by appointment or election, Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the attending physician at the United States Capitol shall conduct annual physical examinations of each Member of Congress and shall keep a detailed record of the results thereof. He shall make available for public inspection at reasonable times in his office the records of all such examinations. The attending physician shall inform each Member of Congress as to the time and place at which such physical examinations are scheduled to be given to him. Any such Member who refuses or fails to take such examination at the time and place specified shall automatically forfeit his then existing committee assignment or assignments and shall be ineligible for any further committee assignments until he has taken such examination. If any Member of Congress does not take such annual physical examination, the attending physician shall duly record this fact and make information to that effect available for public inspection in the same manner as the information regarding the physical examinations. As used in this Act, the term "Member of Congress" means a Representative, Delegate or Resident Commissioner in the House of Representatives and a United States Senator.

H.R. 16174

A bill to provide for the reporting by Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of individual assets in property subject to Government regulation or control in excess of $25,000

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) at the beginning of each Congress beginning on or after January 3, 1973—

(1) each Member of, and Delegate to, or Resident Commissioner in, the House of Representatives shall file with the Clerk of the House; and

(2) each United States Senator shall file with the Secretary of the Senate; a report listing each of his individual holdings of property or any interest therein of fair market value in excess of $25,000.00 which is subject to federal control or regulation, appropriately itemized and identified, owned or controlled by him alone, or by him jointly with another, or by his wife or lineal descendants, including any such asset held in a trust of which he or his family is beneficiary. Should any subsequent qualifying asset acquisition occur, he shall report such acquisition within ten days after the occurrence thereof, to the Clerk of the House or Secretary of the Senate, as the case may be.

(b) The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly shall prescribe regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(c) The Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate shall make available all information filed in their respective offices under this Act for public inspection at reasonable times in those offices.

SEC. 2. (a) Any person who knowingly and willfully files false information under this Act shall be fined not more than $50,000.

(b) Any person who fails to comply with the filing requirement under this Act by the date prescribed by the first section of this Act shall be fined, for each day of noncompliance, in an amount equal to one day's pay from the United States.

H.R. 16175

A bill to provide reduced retirement benefits for Members of Congress who remain in office after attaining seventy years of age

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 8339 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(n) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the annuity of a Member (other than the Vice President) retiring after January 3, 1975 under the first sentence of section 8336(f) of this title, is reduced by 10 percent of the full annuity to which the Member otherwise is entitled under such sentence for each full year by which the age of the Member at the time of retirement exceeds 70 years.".

(b) Section 8341 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(h) The annuity of a surviving spouse, widow, widower, or child authorized by this section is computed without regard to section 8339(n) of this title.".

H.J. RES. 1272

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide an age limit for Senators and Representatives

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. After the ratification of this article, no person who has attained the age of seventy-five years shall be eligible for election or appointment to the office of Senator or Representative."

PROBLEMS OF INDEPENDENT OIL PRODUCER

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, recently I received word from an independent oil producer in my north Texas district relating cost comparisons between running his business today and running it just after World War II. I would like to share it with the House, and therefore request permission to insert it in the RECORD.

Today the leaders of America seem to ignore the contributions of the oil industry and its kingpin—the independent. Carrying the Nation through two World Wars, numerous national emergencies, and fueling the most rapid technological advance of mankind's history, the oil industry has now become the convenient target of some politicians and a variety of self-styled reformists. Government policy appears more and more to be to abandon the entire oil industry, and the small independent operator along with it.

I urge every Member of Congress to study these figures which Mr. Houtchens has sent me. They tell a straight story.

ELECTRA, TEXAS,

July 20, 9172.

Hon. GRAHAM PURCELL,
House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PURCELL: I, as an independent oil man of the past seventeen years, would like to express my personal concern for the Independent Operator.

When I first began in this business pipe line companies were buying oil for $3.15 per barrel and workover rigs were approximately $10.00 per hour and roustabout labor was running about $1.60 per hour. Today oil is selling for $3.55 per barrel, workover rigs approximately $17.50 per hour and labor about $2.75 per hour.

Add to this the fact that the oil is depleting at a very fast rate and it won't be too much longer till the Independent Producer is to the point where it will be hard for him to recover.

If the pipe line companies would realize our situation and give a price increase we could once again operate more profitable.

I think all America should be made aware of the situation and your interest and help in this problem will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

D. D. HOUTCHENS.

WASHINGTON HOCKEY TEAM?

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have become increasingly aware of the thirst of the citizens of the Washington, D.C., area for professional sports. They want a team, their own team, and they want it soon.

Sports fans were recently overjoyed to learn that the National Hockey League had awarded a franchise to Metropolitan Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that so many of our colleagues in the House signed my petition to the National Hockey League urging that they award this area a franchise. This victory was coupled with the agreement to bring the Baltimore Bullets to Metropolitan Washington.

Now the question is: Where will they play? Mr. Speaker, I have fought on many fronts to have the arena built in Largo, Md., and in a recent editorial, WWDC agrees with my position that the Largo site is the only feasible place for the new arena. Mr. Speaker, I insert that editorial into the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

WASHINGTON HOCKEY TEAM

Broadcast of this editorial by Larry Matthews, News Director of WWDC on June 9, 1972. We welcome comments at 587–0347.

Welcome to the National Hockey League. Washington is back on the road to major league sports. The NHL has granted us a franchise for the season beginning in 1974, and it looks as though the NBA Baltimore Bullets will be coming down the parkway at the same time.

The last pro basketball team we had died

for lack of a decent place to play. If that sort of situation is to be prevented this time around somebody had better get to work on some kind of sports arena right away . . . a place we can live with a long time, a place convenient enough for everyone, a place with enough room to park.

We think that place is in suburban Maryland, not in downtown Washington where small businessmen will be hustled out of their neighborhoods. If Congress wants to build a convention center downtown, fine. We'll put our sports money on a private developer who doesn't have to squirm through years of Congressional haggling to get something done. Our hockey and basketball teams will be ready in two years; we doubt that Congress could even get the preliminary planning for an arena out of the way by then.

Thank you for your interest.

SECRETARY LAIRD ANNOUNCES DRAFT WILL END BY JUNE 30, 1973

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when Melvin R. Laird began his tenure as Secretary of Defense, he promised an all-out effort to achieve the President's goal of ending the draft. While the critics scoffed, Mel Laird persisted in pushing through the most significant package of personnel reforms ever witnessed by the Armed Forces.

The skeptics, however, consistently noted the unwillingness of Defense Department spokesmen to firmly commit the administration to a definite date for terminating compulsory military service. But on July 31, 1972, Secretary Laird put all such doubts to rest:

We are going to make the transition so that on June 30 of next year we will be in a volunteer situation . . .

• • • • •

Those that do serve should be adequately compensated on a fair and equitable basis and those labor costs should show up in the Defense budget and we should stop using conscript labor to use and meet the national security requirements of our country.

Mr. Speaker, the action of the Secretary in setting a specific time frame for the expiration of conscription is indeed a momentous occasion. While there is much that I should like to say at this point in time, I merely wish to offer a simple "Congratulations Mr. Secretary on a job well done," and commend his speech to your attention:

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE MELVIN R. LAIRD ADDRESSES ROTC SUMMER TRAINING AT INDIANTOWN GAP MILITARY RESERVATION, PA., JULY 31, 1972

Secretary Laird: Thank you very much. I appreciate this opportunity to visit with the ROTC Cadets that are here at Indiantown Gap. I've had the opportunity to be here before as Member of Congress some six years ago when there was some talk about changing over this particular training spot and making some changes. After that trip it was agreed that we would keep this facility open for a period of time and the Executive Branch yielded to Congressional pressure at that particular time. I was part of that Congressional pressure.

I'm here today to try to dramatize as best as I can, the importance of the ROTC program as we begin another school year. We have a waiting list of universities and colleges that are interested in taking this program on and we are doing, I believe, very well in maintaining our enrollment. Next year, I hope that there's some women here at this training program as far as your Army is concerned, because we have equal and fair treatment for all individuals as far as the Services are concerned. We're moving in the direction of moving up the Army, as the Air Force has already done, to ROTC training for women as well as men.

I'm from a political background, as all of you know. I was for nine terms in the Congress of the United States, the House of Representatives, and then have served as Secretary of Defense these past 3½ years. There's one thing that's a great asset. Don't let anybody mislead you about that. Military service is one of the first things a Democrat or a Republican lists as one of their qualifications to go forward in public life. When people are looking for a job or a job opportunity after they get out of college or after they finish their other training pursuit, whether it be in vocational education or high school technical programs, one of the first things that you'll see on any job application, one of the things is looked at by employers and personnel managers all over this country, is the fact that a young person has had some of the military training, some of the discipline that goes along with military training, and so I think that's one of the things we should be talking about.

We're changing in teh Department of Defense for the first time since 1939. Since 1939, as all of you know, the manpower requirement as far as the Department of Defense is concerned has been made up of conscript labor, where young people did not have a choice. Each time there was a manpower problem in the Department of Defense, be it in the Army, Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, all the personnel officers had to do was just look to Selective Service and say, well, we can fill those requirements by putting a little more pressure on as far as Selective Service is concerned.

The military was not adequately paid or adequately compensated as compared with other segments of our society. Since 1939 that manpower problem has been taken care of that way. We are making the change and we are going to make the transition so that on June 30 of next year we will be in a volunteer situation, and we're moving in that direction as you know. When I became Secretary of Defense, 300,000 young people were taken into military service through the Selective Service and many more were draft-motivated. We reduced that to 200,000 the first year; then 100,000; and 50,000 this year; and we will go to zero by June 30. We've done that by making some of the incentives available to young men and to young women, and we've put almost the entire peace dividend as we've changed from war and wound down the war in Southeast Asia; as we've removed over 500,000 men, we've taken this savings that has come about there and put them almost entirely into manpower. So that all you have to do is look at the manpower costs in 1965, when we were spending $21 billion in this manpower area, but we've done it because we believe that one out of ten, under a volunteer service, which we will reach next year, one out of ten young men and women that are needed for military service should be compensated just as other people in our society are compensated for the kind of jobs that they're doing.

Their job is just as important as other professional jobs are in our society, because the national security requirements which are the requirements that we have to maintain the foreign policy objectives of our country, to meet the obligations of our four multilateral and four bilateral treaty arrangements which have been confirmed and approved under our Constitutional process by the United States Senate, those obligations have to be met, they have to be met by young men and women who are willing to serve in our military services. But everyone isn't going to be required to serve, but those that do serve should be adequately compensated on a fair and equitable basis and those labor costs should show up in the Defense budget and we should stop using conscript labor to use and meet the national security requirements of our country.

So you go back, and some of you will be going back to your college campuses, I hope that you will discuss with your fellow students the importance of adequately financing in the Defense budget the manpower costs; adequately compensating those young men and women who've given us this foreign policy tool that is so important. It's absolutely essential, I think, that we not take any back seat from anyone in stressing the importance of truly reflecting our labor costs for manpower in the DoD budget, and not using other means of taxing our young people to perform this important labor which is so necessary to the safety and security of our people.

I've talked too long. I just wanted to express to you my appreciation as Secretary of Defense for the contribution all of you are making, and to hope that you will never take a back seat in looking upon your mission, your training, with pride, because I know I'm proud to be associated with you, and the important work which we have in restoring peace and maintaining peace for the years to come.

Thank you.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT URGENTLY NEEDED

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a House resolution to establish a standing Committee on the Environment. Joining me are 10 of my colleagues, bringing to 215 the number of Congressmen now sponsoring this important proposal.

I cannot overemphasize the urgency of the House's establishing a standing Committee on the Environment this year so that it will be possible for it to be operational at the outset of the 93d Congress in January. The record of the current Congress is dramatic proof of the need for important environmental legislation to go to one standing committee for disposal. As was noted last week by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, 14 pieces of major environmental legislation have been pending since February 1971. A similar experience occurred in the 91st Congress.

As the chief sponsor of the resolution to create a standing Committee on the Environment, I do not mean to minimize the fine environmental legislation which has passed after having first been considered by the existing committees of the House. The point is, however, that we can do better, and we owe it to the Ameri-

can people to do better. The one act of consolidating environmental jurisdiction in one standing committee of the House could be the one act which enables the Congress to move to the forefront of the fight for a quality environment.

At the present time, committee after committee has jurisdiction over various environmental proposals. This fragmentation has taken its toll in the past and will do so even more in the future as additional environmental legislation is proposed. In both the 91st and 92d Congresses, the House and Senate each passed proposals for the creation of a Joint Committee on the Environment. In neither instance, however, have conferees agreed on a resolution of differences between the House and Senate approaches. During the debate on the joint committee proposal, I pointed out that such a step would be useful in sorting out the maze of environmental legislation, but that what was truly needed was a standing committee with legislative authority. To date, of course, we have neither the standing committee nor the joint committee.

There is still time, Mr. Speaker, for the House to act on the standing committee proposal this year. Today, I have been joined by 100 of the 215 sponsors of the standing committee in requesting the Rules Committee, by way of a letter to its chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. COLMER), to hold hearings on this matter.

The important proposals on air pollution, water pollution, solid waste disposal, herbicide and pesticide problems, and the energy crisis tend to be interrelated. They should be considered within the confines of one standing committee which is able to sort through the proliferating number of environmental bills in a timely and workmanlike fashion.

New standing committees are rarely established. But, times do change, and what might have once seemed like a sensible, all-encompassing committee structure now finds itself unable to respond to the concerns of the American public for legislation to maintain and improve the quality of our environment in a rational and coherent manner.

The Environmental Protection Agency was assembled from 15 subagencies in the executive branch because we in the Congress recognized the inability of the earlier alignment to be responsive to the just concerns of the American people. The Congress should effect a similar restructuring. I again urge, Mr. Speaker, that this be undertaken before the start of the 93d Congress.

RESULTS OF POLL PRESENTED

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to present the results from my 10th annual public opinion poll of my constituents in the 10th District of North Carolina. This survey was distributed to all households in the district, and I was very pleased at the response which I received. A total of 12,426 persons responded to the poll.

The poll consisted of 18 questions which covered a broad range of issues before the Congress and the American people. I asked both husband and wife to indicate their views, as I know that there is often a difference of opinion within families.

The question which elicited the strongest response concerned compulsory busing of schoolchildren to achieve racial balance. Ninety-five percent of those responding to the poll opposed compulsory busing. This issue is, obviously, a very serious one to the people of the 10th District.

Of almost equal concern was the question regarding the removal of Congressmen and Senators from office for excessive unauthorized absences. My constituents are concerned with the high rate of absenteeism among some Members of the House and Senate, and feel that the business of the Nation is sometimes neglected.

I was interested to note that the question on which the greatest difference of opinion between men and women was expressed was that regarding amnesty for draft evaders. Twenty-three percent of the men favored amnesty, while among women this figure rose to 32 percent.

There were two questions on which the respondents to the poll were nearly evenly divided. One concerned barring the sale of handguns which are unsuitable for lawful sporting purposes, with 50 percent of men and 54 percent of women favoring such a ban on handgun sales. On the question of continued U.S. air support for South Vietnam after U.S. ground troops have been withdrawn, 52 percent of men and 46 percent of women favored such support.

The detailed results of the poll follows:

[In percent]

	His		Hers	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Do you favor compulsory busing of children in order to achieve racial balance?	4.6	95.4	4.7	95.3
2. Do you favor continued wage and price controls in order to combat inflation?	84.8	15.2	84.9	15.1
3. Do you favor income tax credit for part of the cost of higher education?	61.5	38.5	62.2	37.8
4. Do you favor the automatic adjustment of social security benefits and taxes to cost-of-living increases?	76.6	23.4	84.0	16.0
5. Should the United States extend diplomatic recognition to the People's Republic of China?	73.2	26.8	70.9	29.1
6. Would you favor amnesty for those who have left the country to evade the draft, with the requirement that they participate in some alternative service such as VISTA, Public Health Service, or a Veterans' Administration hospital?	23.3	76.7	32.0	68.0
7. Do you favor Federal legislation that would require compulsory arbitration to end strikes which affect the national economy?	89.2	10.8	90.1	9.9
8. Do you favor a program of "no fault" automobile insurance through which damage and injury claims would be paid without regard to the party at fault?	71.9	28.1	68.4	31.6
9. Do you favor increased Federal financing for the establishment of day care centers for working mothers?	31.8	68.2	37.6	62.4
10. Would you favor new Federal legislation to implement safety standards for potentially hazardous products?	86.2	13.8	89.2	10.8
11. Would you favor strong antipollution standards even though they may cause some industrial plants to shut down?	72.9	27.1	74.1	25.9
12. Should Congressmen and Senators be removed from office for excessive unauthorized absences?	95.0	5.0	95.2	4.8
13. Should the possession and use of marihuana by adults be legalized?	11.3	88.7	9.6	90.4
14. Should the Congress establish minimum standards for private pension plans?	54.6	45.4	54.9	45.1
15. Do you favor legislation defining the powers of the Congress and the President to commit U.S. military forces abroad?	67.8	32.2	69.7	30.3
16. Do you favor increased Federal funds for the development of rural areas, including public facilities, housing and job opportunities?	43.7	56.3	45.3	54.7
17. Do you favor continued U.S. air support for South Vietnam after U.S. ground troops have been withdrawn?	52.0	48.0	46.4	53.6
18. Do you favor Federal legislation barring the sale of handguns which are unsuitable for lawful sporting purposes?	50.4	49.6	54.5	45.5

HONORS FOR 1ST MARINE DIVISION

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to the Maryland Chapter of the First Marine Division Association, Inc., as it prepares to celebrate the 30th anniversary of the initial landing of the 1st Marine Division on Guadalcanal, August 7, 1942.

Many of the members of the Maryland chapter landed at Guadalcanal, where a powerful Japanese air base was then located. These Marines fought one of the most bloody Pacific campaigns, in which the Allies overpowered the Japanese and secured our position in the South Pacific.

The First Marine Division Association, Inc., was presented by the mayor of Baltimore with a 50-star ceremonial flag on December 10, 1971. Since that day, the flag has been on a "sentimental journey" to the South Pacific. It has flown in Australia, Guadalcanal, the British Solomon Islands Protectorate, and Suva, Fiji Islands. On Monday, August 7, the flag will be flown for the first time within the continental United States at Fort McHenry, the birthplace of "The Star-Spangled Banner." Subsequently, the

flag will continue its journey to areas where the 1st Marine Division has fought to preserve freedom and dignity for all.

I am proud to participate in this ceremony honoring the landing and our flag. As an old friend and admirer of the Marines, I also want to honor the First Marine Division Association members who fought in World War II, thus helping to win our right to fly our flag and to continue our system of democratic government which the flag symbolizes.

The First Marine Division Association will hold its annual reunion in Baltimore, for the first time, in 1973. I should like to honor the men who are donating their time and efforts to organize the 30th anniversary celebration and the 1973 reunion.

BALTIMORE REUNION COMMITTEE OF FIRST MARINE DIVISION ASSOCIATION, INC.

CHAIRMAN

Walter T. Costello.

DIRECTOR OF INFORMATION

George C. Moran.

MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE

James L. McElhinney.
Bertrand Bedford.
Frank Snyder.
Charles Greif.
Joseph Humberson.
Robert Wolfe.
Lon Rowlette.
John Andrews.
Herman Reedy.
Herman Malin.
Joseph Lorber.
Edward Metz.
William Wentworth.
Gordon LaRicci.
Robert Mitchell.
William Wellham
Allen Bramble.
Philip Gerwig.
Gary T. Noble.

ADVISORY BOARD

Captain E. C. Clarke.
1st Sergeant R. A. Romeo.
Donald Pomerleau.
James F. Mutscheller.
Colonel R. J. Schening.

REFLECTIONS ON COMMUNICATION AND AUTISTIC CHILDREN

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, an educator from Chicago, Barbara Seizmore, once said:

Give me a child who can speak, and I can teach him how to read.

Unfortunately, there are many children in our country who are unable to speak, who are unable to communicate. They are autistic children, born with a complex illness which we have only recently begun to seriously study and treat.

I have inserted in the RECORD several articles on autistic children in past months. Today, I would like to call attention to a study which appeared in the January-March issue of the Journal of Autism and Childhood Schizophrenia about autistic children and communication.

The article, "Reflections on Communication and Autistic Children" by Mildred Creak, follows:

REFLECTIONS ON COMMUNICATION AND AUTISTIC CHILDREN

(By Mildred Creak [1])

All observers agree that a major defect shown by autistic children is their inability to communicate. Communication[2] is often lacking even in children who eventually show improvement and develop an adequate use of speech. I shall stress this to indicate that while many remain mute or use an idiosyncratic form of speech, it is not so much the words but "relatedness" and the outgoing social initiative and response that are so noticeably absent.

Kanner (1944) used the expression "extreme autistic aloneness which, wherever possible, disregards, ignores, shuts out anything that comes to the child from outside." This emphasis on a defensive reaction toward incoming stimulation was often interpreted as implying a negative response, a thrust away; this has perhaps delayed attempts to explain the phenomenon in terms of the inner and personal meaning (if any) to the child, of normal social contact. Bender (1960) emphasized this point in relation to therapy by saying that "the therapeutic approach should strive to help the struggling and terror-stricken personality to tolerate the malignancy of a disorder which disturbs all of its inner experiences." In an earlier paper, Potter (1933) considered that speech "through incoherence and diminution, sometimes to the extent of mutism," was important as evidence of disturbed thinking.

We are thus faced with the basic problem: Do we speak because we think, as is usually assumed, or do we think because we speak? The situation, of course, is not as simple nor as unified as that, and cannot be answered as a single alternative. Nevertheless, we are coming to see more and more clearly that the full experience of human communication is something not limited to the use of correct words.

We are well familiar with the barrier to communication caused by cerebral damage. When this occurs before or during birth, it may entirely prevent speech function from developing. The extent to which it prevents a cruder form of communication depends on many factors, ranging from the level of undamaged potential for intellectual development to the achievement of the complex neuro-muscular control required in the act of speaking or writing words. Easier to understand is the block caused by deafness when the input of verbal stimuli has to find a new way, whether by means of a hearing aid, lip-reading or sign language. The surprising thing is to discover how relatively easy communication can become when an intelligent, but "deaf-and-dumb" person is all intent on receiving the message. Even this desire had to be forcibly awakened in Helen Keller when she was first taken on by Miss Sullivan. We must continue to wonder how many potential Helen Kellers we may have missed by not forcing the door open soon enough.

Perhaps this crudely simple resume of the present trend of thinking about autism and communication may be enough to remind us of the enormous gap between the behavior of nerve cells within the brain and the accumulation of understanding, of storage, and of consequent thoughts and ideas which form the essence of adult human communication. This point was vividly focused for me in a chance reading from the writings of Isaac Penington (1616–1679):

"And the end of words is to bring men to the knowledge of things beyond what words can utter. So learn of the Lord to make a right use of the scriptures. . . ."

That remark by one of the early Quakers may be understood in its context which had nothing to do with noncommunicating children. But if we think about Penington's sentence it may help us to put words, language and communication in a proper perspective in the maze of human functioning.

It will be recalled that the second of the nine points,[3] perhaps the one most often criticized and questioned, attempted to put into words the autistic child's lack of self-identity. The expression used was "apparent unawareness of his own personal identity to a degree inappropriate to his age." In a paper dealing with the theory of parent-infant relationship, Winnicott (1960) used a similar context to illustrate how warm and interested maternal care permitted dependence while leading on to independence (perhaps involvement is a better word than dependence):

"The ego support of the maternal care enables the infant to live and develop in spite of his being not yet able to control, or to feel responsible for what is good and bad in the environment . . . a phase in which the infant depends on maternal care that is based on maternal empathy rather than on understanding of what is or could be verbally expressed . . . the infant ego eventually becomes free of the mother's ego support, so that the infant achieves mental detachment from the mother, that is differentiation into a separate personal self."

This suggests that the establishment of a sense of personal identity derives from close warm care which permits the growth of this small human plant to the point of emergence into a relatively independent and personal life of its own. It is perhaps not without significance that this individuation occurs before, but leads on to the stage of verbal expression, very simple at first but all the time increasing in range and complexity.

Turning again to the nine points, the definition of point (1) went to some pains to link Mahler's (Mahler, Furer, & Settledge, 1959) concept of the autistic child's symbiosis with the mother figure (an attachment which is seen to owe nothing to communication) with what Kanner calls "autistic aloneness," and to place both in the category of imparied emotional relationships. Clinging is not a warmly felt awareness of a protecting person, and the aloneness is not shown as a graduation to independence. Nor is it the positive outgoing protest and hostility shown by the normal infant when from time to time his loving figure prevents him from doing something potentially detrimental that he wants. It is the lack of any accompanying personal involvement, dare we say communication, which seems again so characteristic of the autistic child.

Turning for further guidance to a strictly neurological basis related to the act of self-awareness, I came across a paragraph in a Wayneflete lecture by John Carew Eccles (1952) which seemed to suggest a possible link:[4]

"Another word that needs comment is 'self.' It will be used to connote a unity that derives from a linking by memory of conscious states that are experienced at widely different times . . . spread over a lifetime. Thus, in order that a 'self' may exist, there must be some continuity of mental experiences and, particularly, continuity bridging the gaps of unconsciousness. . . .[5] On the other hand, mental experiences restricted to the so-called 'specious present' exist without such continuity of memory linkage. In a brief interval of time, we have a multitude of transient mental experiences *that are not linked together* (Eccles' italics) and vanish past all recall in a few seconds. Perhaps such mental experiences are all that animals

---

Footnotes at end of article.

and very young children have, all their learning processes being subconscious and strictly speaking unremembered, *hence they would lack a self* (my italics) as defined above."

These widely differing quotations may seem to have little to do with the problem of communication manifested by the young autistic child, but they may go some way to bring together certain clinical aspects with which we are familiar. Were it the case that a basic fault lay in the capacity to record experiences and thus to build up meaningful concepts, we could begin to see the inner life of an autistic child as a series of interruptions, all unrelated, without meaning and therefore disturbing. Each unrecorded pattern is erased as soon as it happens. You could think of it as nothing leads to anything, or even that anything leads to nothing.

These speculations began as a result of a visit paid to me by an adult autistic boy and his two parents:

"He is now approaching the age of 20 and was 5 when I first saw him. The boy has never been without speech but tended to be repetitive at an early age, learning and repeating rhymes and songs rather than conversing. He lives at home, has no social life but earns a living with routine machine-tool work. Skilled when he has learned what to do, the boy shows no initiative. He makes no friends and his chief interests are the underground railway, which he knows like the back of his hand, and also traction engines. It is difficult not to feel bored at a certain empty unresponsiveness in his very restricted conversation."

We decided to take photographs in the garden, particularly one of all three standing beside a plant they admired. He persistently stood too far off to come into the picture until finally I said: "Stand in here, between mother and father." He seemed puzzled and annoyed and walked away so that we had to do without that one. This ordinary incident prompted me to think: I came to the conclusion that his irritation resulted from my incomprehensible request. I had, after all, asked him to "stand in," to "stand here," and to "stand between." How could he possibly do all three? Nor had he any idea of *why* a photograph requires grouping, distance, and focusing. Put that way with no linkages and no resultant visual concept of what I could mean, it was indeed an incomprehensible, and therefore disturbing request. So he moved away from it, but in an entirely different manner from some one registering impatience, boredom, or simply lack of interest. Nor did he question, or seek an explanation. In other words, communication failed.

At this point, I should like to refer to a recent conference held in London on February 26, 1972. Rather a small seminar than a conference, it was entitled Communication in Psychotic Children. The group, small enough to encourage a frank dialogue, comprised participants with extensive clinical experience in diagnosing, caring for, and attempting to treat psychotic children.[6] The gathering provided an opportunity for an open and challenging exchange of ideas, also allowing us to take a look at the new frontiers in research.

The subject was communication or lack of it. It was pointed out that autistic children not only fail to communicate, but also fail to receive our attempts to communicate with them. This may be so at a simple level:

"A small boy (able to speak in a limited way), clutching his pants, asked his teacher: 'May he go toilet,' to which she replied 'Yes' and again 'Yes, certainly' with no result. Not until she said 'You may go toilet' was he able to accept, and took himself off with evident relief. Surely here was a comparable situation to the failure to respond to 'stand in here. . . .'?"

This focused attention on how meaningful concepts are built up in the developing child, with a word of warning about the complexity (in terms of neurological communication) of the systems that are involved. Language is clearly not built up from a series of anatomical centers—*the* speech center, *the* hearing center—being damaged or delayed in the developmental pattern, but a complex fault in building up a communication system with a meaningful part to play in that individual's life. How and when is such information stored and recorded, so that it becomes meaningfully linked with subsequent happenings? One has the impression that the autistic child is bombarded with a welter of meaningless stimulation, speech fails to communicate, and inevitably attention is not gained or is positively rejected.

At the present time, sophisticated EEG work (Hutt, Hutt, Lee, & Ounsted, 1965) sought to explain this, or at least link it with EEG evidence suggesting a state of over-arousal. This research had led to consideration of the role of the reticular activating system, but it was clear that to regard this as an answer was totally inadequate. The Hutts and their associates believed there might be both a defensive under-arousal, and an over-arousal which flooded the receptive system resulting in widespread and extending inhibition, thus preventing learning and memory. The experience, as well as trauma, could also prove useless as an act of communication. They referred both to possibly connected biochemical faults and to certain ways in which the EEGs of autistic children resemble those of infants. Much of this work is being reviewed and revised in view of changing concepts. Nevertheless, a sound clinical approach can only be made by the accumulation and sifting of such evidence. Do we really know how normal children learn to think? We know they do so, sometimes eagerly, often in a confused or tentative way, and it is rare in the normal child to have this happen without a verbal clue from time to time. Indeed, if the more recent approaches to the problem of early autistic patterns (as shown in children before speech has begun) have taken a definite and lasting direction in the last 5 years, it is to support the view that the basic handicap is built in, and that much of the resulting emotional distortion (which indeed can be infectious to the family as a whole) is secondary.

This concept was expressed in an unusual way by one of the speakers at the aforementioned seminar who likened human speech to "a sort of human preening, to get yourself accepted." This is a great deal less frivolous than it sounds. Thinking back over many years' work with autistic children reminds me that in their intense loneliness (a point always made by Kanner) they appeared not only to have nothing to communicate, and nothing to communicate with, but also seemed to have no urge or direction toward acquiring these elemental human attributes.

Following two papers which emphasized that no positive help can be given without some to-and-fro communication between therapist and patient, Lawrence Bartak gave a more detailed account of autistic behavior in relation to communication.[7] A number of views leading back to the entire concept of the role of communication in human life were expressed. For the autistic child, the degree of understanding as to what is expected of him will be reflected in the degree of autistic withdrawal and disturbance that he shows. When, as so frequently, he fails to understand the demand, he may show more disturbance. If he can understand, there is often a decrease in such behavior and he will go ahead to do what is asked of him. This implies that much of the time the autistic child is neither simply unwilling nor involved but wholly at a loss. So his confusion overflows into increased autistic behavior.

The language faults often show "impaired ability to comprehend components of phrase structure" (as in the garden story); this will also impede the children's understanding of anything complex in the speech of those trying to communicate with them. Bartak suggested that one might go further than this and question whether the autistic child can regard speech as more than yet another noise impingeing on his consciousness. The child may indeed be unaware of communication as a normal human exercise. While methods that aim at introducing speech and language may actually succeed, they obviously must be actively linked to an understanding of the meaning of the imparted instruction to "hear" and "understand."

This brought me back to where I began, namely a deeper awareness of the autistic child's built-in difficulties. It is as if the echoes and the inward associations of things said fail to attach themselves to any growing awareness of the personal and social relatedness we all develop towards the world in which we grow up. In this situation, such children create for themselves an emptiness so that those of us who love them, or seek to care for them or improve their lot, will find ourselves nearly as lost as our patients. There the story might end were it not for the massive investigation and research into this difficult area of abnormal development patterns in early childhood. Would it be too bold an assumption to suggest that the nature of communication, what it means to the human being, and how it gets established in each individual, is possibly the key note to the whole?

FOOTNOTES

[1] Requests for reprints should be sent to Dr. Mildred Creak, 36 Brookswood Lane, Welwyn Garden City, Herts, England.

[2] The word *communication* is used here in its widest sense, implying not only speech, but also an emotional response and demand for attention, linked with some degree of receptive awareness of stimuli.

[3] Reference to the descriptive statements of the British Working Party (Creak et al., 1961) headed by the author (Ed.).

[4] Again having nothing to do with autistic children, the Wayneflete lectures were focused speculations suggesting a neurophysiological basis of the mind.

[5] To illustrate this point, Eccles instances sleep, concussion and convulsions.

[6] Significantly, the opening remarks stressed that the variously-used terms "early childhood autism," "schizophrenic syndrom," and "psychotic child" cover a clinical area which cannot be precisely defined.

[7] See also Rutter, Bartak, and Newman (1971).

EROSION AND SEDIMENTATION IN TRIBUTARY STREAMS

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, virtually all of our water supply—4.75 billion acre-feet for the coterminous United States in the average year—arrives as precipitation upon the land. When rains fall and water flows over the land, the running water is completely indiscriminate; it will pick up and move anything in its path and it will silt wherever it may flow.

This is how erosion and sedimentation are caused, and this is the reason why an estimated 4 billion tons of topsoil annually are washed from our Nation's land

into the waterways, where the silt and chemicals become the worst polluter of all. Erosion and sedimentation problems are naturally aggravated in the spring, when rains are heaviest and combine with winter thaws to produce extensive flooding.

Though the most spectacular damage occurs in the downstream areas where problems reach their greatest magnitude, 56 percent of the total damage caused by floodwater and related erosion occurs in the upstream tributary areas of our Nation's watersheds. This same damage constitutes between 75 and 85 percent of all floodwater damages to agricultural concerns. The term "flood" is not synonymous with some specific rate of flow. What may be a flood at one section of the stream may be well-contained flow at another section. Flooding will result from a reduction in channel capacity because of any of a number of physical conditions, such as reduction in gradient, barriers to flow, meander or changes in direction, an undefined channel, or the siltation of a channel.

Flooding might be induced at one section through the upstream channel characteristics that tend to speed up flow. The removal of some barrier by force of the flow, or magnification of the hydraulics of a reach through scouring, for example, may speed up flows to the extent that subsequent sections downstream cannot carry them. Thus the flooded section may shift over a period of years from one place to another along a stream bed that is not stable.

Estimates prepared by the S.C.S. in 1952 indicated that the annual losses to agriculture from flooding were then about $557 million. Losses themselves are of several kinds: damage to crops and pastures; land damage from floodplain scour, streambank erosion, and gully trenching; damage to farm buildings, fences, roads, stored crops, and livestock; and indirect losses such as delays in field work and disruptions in the marketing of farm products.

While the floodwaters themselves can cause more noticeable damage, the erosion and siltation of streambanks is by no means dependent upon floodwaters, and is more continuous, and in some cases, even harder to control. A recent study by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers shows that approximately 549,000 miles, or 8 percent of the Nation's 7 million miles of streambank, are being damaged in some degree. Of the damaged streambank areas, possibly 148,000 miles are already in need of extensive remedial measures. Damages resulting from erosion alone in these reaches are estimated to total some $90 million annually, half from sediment damage, a third from land losses, and the remainder from other types of damages. Sediment produced by erosion is deposited downstream where it damages productive floodplain land, clogs streams and channels, harms fish and wildlife habitat, covers streets and roadways, damages buildings in cities and towns, and fills rivers and harbors. This sediment must come from the streambank, and the loss of land to erosion represents a serious problem. The Virginia Tidal Riverbank Erosion Survey, covering 951 miles of riverbanks, showed 221 miles of riverbank with an average recession rate of at least 1.85 feet per year.

It has been estimated that up to 84 percent of sediment damages could be reduced by the installation of proper protective and maintenance measures. Many of these measures needed for stabilization of watershed lands, however, are too complex for landowners to install, or the benefits will be so long deferred that it is unreasonable to expect that very many landowners will do the needed jobs without assistance. Basic soil conservation practices through simple vegetative and mechanical measures can help in controlling the problem of streambank erosion. Practices such as contour tillage, stripcropping, and minor structural measures such as gully plugs help to reduce the amount of water that runs off the land and over the streambanks into the stream. However, major improvements in streambank erosion control require extensive outlays of time and resources.

As a general rule, streambank protection requires frequent and expensive maintenance, and involves all the elements of planning, design, and supervision of a major flood control structure. Occassionally a meandering or braided stream may form a new channel, bypassing existing bank protection or stabilization structures. The nature of bank protection often requires that a single project may cover many miles and may pass through several political boundaries. When such projects are turned over to local interests, construction and maintenance costs may be more than they can bear.

The present watershed program, under Public Law 566, has failed to provide the resources and the direction needed in our efforts to control flooding and erosion on the tributaries of major rivers. In some cases, Federal moneys have been spent in planning and construction, and the local agencies have failed to keep up adequate maintenance programs. In other cases, local agencies have developed comprehensive and imaginative plans, only to be stymied by delay and indecision by the Federal Government.

I have introduced a bill, H.R. 15596, which would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make direct, binding agreements with people involved in all levels of the watershed program—from local landowners up through other Federal agencies. These agreements, as vehicles for utilizing local imagination and energy as well as the resources provided in the bill, should insure that everyone involved in each project has a clear understanding of what measures will be taken. In order to guarantee that the agreements will produce positive results, my bill provides that the Secretary must require the local agencies to bear at least 25 percent of the construction costs, acquire the needed land rights, make arrangements for defraying operating costs, and bear proportionate costs of engineering and administrative services.

This bill provides the means for making resources available where they are needed, and it includes guarantees that each program will be completed as planned. The flooding and erosion of our Nation's streambanks will not wait for the present program to produce results, and the problems become more serious as time passes. I sincerely hope that my bill will be passed so that we can begin to attack the problems of siltation and pollution in our Nation's waterways.

THE POLICE LEGAL UNIT

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the August 1972 edition of the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin which was just sent to me by my good friend, L. Patrick Gray III, Acting Director of the FBI, contained an article entitled the "Police Legal Unit" written by the Director of the Dallas, Tex., Criminal Justice Interface Division of the local police department. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include this article.

The article follows:

THE POLICE LEGAL UNIT

(By Edwin D. Heath, Jr.)

The need for police legal units has been clearly demonstrated during the past few years. With the advent of the so-called "criminal law revolution," police administrators have more than ever been required to formulate policy in areas where legislative or judicial direction is new, nonexistent, unclear, or in need of administrative implementation. Further, the complexity of the police enforcement function in the criminal justice system requires a higher degree of legal knowledge and direct legal advice than ever before.

The American Bar Association, in "Standards Relating to the Urban Police Function," has stated:

"Given the nature of the police function, police administrators should be provided with in-house police legal advisors who have the personal orientation and expertise necessary to equip them to play a major role in the planning and in the development and continued assessment of operating policies and training programs."

The requirement for newer, law-related training programs pertinent to changes in the criminal law and judicial trends deserves a significant role in police training today. The police administrator must clearly understand that his agency is only a part of the criminal justice system. While it can certainly be described as the first line, it cannot operate in a vacuum, without proper legal direction and training and development of new plans and programs for the future. The police legal adviser and his unit can provide this necessary assistance and expertise.

HISTORY OF THE POLICE LEGAL UNIT

The first police legal unit, known as the "Law Library," was established by the New York City Police Department in 1907. This unit was under the supervision of an attorney who was a member of the police force.

The Texas Department of Public Safety had a legal officer known as the "chief clerk" as early as 1935, and the Indiana State Police established a legal unit in 1941, as a part of what was then their training division. Other police agencies developed legal units in various forms; but as late as 1967 there were only approximately 14 units in the entire United States, and six of these were

staffed with part-time employees. The Federal Bureau of Investigation appointed a legal officer about 1945, established a legal research unit in its Training Division in 1961, and gave this unit separate status in 1971 as the Office of Legal Counsel, under the supervision of an Assistant Director of the FBI.

It was not until 1967 that the issue of the police legal unit was clearly raised by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice. Both "The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society" and "Task Force Report: The Police" articulated the positive need to provide police administrators with in-house police legal advisers.

Following the reports of the President's Commission, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) of the U.S. Department of Justice began a Federal program to fund new police legal units. Since 1969 the number of police legal units has grown from approximately 20 to more than 80 local units, with over 120 full- and part-time licensed attorneys. Two-year funding is still available through the LEAA for local police agencies with 75 or more sworn personnel.

In addition to programs funded by the LEAA, the Northwestern University School of Law began a 2-year training program for police legal advisers in 1964. Originally designed to provide a combined course of on-the-job training and classroom study leading to a master of laws degree, this program was re-funded in 1968 by the Ford Foundation for a period of 3 years. The curriculum was shortened to 6 months and the requirements for a master's degree deleted in an effort to devote more time to on-the-job training during the school year. While this program was small in scope, it provided the necessary impetus for establishment of police legal units on a local basis.

In 1971 the program for training police legal advisers was transferred from Northwestern University to the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), where a police legal center was established to serve as a clearinghouse for training and information. Short courses offering legal adviser-type training are currently available annually from the Northwestern University Traffic Institute, the IACP, and the FBI.

While the police legal advisers have held an annual conference since 1966, the IACP formally established a legal officers section in 1972 and made these meetings a part of the annual IACP Conference.

THE DALLAS LEGAL UNIT

The Dallas Police Department established its first legal unit on January 6, 1970. The unit was named the legal liaison division and staffed by two directors of police—both licensed attorneys, sworn law enforcement officers, and graduates of the FBI National Academy—and one stenographer.

The legal liaison division was established for the following purposes:

To provide consultive legal services to the chief of police, the assistant chiefs of police, supervisory officers, and other personnel of the Dallas Police Department.

To provide liaison services between the Dallas Police Department and the offices of the city attorney, district attorney, and Federal prosecuting agencies.

To provide liaison with the Dallas Bar Association and the State Bar of Texas on legal matters affecting police operation.

To assist the department director of training in preparation of material on legal subjects.

To assist in the development of departmental policy, general and special orders, and rules and regulations affecting procedures of the department.

To assist in legal proceedings affecting departmental personnel, as requested by the city attorney and/or the district attorney, and when specifically directed by the chief of police.

To assist on special projects and programs established by the chief of police.

The Dallas Police Department, with the active participation of the legal liaison division, formally established a legislative program for the 1971 regular session of the Texas Legislature. Some of the feature points of this program included requests for authorization of a State wiretap bill similar to the Federal provision, changes in the search warrant law and Texas confession law, a provision for denial of bail to recidivist offenders, and a provision to tighten the statutes on receiving and concealing stolen property. While this program was to a large extent unsuccessful, it had a tremendous impact upon both the public and some members of the Texas Legislature. Although many police agencies seem reluctant to speak for the needs of law enforcement in the legislative field, the Dallas Police Department will continue to assert the need for improved legislation to aid law enforcement in the administration of criminal justice.

Other activities of the legal liaison division have included consultation with investigative personnel on complex legal issues arising in involved criminal investigations. Limited assistance is provided to uniformed personnel, particularly in those cases involving special enforcement or civil disturbance issues.

The division is regularly involved in police education, including training of new recruits and inservice training. Departmental training material on the laws of arrest has been revised by the division, and the material on laws of search and seizure is currently being revised. A legal bulletin has been established, with the objective of keeping departmental personnel advised of current judicial changes affecting police activity.

LIAISON WITH OTHER AGENCIES

One of the most important functions of the police legal unit, in addition to its liaison with other criminal justice agencies, such as the city attorney, the district attorney or county prosecutor, the courts, the Federal attorney, and local bar groups, is communication with police-community relations units. The Dallas legal unit has heavily involved itself in learning of community relations programs and accomplishments.

One of the most promising programs of the Dallas Police Department is the community effort known as "Operation: Get Involved!" The purpose of this progam is to establish citizen committees on each police "beat." These committees meet at least once a month with the local beat officer to discuss the crime situation and other police-related problems of the individual areas, as well as the city as a whole. This group of interested citizens has provided tremendous support to departmental programs through interest in legislation, improved police service, and understanding city government goals. This program has greatly enhanced community relations in Dallas.

FUTURE PLANS

On March 28, 1972, with a departmental reorganization, the name of the Dallas Legal liaison Division was changed to Criminal Justice Interface Division. While the primary duties remain the same, the purpose of the reorganization, as it affected the legal unit, was to provide for expansion of legal services within the department and to interface the efforts of the department with other agencies of the criminal justice system. Funding for this expanded program will be carried out under an impact grant of the LEAA received in 1972.

Plans are still in the developmental stage; however, the future will see an increase in the number of attorneys assigned to the Criminal Justice Interface Division for the purpose of providing direct legal assistance to officers on the street from arrest through prosecution. Results of arrests will be systematically reviewed in order to determine if any deficiency exists in police practice and in the subsequent handling of each case by prosecutors, the courts, and the corrections process. Attention will be specifically directed toward improved case preparation and improved procedures involving recidivists, organized crime, crimes of violence, and offenders on probation and/or parole. Administrative policies and procedures will be reviewed relative to criminal justice problems; and additional training will be emphasized at patrol and investigative levels, as well as at the levels of supervisory and command officers. A program will also be implemented to train legal technicians who will work directly with uniformed and other field officers on routine legal matters.

By providing liaison and direct support to all segments of the criminal justice system, the Dallas Police Department will be better able to analyze its own practices, policies, and enforcement efforts. Cooperation has always been the lifeblood of effective law enforcement. The Criminal Justice Interface Division of the Dallas police is enhancing this proven concept with the legal expertise so necessary to the complexities of modern law enforcement.

FARM PRICES PEAK IN JULY

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, with cattle and hog levels helping to push July along, this was the second record month in a row for farm prices. Compared with a year ago, farm prices were 13 percent higher than July 1971. This is extremely good news for farmers generally. I attach herewith an article titled, "Farm Prices Rise to Peak in Month" in the August 1 issue of the New York Times. I am sure all my colleagues will be glad to read it:

FARM PRICES RISE TO PEAK IN MONTH

WASHINGTON, July 31.—Further increases for cattle and hogs helped send farm prices in July to a record for the second consecutive month, the Agriculture Department reported today.

The July index for raw farm products was up 1.5 per cent, the department said. In June the index also rose 1.5 per cent to break a record set in February, 1951.

Compared with a year ago, farm prices in July were 13 per cent higher.

Officials said higher prices for hogs, cattle, potatoes, eggs, milk and onions contributed to most of the increase.

Lower prices were reported for cotton, peaches, lettuce, grapefruit, hay, tomatoes, and oranges.

Administration price curbs do not apply to raw products sold by farmers, and middlemen can pass added costs on to consumers.

The July index was reported at 323 per cent of a 1910–14 base used to measure farm prices. In June, the index rose to 317 per cent, exceeding the former high of 313 set during the Korean War more than 20 years ago.

HOG LEVELS RISE

Meanwhile, farm expenses in July rose 1 per cent and averaged 6 per cent more than a year earlier, the Crop Reporting Board said. The expense index also rose 1 per cent in June.

Cattle averaged $34.60 per 100 pounds of live weight at mid-July—a record compared

with $34.20 in June, the former record, and with $28.50 a year earlier.

Hogs averaged $27.50 per 100 pounds, equaling the high set in February, 1970. In June, hogs averaged $25.40 and a year earlier they averaged $19.00.

A comparison of farm-product prices and costs, expressed as a parity ratio based on the 1910–14 formula, was 75 per cent in July, compared with 73 in June and 69 a year earlier.

Under the parity guideline, prices farmers receive and pay out are theoretically in harmony when the 1910–14 ratio is 100 per cent.

A more recent measure, using 1967 as a base, showed the ratio at 100 per cent in July, compared with 99 in June and 93 a year earlier.

Prices farmers received in July averaged 127 per cent of the 1967 base, and expenses 127 per cent, compared with 125 and 126 in June.

RED CHINA'S NEW OPIUM WAR

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, now that the Peking regime has gained entrance to the United Nations, and trade with that Communist stronghold is being considered, let us not lose sight of the fact that Red China ranks today as probably the world's leading producer and pusher of narcotics.

Under leave to extend my remarks I will include an article written by Eric Brodin which appeared in the Mainichi Daily News, Japan, on July 23, 1972. It will be noted that Mr. Brodin raises the question of whether the United Nation's newest member can reconcile membership of such an organization with its growing, production, and export, of narcotic drugs destined for markets where they will do most harm?

The article follows:

CHINA'S NEW OPIUM WAR: LARGE AREAS DEVOTED TO OPIUM PRODUCTION

(By Eric Brodin)

GENEVA (FWF).—Communist China was not a member of the United Nations when the U.N. Commission on Narcotic Drugs held its 24th meeting here in September and October last year. Had it been, there is good reason to believe that the Chinese would have boycotted the meeting. The reason is obvious. China is today one of the world's largest producers and exporters of opium and heroin, and this has come about as a result of a deliberate policy.

Peking leaders have reason to recall how, at one time, the "white devils" from the Western world imposed the opium habit on the Chinese. Chairman Mao Tse-tung remembered this in 1928 when he was instructing his first cadres, the members of which had just fled from Hunan Province to the Chingkanshan mountain area in Kiangsi Province. He ordered them to get busy and plant the poppy for large-scale opium production. Full-scale planting of the poppy was achieved by 1935. The civil war between the Nationalists and the Communists, plus the Japanese occupation, hampered the production plans. By October 1949, however, the Communist leaders gave secret instructions to all provinces to pay particular attention to opium production—for future export. Since 1958 this activity has been an important feature of the crops produced on state-operated farms. But the export of opium had begun by 1950.

Proof of this was revealed at last year's Geneva meeting when the British delegation to the U.N. Commission produced a letter, dated October 1950, in which 500 tons of opium were offered for sale—"on generous terms"—to the Hong Kong division of Imperial Chemical Industries (ICI). The British delegation affirmed that this offer had been rejected. The opium in question was described as having a morphine content of between eight and 11 per cent and came from the Jehol area of China.

China's production and export of opium has been growing since 1952. From about that time it appears that the Chinese Communists have been using their drug exports as a political weapon. Perhaps the most direct confirmation of this policy was received by the late President Nasser, of Egypt, during a conversation he had with Chinese Premier Chou En-lai at a meeting on June 23, 1965. (This conversation was recalled by Nasser's close friend and editor of Cairo's Al Ahram newspaper, Mohammed Hassanein Heykal, in an article published by London's Sunday Telegraph on October 24, 1971.)

Heykal wrote that the Chinese Premier had been discussing the United States military presence in Vietnam with Nasser. Far from expressing unhappiness about the soldiers being there, Chou expressed the hope that even more American servicemen would be sent to the war zone. "Some of them are trying opium and we are helping them," Nasser was told, according to Heykal. "We are planting the best kind of opium especially for the American soldiers in Vietnam," the Chinese leader had added.

DEMORALIZATION PLAN

These fateful words have been reflected in newspaper headlines around the world—headlines such as "U.S. soldiers use of drugs growing in Vietnam," "Drugged soldier shoots comrade," and so on. Although the number of U.S. servicemen in Vietnam has been drastically reduced, the Chinese leaders have today succeeded in their goal—"to demoralize them . . . because the effect this demoralization is going to have on the United States will be far greater than anyone realizes," as Chou En-lai told President Nasser back in 1965.

It is understood that in its current program, China has designated 179 counties as important areas for poppy-growing. Some 60 state-operated farms are devoted to the crop, 318 communes cultivate it, while 72 manufacturing plants attend to the refining of the drugs. Export figures vary with demand and the need for foreign currency. But annual production levels have increased from about 2,000 tons in 1952 to more than 10,000 today. At the moment there are some 5,830,000 acres of land under cultivation.

According to a report in the Manila Evening News of May 29, 1971, China uses four main outlet areas for its trafficking. They are Shanghai, Macao, parts of South-East Asia plus Korea and Japan.

The seriousness of this international trafficking of dangerous drugs was emphasized at a meeting of the International Criminal Police Association, in September of last year, when members were told that the estimated total value of drugs annually exported from China amounted to a staggering 800 million U.S. dollars.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mothers 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 1,757 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

DES: A CASE STUDY OF REGULATORY ABDICATION

HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues a very timely and revealing journal article on the regulation of the cancer-promoting drug, diethylstilbestrol—DES—which is widely used as a feed additive to stimulate weight gain in cattle and sheep. The article, written by Nicholas Wade, is entitled "DES: A Case Study of Regulatory Abdication," and appears in the July 28, 1972, issue of Science, the official publication of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Mr. Speaker, on June 20, 1972, I called attention on the House floor to the extraordinary action announced 4 days earlier by FDA Commissioner Edwards in connection with DES. The Commissioner had announced that FDA would shortly publish a proposal in the Federal Register to withdraw approval of the new drug application for the use of DES in animal feed, but stated that FDA does not have sufficient information to act in this matter and is proposing the order to ban DES only as a means of accumulating additional information at a public hearing.

As I had informed the House, this is a curious approach to law enforcement. Either FDA has the necessary evidence to ban DES as a feed additive, in which case the agency has the responsibility to take forthright action, or else it is not justified in beginning a formal revocation procedure of this kind before obtaining such information. Congress has given FDA ample resources to develop the necessary evidence prior to taking regulatory action.

It is an indisputable fact that DES has been shown to cause cancer in numerous species of animals and was associated early last year with a form of cancer in young women. It is also well established that DES residues have been found for some time, and continue to be found increasingly, in the livers of cattle and sheep which have been fed mixes containing DES.

It is the FDA Commissioner's responsibility to enforce the law on the basis of the evidence as it relates to the carcinogenecity of DES and the existence of residues. These are the only relevant regulatory issues. I believe FDA now has the evidence upon which to make a decision in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, this is a most serious matter. The American people, acting through Congress, have declared total war on that most dreaded enemy—cancer. Congress and the President have joined forces to make available what-

ever resources can be spent effectively for the conquest of cancer. One of the major targets in this fight is the identification of chemical carcinogens and their removal from our food supply and our environment. It has been conclusively demonstrated that DES is a powerful chemical that is carcinogenic. There is incontestible evidence that it has been found and continues to be found increasingly in the livers of animals fed this drug.

The Science article follows:

DES: A CASE STUDY OF REGULATORY ABDICATION

(By Nicholas Wade)

A restaurant worker in New York was so fond of chicken that he had for his supper each night the necks left over from the birds consumed by the patrons. At that time, in the 1950's, the poultry industry was producing a particularly tender-meated chicken called a caponette, whose soft flesh was the result not of castration, as in the capon, but of the implantation of a pellet of diethylstilbestrol, or DES. The DES, a synthetic chemical that mimics the action of the natural female sex hormones, was implanted in the young chickens' necks. On his diet of caponettes' necks, the New York restaurant worker attained immortality as a medical textbook example of gynecomastia—the growth of female-sized breasts on a man. Last year DES itself made medical history in what the *New England Journal of Medicine* described as a "unique situation in human oncology." A hitherto extremely rare kind of vaginal cancer was noticed in eight young women admitted to a Massachusetts hospital. Their only point in common was that some 20 years previously they had all, as fetuses, been exposed to DES (in one case to a related chemical) when their mothers were treated with it to prevent a threatened abortion.

DES is a chemical of bizarre and far-reaching properties, chief of which is that it is a spectacularly dangerous carcinogen. Some 22 countries have taken steps to ensure they do without DES in their food supply. The hormone is a regular ingredient of the American diet because the federal government permits its use as an additive in cattle feed. Fed so some 75 percent of the 30 million cattle slaughtered each year, DES makes the animals fatten faster and on less grain, thereby saving cattlemen some $90 million yearly. In the past 9 months, the chemical has enjoyed a crescendo of notoriety—culminating in hearings last week before Senator Kennedy's health subcommittee—because residues of DES in possibly cancer-causing quantities continue to this day to appear in beef.

The attempts of the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and the Department of Agriculture (USDA) to protect the consumer from DES form an illuminating case study of the use of scientific information in regulatory decision-making. The DES case also illustrates the gulf between the present law and rational policy, as well as the basic and as yet unresolved dilemma of food protection: Is there a "no effect" level at which a carcinogen can safely be allowed in food?

The history of the attempt to control DES is a record that includes negligence, deception, and suppression by the USDA and prevarication by the FDA. DES was first approved for use in cattle in 1954, with the condition that it be withdrawn from feed 48 hours before slaughter so that none would remain in the meat. Under the law, the FDA was supposed to recommend a method for detecting DES in meat, and the USDA was to inspect meat. For 11 years, until 1965, neither agency bothered to check meat for DES on a regular basis. This abdication was in spite of the clearest warning signals. For example, in 1959 the National Cancer Institute advised that "it would seem the better part of reason to exclude this known potent carcinogen from our diet and to eliminate such food additive practices as have been shown to lead to any detectable residues . . . in our food."

The methods available in 1959 were good enough to pick up DES residues in poultry but not in sheep or cattle. The Delaney anticancer law of 1958 says unambiguously that no known carcinogen shall be allowed in food, so the FDA had no option but to prohibit the use of the hormone in poultry. It was clearly only a matter of time before detection methods improved sufficiently to pick up DES residues in beef and mutton. The FDA was not hurrying, however, and in 1962 someone persuaded Congress to emasculate the Delaney law as it affected DES. The new clause, a piece of fine-print chicanery known as Section 512(d)(1)(H) of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, said that it is okay to feed carcinogens to meat animals, as long as no residue is left in the meat when the chemical is used according to label directions that are "reasonably certain to be followed in practice." In other words, if you find DES in meat, that's the fault of the farmer for "disobeying" the "reasonable" regulations. So don't ban DES, jail the farmer.

The loophole didn't face any test until 1965, the first year the USDA started to check beef regularly for DES. Even then, the USDA's anxiety about DES remained less than extreme, as is illustrated by the case of John N. S. White, a former USDA meat inspector in Los Angeles. Noticing that cows fed particularly heavy doses of DES developed anatomical abnormalities, White prepared a scientific article suggesting that DES should be more strictly controlled. He was told not to publish it. When he persisted he received the following encouragement in a letter from a USDA personnel officer:

"I have before me a file disclosing that you acted contrary to supervisory instructions by offering for publication an article entitled 'The Effect of Feeding Stilbestrol to Beef Cattle.' . . . You are hereby reprimanded for failure to follow supervisory instructions and conduct causing embarrassment to the Department. You are also warned that a repetition of this type of offense could result in severe disciplinary action and very possibly removal."

White eventually got his article published, by the expedient of quitting the USDA.

When the USDA did start looking for DES residues in meat, it used an analytical method capable of detecting DES down to levels of 10 parts per billion (ppb). Only the year before, in 1964, DES had been shown to cause tumors in mice when fed at a level of 6.5 ppb, and the "no effect" level, if any, had not been discovered, then or since. Hence even meat shown to be clear of DES by the USDA's method could still contain dangerous quantities of DES. Little wonder that a senior USDA chemist described the method as a "regulatory control chemist's nightmare."

It was the nightmare, nonetheless, which allowed the DES issue to slumber on for 7 years more. Maybe because of the coarseness of the detection method, the USDA did not bother to test more than a perfunctory number of samples each year, even though DES turned up in a suggestive quantity. In 1966, the USDA found DES in 1.1 percent of 1023 samples. Since some 30 million cattle are slaughtered each year, 1023 is not too healthy a sample from which to draw statistically valid conclusions. A reasonable step to ensure that DES was not contaminating the public's beef might have been to increase the sample size. Yet in 1967 the USDA tested only 495 samples, 2.6 percent of which contained DES. In 1968 545 samples were taken, in 1969 505, and in 1970 only 192.

The USDA's sampling program showed every appearance of dwindling to the vanishing point in a few more years. For 1971, however, the USDA actually increased its sample size to 6000, yet by some strange circumstance found DES residues in none. That, at least, is what USDA Assistant Secretary Richard Lyng told Senator William Proxmire (D-Wis.) on 31 August. The truth was that DES had been detected in ten animals, in quantities up to 37 parts per billion (ppb), but a lower official had ordered these results to be suppressed. The explanation proffered when this became known was that the residues were not to be reported until confirmed by a second method of analysis. No second method was available, so the results had not been reported. In his letter of apology to Senator Proxmire, Lyng called the episode an "inexcusable error" and a "gross malpractice."

In a critique of the DES case, Harrison Welford, of Ralph Nader's Center for the Study of Responsive Law, concludes that up until April 1971, some 17 years after DES was first approved for use in cattle, "neither the USDA nor the FDA could make a serious estimate of how much DES was getting into the nation's beef. This result is an object lesson in the ways bureaucracy can silently evade the consumer protection mandates of Congress," Welford says.*

The cases of vaginal cancer discovered in April 1971 suggested that the silent evasion policy had nearly outrun its usefulness. When the USDA admitted in October that it had, after all, been finding DES in beef, the FDA had a crisis on its hands. For a start, the Natural Resources Defense Council filed a suit requiring the FDA to ban DES. The residues of DES being found in beef were confined to the liver and averaged typically 2 ppb—the lower limit of the new detection technique. This concentration of DES amounts to about 0.3 microgram for a 150-gram serving of liver, a quantity that represents an appreciable addition to a woman's own natural supply of estrogen. Whether or not regular exposure to such quantities of DES represents a cancer hazard no one knows, but witnesses from the National Cancer Institute and elsewhere have advised that it would be prudent to avoid such exposure.

The FDA's response to the crisis last October was not to ban DES, but to lengthen from 2 to 7 days, the mandatory period between the withdrawal of DES from a cow's feed and the time of the animal's slaughter. The continuing presence of DES residues in beef could have been either because it took longer than 2 days for DES to be cleared from an animal's system or because some cattlemen were breaking the law by neglecting to withdraw DES before slaughter. Which explanation had the FDA acted on? If the latter, a cattleman who neglected to withdraw DES had just the same chance of being caught—about 1 in 5000—whether the withdrawal period was 2 days or 7. Did the FDA then have scientific evidence to indicate that the 2-day withdrawal period was insufficient? Apparently not. In a hearing on 11 November before Congressman L. H. Fountain's (D–N.C.) subcommittee on intergovernmental relations, the commissioner of the FDA, Charles C. Edwards, explained that "sound scientific data" supported the belief that DES is cleared from an animal's system within 2 days. This may have been belief at the top of the FDA hierarchy; at humbler levels there was doubt if even the new 7 day period was long enough for DES to be cleared. According to a position paper drafted on 8 February 1972 by A. J. Kowalk and R. L. Gillespie, scientists in the FDA's Division of Toxicology, a single experiment formed "practically the only evidence to support a 7-day withdrawal period." This study is "weak scientific justification," Kowalk and Gillespie said, because only one animal was used, only a single dose of DES was fed, and half the drug could not be accounted for. And far from justifying a 7-

* H. Welford, *Sowing the Wind* (Grossman, New York, in press).

day withdrawal period, the data even from this experiment could be interpreted to indictate that residues of DES will remain in the animal for longer than 7 days.

The practical value of the FDA's 7-day withdrawal period was no less contentious than its scientific basis. Roy Hertz, of Rockefeller University, an adviser to the FDA at the time that DES was banned from use in poultry, opined to the Fountain subcommittee last October that the new 7-day withdrawal period would be even harder to enforce than the 2-day period. He categorized the FDA's new procedures as "unfeasible and impractical and ill-advised" because they would increase rather than reduce the hazards of exposure to DES. The only justification for using DES in cattle would be under threat of famine, Hertz said.

"We are absolutely convinced that, if we do have and enforce sound controls, DES can be used safely and effectively," Edwards proclaimed. But it was Hertz's predictions that were correct, DES, which appeared in 0.5 percent of the samples tested in 1971, is at present being found in 2 percent (admittedly the USDA's testing procedure has also grown more sensitive over the same period). In the week ending on 24 June, DES was found in an outstanding 10 percent of all samples tested. As for the threat of famine, under which the saving of grain by use of DES might make some sense, the present wheat surpluses are the highest in a decade, even though farmers were paid $1 billion this year not to grow wheat.

At the hearings before Fountain's subcommittee on 11 November and 13 December, the FDA's basic game plan was to rely on Section 512 (d) (1) (H) the specially created loophole for DES. To objections that, legalisms aside, a potent carcinogen was nevertheless getting into people's food, the FDA's response was, first, that DES is no more carcinogenic than the natural estrogens and, second, that a carcinogen ingested in small enough doses can reasonably be regarded as safe. When it was pointed out that Congress had passed the Delaney clause specifically to protect the public against this kind of judgment, the FDA scuttled back into its Section 512 (d) (1) (H) bolthole. And when asked what would happen if the new regulations failed to prevent DES from turning up in food, Edwards stated categorically that he would have no choice but to ban DES immediately.

Although the FDA is supposed to be protecting the consumer against the manufacturer no less than vice versa, FDA witnesses at the Fountain hearings seemed to be grasping at any straw to defend DES, even the assertion that to ban DES would create more animal excrement, leading to the eutrophication of lakes and streams. A less absurd bulwark of the FDA's defense is the contention that, for any carcinogen, there exists a dose sufficiently low that, for all practical purposes, it is safe. On this issue a diversity of voices is heard. On the one hand, two committees of independent experts have advised that, once a substance is agreed to be a true carcinogen, then none, or for all practical purposes none, of it shall be allowed in food.†

† The two committees are the Ad Hoc Committee on the Evaluation of Low Levels of Environmental Chemical Carcinogens, which reported to the surgeon general on 22 April 1970, and the Panel on Carcinogenesis of the FDA Advisory Committee on Protocols for Safety Evaluation, which reported in December 1969. The former committee, chaired by Umberto Saffiotti of the National Cancer Institute, said zero carcinogens should be allowed in food; the latter committee, chaired by Norton Nelson of the New York University Medical Center, opted for "levels which are the practical equivalent of zero."

HOW LITTLE IS ENOUGH?

On the other hand, the Food Protection Committee of the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) states in a 1969 report that under certain conditions people of sound toxicological judgment can ascertain "toxicologically insignificant" levels of a chemical. Any claim by the NAS food protection committee to be an independent, unbiased, and representative body of experts must be weighed against the fact that it is supported by grants from the food, chemical, and packaging industries, and five of the nine scientists who prepared the 1969 report were employed by food or chemical companies.

Which side did the FDA favor, Fountain asked during the DES hearings. "We cannot, with confidence determine what a practical safe level would be of a carcinogen," the FDA said in written response. "However . . . we must be pragmatic." The FDA "accepts and endorses the Delaney clause." On the other hand, "arbitrarily to ban foods that contain miniscule amounts of known [cancer-]inducing factors would lead to chaos and an inordinate waste of vitally needed food." Who could doubt just where the FDA stood on this vital issue?

"If we find the new program is not going to work," FDA commissioner Edwards told Fountain last December, "... we will take immediate steps to ban this particular drug from the animal food supply." Five months later, when DES residues had not increased but quadrupled, it was time for the FDA to deliver on its promise. On 16 June, Edwards announced that he would hold a public hearing in order for the FDA to "make absolutely certain it has all the facts." The only legal mechanism for holding a hearing is for the FDA to propose to withdraw the drug, as has been done. But formalities apart, it appears that even now the FDA has not decided to ban DES. "We have not yet concluded that withdrawal of approval for DES is the appropriate course of action," Edwards said in his 16 June announcement.

The FDA's decision to hold hearings on DES did not please everyone. Fountain dismissed it as "merely a tactic for delaying the regulatory action which the law requires." And the new head of the National Cancer Institute, Frank J. Rauscher, courageously took public exception to the policy of his fellow bureaucrat. Anything that adds to man's carcinogenic burden should be eliminated if possible, Rauscher told Morton Mintz of the Washington *Post*, and it would be "prudent" to eliminate DES pending the outcome of the FDA's public hearing.

Why has the FDA invested so much credit in the defense of a mediocre and probably unwinnable cause? Cynics have observed that the Administration has been visibly concerned about the rising price of meat in an election year, and the banning of DES would cause a small but perceptible rise—3.85 cents per pound—in the price of beef. The circumstance that the FDA's present course of action will probably not lead to a decision on DES until shortly after 7 November does not in itself invalidate this explanation. Another consideration the FDA may have in mind is that if they cannot hold the line with DES, which has a legal loophole tailored for it, a lot of other chemicals may fall domino-like into the jaws of the Delaney clause: "Des will not be the only substance to generate these kinds of issues," Edwards complained darkly to Kennedy's subcommittee. More important, perhaps, the defense of the carcinogenic food additive is a self-sustaining activity, from which the FDA can withdraw only at the price of admitting that the critics were right all along.

THE WILLOWS DAILY JOURNAL'S UNCOMMON EDITORIAL POLICY

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, recently there occurred an interesting exchange between Editor Edwin F. Davis and Lyon Evans, both of the Daily Journal of Willows, Calif.

On July 19 Editor Davis wrote an editorial accusing Senator McGOVERN of winning the Democratic nomination by a power play at the Democratic Convention. On July 24 Lyon Evans responded on the same editorial page to the Davis editorial. What is noteworthy about this exchange is not the substance of the columns, although both articles are examples of excellent argumentative discourse. The importance of these two articles lies in their publication on the same editorial page of the same newspaper.

In a day and age of media conglomerates and monolithic editorial policies it is heartening to see a small town newspaper with the courage to openly display its staff disagreements.

In recent years we have seen a dramatic decrease in the number of daily newspapers. New York can now only boast of two daily newspapers; Washington has also recently been reduced to two dailies. In San Francisco the two major newspapers are owned by the same company. As if this media conglomeration is not disturbing enough, too often papers refuse to publish alternative points of view on their editorial page. Minority views are usually expressed infrequently, and even then, they are seldom granted prime editorial space.

My congratulations to the editors of the Willows Daily Journal. Their enlightened editorial policies should serve as an example to the larger, more influential metropolitan newspapers of the country.

At this point in the RECORD I insert the column by Lyon Evans, entitled "McGovern Win No 'Power Play'," from the July 24, 1972 Willows Daily Journal. Unfortunately, a filing oversight prevents the insertion of the editorial by Publisher Edwin Davis.

The article follows:

MCGOVERN WIN NO "POWER PLAY"

(By Lyon Evans)

In an editorial published on this page July 19, editor Edwin F. Davis accused Sen. George McGovern of "winning" the Democratic nomination by a "power play" at the Democratic convention.

"Having . . . declared himself publicly as "winner or spoiler," Mr. Davis wrote, "Senator McGovern followed up his threat with sheer intimidation (at the convention) to ensure himself of favorable rulings from the chair."

In the belief that "there is nothing so powerful as the truth," I should like to correct the distortions contained in this statement, set the record straight regarding the McGovern nomination, and, in the process, help restore the Daily Journal to the path of enlightened journalism to which it usually aspires.

Briefly, Mr. Davis contended that McGovern won the nomination by "capturing" the convention in Miami Beach, allegedly by making use of "back-room politics."

In fact, McGovern did not "win" the nomination at the convention at all, let alone by back-room deals. Rather, he won the nomination by openly taking on his fellow candidates in open primaries, and in open party caucuses and conventions in non-primary states, and by openly defeating them—decisively.

The measure of his victory is that McGovern won 10 of the 23 primary elections—including the last six in a row; and both New York and California. By the time the convention opened, McGovern was within 100 votes of the nomination. His nearest competitor, Hubert Humphrey, trailed McGovern by more than 1,000 delegates, and had been decisively beaten in the California primary—which Humphrey himself had termed the nomination's "Super Bowl."

Of the other candidates, Muskie and Lindsay had been early casualties of the primary process; Jackson, Chisholm, Mills et al. had never gotten off the ground; and Wallace, though picking up a lot of primary votes, had not entered enough primaries or contested for delegates in enough non-primary states to have any serious chance of winning the nomination.

When one adds to this the fact that no candidate in history had ever entered the convention only 100 votes short of the nomination and then failed to get it, and that McGovern on the eve of the convention was leading Humphrey by seven points in the opinion polls, it becomes clear that: (1) McGovern had earned the nomination; and (2) only by an illegitimate power-play could it in fact be denied him: a power-play, because only a power-play could prevent 100 of the more than 500 uncommitted delegates from coming over to the McGovern camp; and illegitimate, because such a power-play would be in clear violation of the spirit of the new reform rules of the party—rules which McGovern himself had helped to draft.

In view of all this, McGovern's assertion in a Life Magazine interview that he would "repudiate the whole process" were he to be denied the nomination by "a bunch of old established politicians" who ganged up on him in "an illegitimate power-play", was not only just; it also served to put the old, established politicians on notice that he would not take such a power-play lying down.

It is this statement that Mr. Davis seized upon in his editorial to support his contention that McGovern had "declared himself publicly as a winner or spoiler"—as if to suggest that McGovern's charge of a possible power-play against him by old-established politicians was without justification, and merely a ploy.

However, as Mr. Davis and everyone else knows perfectly well, such a power-play did in fact occur, and in exactly the manner that McGovern had forecast. That is to say, the losers in the California primary ganged up on the winner—McGovern—and attempted to deny him 151 of his 271 fairly-won delegates, which in effect constituted changing the rules after the game had been played.

Mr. Davis, unfortunately, did not see fit to make mention of this crucial fact in his editorial. Instead, glossing over the particulars of the California challenge, he went on to charge the McGovern forces with engaging in "sheer intimidation" and "browbeating" of convention Chairman Lawrence O'Brien, in an attempt to secure favorable rulings on the floor regarding that challenge.

Rightly describing O'Brien as "beleaguered," Mr. Davis nevertheless made a further omission of important information, by making it appear that only the McGovern forces had put pressure on O'Brien to rule their way on the challenge.

Actually—and again, as everybody well knows—the dispute over the rulings of the chair had been initiated not by the McGovern forces, but by the same bunch of old established politicians who had ganged up on him in the California challenge in the first place. And, naturally, they were urging O'Brien to rule the other way.

By using language such as "intimidation" and "browbeat," Mr. Davis made it appear that there was something improper about the way the McGovern forces wanted O'Brien to rule—which, in fact, was the way he did rule. On closer inspection, however, it appears that O'Brien ruled justly and fairly.

Hence the implication by Mr. Davis that O'Brien ruled as he did "because of" the alleged McGovern "browbeating" is without foundation. On the contrary, it would seem on the face of it that O'Brien ruled as he did because it was right.

Consider the specifics of the two rulings. In the first, O'Brien decided that 120 delegates from California would be allowed to vote on the California challenge, while the 151 remaining delegates would be excluded from the voting.

Mr. Davis, in his editorial, suggested that this ruling was unfair because it seated the McGovern delegates but excluded those of "his opponents." But in point of fact, the anti-McGovern forces never wanted the entire delegation to be seated. What they wanted was tc exclude the entire delegation, on the ground that under the rules of the convention, a delegation shall not be permitted to vote on its own challenge.

But as O'Brien rightly pointed out, only 151 of the 271 California delegates were being challenged. The remaining 120, which were pledged to McGovern, would retain their seats no matter which way the challenge was settled. Hence to exclude these 120 legally elected and certified delegates would have the effect, as Mr. Davis quoted the McGovern forces as arguing, of "cheating" them of their votes, by a "parliamentary ruling." And commendably, O'Brien refused to do this.

The second ruling, which Mr. Davis implied was extracted from O'Brien by McGovern "browbeating," is even more decisive in its rightness. Here, O'Brien turned down a request by the anti-McGovern forces that a "majority" for purposes of voting on the uncertified 151 California delegates had the California challenge be set at one more than half the entire convention—that is to say, 1509 votes.

But, as O'Brien pointed out, excluding the effect of reducing by that number the size of the convention. Therefore, he ruled, with full parliamentary precedent to back him up, that a majority vote for purposes of certifying the disputed delegates would be set at one more than half the number of actual certified delegates, excluding the 151—that is to say, 1359.

Such an action is precisely what any elected or appointed body takes when vacancies occur in its membership. Thus, after two Supreme Court Justices died last year, and the seats remained vacant, the working majority of the smaller Court was reduced from five to four. The Justices understood, as does every legally-constituted body, that there is nothing sacred about a fixed majority "number." What IS sacred is the principal of a majority as "one more than half"—half the certified membership—and that is the principal that O'Brien upheld in his ruling, and which the anti-McGovern forces sought to undermine in their unsuccessful attempt to pull off an illegitimate power play by securing an unfair ruling from the chair.

It may be true, as Mr. Davis states, that the McGovern forces urged O'Brien to rule on the side of justice "for the sake of party unity." But this merely reaffirmed in private what McGovern had already stated publicly: that the candidate would "repudiate the entire process" were he to be denied the nomiation by "an illegitimate power play." And had O'Brien ruled in favor of the anti-McGovern forces, he would have been participating in, and sustaining, that power play.

In sum, it would appear that if one separates the hyperbole and innuendo from the cold facts in Mr. Davis's editorial, we are left not with a McGovern group that "browbeat" and "intimidated" the convention chairman into making favorable rulings, but rather with a convention chairman who chose to rule on the issues in a way that was fair and just.

Since, therefore, charges of "intimidation" and "browbeating" have not been proved, and since the McGovern forces have not been shown to have done anything illegitimate, the allegation that the McGovern forces engaged in a "power-play" has not been substantiated. And not having proved that a McGovern "power-play" took place, Mr. Davis is thus speaking in excess of the facts in asserting that such a power-play "won" the nomination for McGovern.

On the contrary, as I have shown, Sen. McGovern in fact was the victim, not the perpetrator, of a "power-play", by those who wished to deny him what he had legitimately and openly won—the nomination of his party. Fortunately, the members of the convention, who had been openly selected under the reform rules drafted by McGovern himself, repudiated this illegitimate power-play by a gang of old, established politicians, and instead upheld the rule of law and the spirit of party reform.

Mr. Davis was indeed correct when he described the convention as "a significant departure from former national political conventions," with its "full representation in party affairs," of "grass-roots citizens, young men, young women, blacks and other groups."

Unfortunately, he did not grasp the implications of his own statements. For how could such a convention, in marked contrast to previous conventions dominated by a gang of old, established politicians, have successfully perpetrated a power play, or even sought to do so, or allowed one to take place? Clearly, Mr. Davis has been caught in the snares of his own illogic.

There is no doubt but that in the coming weeks and months, the editor of the Daily Journal will have more to say on the Presidential campaign. I can only hope that his future efforts will be more illuminating and coherent than the first one.

AHEPA 50TH ANNIVERSARY SALUTED

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, the Order of Ahepa, is celebrating its golden anniversary during 1972, and I would like to add my commendation for 50 years of civic and public contribution by this organization.

Founded July 26, 1922, these four organizations within the AHEPA family—the Order of Ahepa, the Daughters of Penelope, the Sons of Pericles, and Maids of Athena—have provided help on many occasions and in many fields. Scholarships; relief to victims of natural disasters; children orphaned by war; museum, hospital, and library assistance;

U.S. war bond sales; and memorial construction are only a few of the causes undertaken by AHEPA in our country and abroad.

Countless individuals, communities, and charities owe a debt of gratitude to the Order of Ahepa, and it is a pleasure to congratulate the members on a half century of achievement. May we have the benefit of another century of their participation in worldwide causes.

CUBBERLEY SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL SUPPORTS MEDICAL CARE FOR WAR-INJURED VIETNAMESE CHILDREN

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, on my office wall I have hung a photograph of a child. He is no ordinary child. He is not a son, nephew, or godchild, but he commands my attention every day and I think of him very often.

He is a child I met while in Vietnam last year. He is a bright, charming child, but, Mr. Speaker, he will find it difficult to join with his friends at play, for his body bears the ugly scars of terrible injury—injury caused by American phosphate bombs.

Mr. Speaker, he is but one of thousands of innocents in Vietnam who bear such scars. Many more bear scars in their minds, not their bodies.

Who, Mr. Speaker, can repay these people, so many of them children, when their bodies and minds are forever imperfect?

There is one group of Americans who have given this question great thought. These Americans are making an effort to relieve the suffering of the children of Vietnam. And, Mr. Speaker, these Americans are young people themselves.

I was greatly impressed by a recent letter from Coach Bob Peters, of Cubberley Senior High School, Palo Alto, Calif., who told me of the efforts of students and faculty at that school to assist the young people of Vietnam.

I would like at this time, Mr. Speaker, to draw attention to the efforts of these students and the cause for which they are working.

I include in the RECORD Coach Peter's letter to me, a statement made to the community, and another statement made at a ceremony marking his own symbolic contribution to this effort:

ELLWOOD P. CUBBERLEY
SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL,
Palo Alto, Calif., July 5, 1972.

Congressman JEROME R. WALDIE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALDIE: We, at Cubberley High School, are presently engaged in a most unique undertaking—*a positive expression of an attitude against war* in the form of a "Gift" to Children's Medical Relief International, an organization which specializes in the rehabilitation of disabled Vietnamese war children (both North and South). We are tired of self-defeating, destructive kinds of protest which serve only to antagonize and alienate the very people who are in a position to do something about that which we are so deeply concerned. We are only hoping that our "Gift" will bring vivid realization to all the world the fact that innocent children are maimed and disfigured from the indiscriminate consequences of war. Political beliefs regarding whether or not we should be in Vietnam are not of a major concern in relation to this "protest", for it is only war itself and the unutterable consequences of it that we are challenging.

We strongly believe in the premise that *all* must work together for peace and not fight amongst themselves in the name of it. Ninety-five percent of the nation's high school and college population have been publicly misrepresented by less than five percent who throw "rocks at cops and bricks through windows", hypocritically, in the name of peace.

We are calling our movement "A Gift of Hope, Love and Life."

Enclosed you will find information about our campaign which we hope you will take the time to read. We are asking for your public support of our most unusual endeavor which we hope will reach national proportions.

Thank you for any consideration you may give our idea.

Very respectfully,

Coach BOB PETERS,
Representative, Students of Cubberley High school.

CUBBERLEY AMPHITHEATER, CEREMONIAL CUTTING OF THE HAIR, MAY 25, 1972

I gladly and with pride give my locks and my beard for this most worthy of causes "A Gift of Hope, Love and Life" to the supremely innocent, disabled Vietnamese war children (both North and South). By making our Gift to CMRI we bring to the vivid realization of all the world the fact that children are being maimed, disfigured and killed as a result of the indiscriminate consequences of war. Ours is, for the first time in the history of the world, a positive expression of an attitude against war. We are tired of the throwing of rocks at cops and bricks through windows all in the name of peace when these self-defeating kinds of protests serve only to effectively alienate and antagonize the very people who are in a position to do something about that which we are so deeply concerned.

We offer the proceeds from May 15 on from the hair and beard vote and we offer the proceeds from car washes, carnival booths, a dance to be held on June 9 and other fund raising projects to CMRI, an organization which specializes in the rehabilitation of disabled, Vietnamese war children. We ask that the High School Student Bodies of America join us in this positive expression of our attitude against war by participating in a new high school movement which will be called Phase II a Gift of Hope, Love and Life by the donation of senior class gifts or proceeds from other fund raising projects if their senior class gifts have already been committed.

The impact from such a single direction of Gifts will have a resounding effect by the bringing to light of certain horrible, agonizing truths. The amount of time we have remaining for the beginning of such a movement is very inconvenient, but so is war and the consequences of it. How can we or anyone else turn our backs on mangled children? People must work together for peace and not fight amongst themselves in the name of it.

Coach BOB PETERS,
Cubberley High School.

A LIFT FOR HUMANITY

Our students and community are continuing to support the positive attitude of our youth in regard to our high school movement—"A Gift of Hope, Love and Life"—a positive expression of an attitude against war by donating funds to Children's Medical Relief International an organization which specializes in the rehabilitation of disabled Vietnamese war children (both North and South).

Our next fund raising activity is a Power Lifting contest to be held on Saturday, August 19, at 11:00 a.m. in the Cubberley High School Boys' Gym. We are looking for sponsors for each boy who participates and are asking those sponsors to donate a minimum of one cent for each pound that our boys legally lift (of course sponsors can pay more but it is only fair to inform you that lifters will be totaling from 600 to 1400 pounds for the three lifts—Bench Press, Squat and Dead Lift.)

Our kids are really working hard on positive, constructive ways of expressing themselves against war in general and we would like to continue encouraging them to do just that. If you are interested in being a sponsor, please send your name and address to Coach Bob Peters, Cubberley High School, 4000 Middlefield Rd., Palo Alto, California.

For information about Children's Medical Relief International write:

Claudine Fischer, Children's Medical Relief International, 228 E. 48th, New York, N.Y. 10017.

Political beliefs related to whether or not we should be in Vietnam are not of a major concern in this form of "protest" for it is only war itself and the unutterable consequences of it that we are challenging. Please join us in our most unique, positive and constructive form of expressing an attitude against all war.

Respectfully,

COACH BOB PETERS,
Representative, Cubberley Senior High School Students.

(P.S.—Anyone can lift in the exhibition division, so get a sponsor and give "humanity a lift".)

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ORDER OF AHEPA

HON. JOHN Y. McCOLLISTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. McCOLLISTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues today in congratulating the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association on its golden anniversary. Since the founding of the Order of Ahepa in Atlanta, Ga., in 1922, the organization has devoted itself to numerous educational pursuits, relief for disaster victims, and various charitable causes.

Its 430 chapters include four in Nebraska and can be found in 49 States, Canada, and Australia. Those in my State are located in Omaha, Lincoln, Grand Island, and Bridgeport.

Among the noteworthy projects of the organization in the field of education are the scholarship awards program, the donation of books to schools and libraries, and summer study programs in Greece.

Citizenship is an important part of the AHEPA program and chapters provide help to those who are in the process of becoming citizens.

Greeks throughout the world can be proud of the contributions of AHEPA. I am happy to pay tribute to such outstanding achievement and to wish the Order of Ahepa many more years of success.

AN UNNECESSARY DEATH

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, it was not a quirk of fate that accounted for the death of Roy Mullendore, age 13. He would be alive today if there were more effective gun control laws. Any society that allows handguns in private homes, must be willing to pay the price. That price is nearly 10,000 unnecessary deaths a year. Perhaps it is worth it to the man who values his handgun more than human life. But to the parents of Roy Mullendore, the death of their son was far too costly.

Roy was extremely well informed about guns. He had taken a National Rifle Association hunter safety course and was familiar with all types of firearms. Perhaps because of the safety training, Roy's father would not allow guns in his home. Unfortunately, their neighbor was not as sensible and kept firearms in his home. One afternoon last week his son was playing with a supposedly unloaded weapon and accidently shot Roy Mullendore—a death that would not have occurred if the weapon had not been there.

As long as handguns are as prevalent in our society as they are today, there will continue to be innumerable gun accidents."

The story of Roy Mullendore's death appeared in the Evening Star on June 27, 1972. The article follows:

HE KNEW ALL ABOUT GUNS

Roy Neil Mullendore, 13, knew all about guns, so it was a doubly terrible quirk of fate when a friend pointed an "empty" .45 automatic at him and pulled the trigger.

The gun was loaded and Mullendore is dead of a head wound at the hands of a 13-year-old playmate who didn't know much about guns.

Roy Mullendore lived in the 9900 block of Portsmouth Road, and he was visiting a friend's home. Somehow, at about noon, there was the gun, which belonged to the friend's father, there were the boys, both 13, and then the explosion, the silence, the ambulance to Prince William Hospital without hope.

His father, Thomas Mullendore, said of his son's death last night that it was "purely accidental." He said Roy had taken a National Rifle Association hunter safety course in June, while the family was visiting Ethiopia.

Roy knew how to handle automatics. He was familiar with other types of revolvers, the father said. "He was familiar with all types of firearms; he has fired a .22 caliber pistol and rifle on ranges."

But perhaps because of the safety training, Mullendore, a communications specialist, would allow no guns in his home.

"I don't own a firearm and I have not let my children own even a BB gun," the father said yesterday. "Anyone that has a firearm in his house is . . . well, I just don't know."

"It was an accident," the father of the other boy said.

"I don't want to talk about it. The kids were just fooling around like kids do."

Police placed no charges against the youth; the neighbors were understanding yesterday, talking of the dead boy's popularity.

A little girl remembered Roy Mullendore lent her a face mask at the neighborhood pool; a classmate at Marsteller Junior High wept to tell of the two going fishing. "Roy was a pretty good guy," the fishing companion said.

Roy was born in San Jose, Costa Rica. He was a Boy Scout and high school student of distinction, a swimmer and competitor at track.

He collected poems, and his favorite poet was the Canadian balladeer Robert W. Service. The boy's favorite work, his father said, was Service's best known, "The Shooting of Dan McGrew."

Yesterday he came home from summer school at Stonewall Jackson High School where he had been taking a typing course.

His father, taking his day off at home, saw him briefly. Roy ate a light lunch and left.

It was the police who come to the house after the accident who told Mullendore he would never see Roy alive.

HEROIN ADDICTION: THE WAR BROUGHT HOME

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons why the United States must end the war in Vietnam and many unanswered questions regarding why the war continues. Increasingly our attention is drawn to a reason, and a question, that have become paramount—the infection of our society through the Southeast Asian heroin traffic and the failure of the U.S. Government to use its power over Asian allies to stop their complicity in the drug traffic. An editorial which recently appeared in the Washington Post describes a report by Government agencies, including the CIA, which have recently investigated the involvement of officials of the Governments of Thailand and South Vietnam in the narcotics traffic. This connection between heroin smuggling and the very highest governmental levels of our Asian allies has been well documented and long known. The destruction of the lives of young soldiers who became addicted in Vietnam is, unfortunately, becoming a human tragedy equally well documented and known. The question is, when are we going to stop the war and end this source of heroin addiction?

The article follows:

HEROIN AND THE WAR

Alfred McCoy, a Yale graduate student who interviewed 250 people, charges that the Central Intelligence Agency has known of Thai and South Vietnamese official involvement in heroin traffic, has covered up their involvement and has participated in aspects of the traffic itself. The CIA has publicly denied these charges, in the process even persuading Mr. McCoy's publisher, Harper & Row, to let it review his book manuscript before publication. But now there comes an internal government report—done by the CIA and other agencies—on the difficulties of controlling the narcotics trade in Southeast Asia. The report states:

"The most basic problem, and the one that unfortunately appears least likely of any early solution, is the corruption, collusion, and indifference at some places in some governments, particularly Thailand and South Vietnam, that precludes more effective suppression of traffic by the governments on whose territory it takes place."

That is to say, a private report by agencies including the CIA confirms the thrust of charges which the CIA publicly denies. The White House contends the report, completed in February, is "out of date."

Now, we are aware that the Nixon administration has worked with great vigor and much effectiveness to curb the international narcotics trade. The fact remains that the largest supplies of the filthiest poison of them all apparently come from or through Thailand and South Vietnam, if one is to take the CIA's private word—as against its public word—on the matter. Nor should it stretch any reasonable man's credulity to understand that the United States has had to accept certain limitations on its efforts to get those governments to stop drug dealing because it has wanted to ensure their cooperation in the war against North Vietnam. In the final human analysis there is simply no place in the pursuit of honor and a just peace in Southeast Asia for an all-out honest effort to control traffic in heroin. This is the infinitely tragic fact flowing from continued American involvement in the war.

Would heroin addiction among Americans have swollen to its current dimensions and would the amount of heroin reaching the United States from South Vietnam and Thailand have reached its current levels if the war—and power politics—had not gotten in the way of effective American pressure upon the governments in Saigon and Bangkok? If President Nixon needs any further reason to make good his pledge to end the war, this is almost reason enough by itself for what it says about the character of regimes this country has gotten into the habit of supporting—lavishly and indiscriminately—in the name of our "national security" and world peace."

DEDICATES NEW CHURCH BUILDING

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, recently the Free Magyar Reformed Church of McKeesport, Pa., dedicated a new building which stands as a testimonial to the deep and abiding religious faith of its congregation and its pastor, the Reverend Barnabas Roczey.

I was privileged to participate in the dedication which climaxed a 12-year building program on the part of these faithful members of the church and their many friends. It was an occasion which attracted ranking officials of the Reformed Church and other dignitaries. Among them were: the Reverend Dr. Laszlo Berzeviczy; Mr. Paul St. Miklossy of the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America; the Reverend Louis Nagy; the Right Reverend Dezso Abraham, who is a bishop of the Hungarian Reformed

Church in America; Mr. Elmer Charles, national president of the William Penn Fraternal Association; Judge Albert Fiok and the Reverend Zoltan Kovacs, principal speakers for the evening; and Pastor Roczey.

The decision of the Free Magyar Reformed Church to build a new house of worship was made back in 1960. The step was the purchase of property on the outskirts of the city of McKeesport, where it was decided to construct a new sanctuary, Sunday school classrooms, a fellowship hall and a parsonage. Ten years later, the congregation authorized the church council to proceed with the drawing of preliminary plans. Within 6 months this was accomplished and the church began making rapid progress in its building campaign. Ground for the new structure was broken in May 1971; the cornerstone was dedicated a year later, and on Sunday, July 23, the congregation of the Free Magyar Reformed Church gave to the city of McKeesport a new edifice constructed for the worship and the service of God.

Mr. Speaker, each and every person who contributed to the success of this noble undertaking deserves public recognition. While I cannot commend them personally, I can call to the attention of my colleagues those who played major roles in bringing this project to its completion. It is with great pride and pleasure, therefore, that I insert into the RECORD the names of those who served on the church council and on the church building committee. The list is as follows:

CHURCH COUNCIL

Rev. Barnabas Roczey, Pastor.
Mr. John Kontz, Chief Elder.
Mr. Steve T. Balogh, Vice Chief Elder.
Mr. Andrew Toth, Vice Chief Elder.
Mr. Albert Bertok, Secretary.
Mr. Robert Jordanhazy, Treasurer.
Mr. John Canelle, Assistant Treasurer.

BUILDING COMMITTEE

Rev. Roczey.
Mr. William Arokhaty.
Mr. Gabor Balogh.
Mr. Steve Balogh.
Mr. Albert Bertok.
Mr. John Canelle.
Mr. Andrew Fedor.
Mr. William Jardanhazy.
Mr. Robert Jordanhazy.
Mr. John Kontz.
Mr. Andrew Makatura.
Mr. Joseph Martin.
Mr. William Orris, Sr.

ELDERS

Mr. Gabor Balogh.
Mr. James Balogh.
Mr. Dennis Caiarelle.
Mr. Zoltan Fazekas.
Mr. Steve Jordan.
Mr. Robert Jacklitch.
Mr. William Jardanhazy.
Mr. Andrew Makatura.
Mr. Joseph Martin.
Mr. Alex Meszar.
Mr. William Orris, Jr.
Mr. Lawrence Papp.
Mr. Arthur Pogyor.
Mr. John Ritzo.
Mr. Andrew Sotak.
Mr. Joseph Szarka.
Mr. Albert Toth.
Mr. John Varga.

FORMATION OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY "UNDER THE OAKS" IN JACKSON, MICH.

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on July 8, the Republicans of Michigan celebrated the dedication of Michigan's 257th historical marker, but more importantly we celebrated the dedication of the historical marker commemorating the formation of the Republican Party "Under the Oaks" in the fair city of Jackson, Mich.

Although there were many notables in attendance, we were especially pleased to have as our special guest and speaker our highly respected and esteemed Governor, William G. Milliken, who delivered some very appropriate and cogent remarks. Since what he had to say has application far beyond the boundaries of Michigan and outside the Republican Party, I thought his words would be of interest to my colleagues and so I herewith make them available to my friends in the House.

REMARKS BY GOV. WILLIAM G. MILLIKEN

Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is a great pleasure for me as Governor, as a Republican, and as a citizen of this state to be here with all of you this morning for the dedication of Michigan's 257th historical marker. Most people when asked to describe Michigan's contributions to America, would cite our tremendous industrial heritage and its contributions to American technology and business growth. Since 1896, when the first automobile appeared in Detroit, Michigan has been a leader in this nation in the production of automobiles and other mechanized equipment, and during World War II, Michigan was known as the "Arsenal of Democracy," providing the bulk of U.S. military equipment for American combat efforts overseas.

What many fail to realize, however, is the fact that Michigan has played a highly important role in this nation's developing political maturity and growth from the time of its admittance to the Union in 1837.

There are few places in Michigan where a plot of ground can be found that is a more significant American historical footnote than where we stand today, for it was on this land, then known simply as "Morgan's Forty," that on July 6, 1854, more than 3,000 people gathered with the intention of ridding America of the most serious blight on the face of our nation—the continuing existence of the institution of slavery. The scene that day must have been truly inspiring. Whigs, Free Soilers, and persons from all walks of life gathered together with one purpose in mind. These were strong and concerned men, young and old, with an abiding belief in the potential of this nation, a pervasive confidence in the dignity and integrity of every individual, and a deep personal commitment to righting the wrongs apparent in this country.

Among those attending that convention were five men who later became United States Senators, fourteen future members of Congress, three distinguished jurists, many circuit judges, three foreign ministers, and a host of men who were destined to play important roles in state government in Michigan. As a matter of fact, during 22 of the next 28 years following the convention, the gubernatorial chair of Michigan was occupied by men who were present at that convention. The resolutions they adopted were strong and to the point, opposing slavery in any form and recognizing the need for unity among all freedom-loving Americans in the fight for freedom for all people. The Jackson Democrat, in an editorial, carried the following account of the convention:

"We never saw in any deliberative body so strong a desire for harmony manifested. Every member of the convention seemed to have come there resolved upon conciliation and tranquil action. There was scarcely a dissenting voice from the action resolved upon."

Those words serve to give us a picture of the kind of a gathering it was on that July day in 1854.

In that convention were sown the seeds of the Emancipation Proclamation issued by Republican President Abraham Lincoln eight years later and the seeds of a struggle that would ultimately serve to preserve the Union and leave America as a land where, finally, all men would be free.

I believe that each of us in Twentieth Century United States can learn an important lesson from the events that took place here 118 years ago. The national self-confidence and spirit demonstrated at that first Republican convention are symbolic of our greatest assets in the past and our greatest hopes for the future. But if we are honest with ourselves, we must admit that this optimism is not shared by all Americans and that the voices of doubt and despair have become louder today than ever before.

However, we cannot really blame all our continuing problems on the government because in America, we, the people, are the government. Over the last two decades, we have had many opportunities to change our governments, but the problems remain.

In large measure, we as Americans have failed in recent years to enlist the widespread public support for the reforms that are so desperately needed. People have known for years about the failure of our prison system to rehabilitate criminals, about the existence of racism, and about the desperate financial plight of our schools. But simply being informed is not enough. Once people are informed, they must act. And that is where we as a nation have failed.

A willingness to accept failure has never been counted among the American traits of character. Confronted with danger from within or without, we have always responded with imagination, courage, and great vigor. But in the last few years, many people seem to have taken on a kind of cynical resignation that is clearly alien to the spirit of our national heritage—a heritage perhaps best demonstrated by that convention in Jackson more than 100 years ago.

Where people once dreamed impossible dreams about the future of this country and the quality of life that could prevail here, all too many now seem content to accept poverty and hate and strife as the American way of life.

No, the greatest threat to America today is not the threat of external invasion or even of internal revolution. The greatest danger we as a nation face is our own indifference and our own apathy—the spreading conviction that nothing matters beyond our own personal pleasures; the belief that if it works for me, it is good, regardless of the principles it may violate or the effect it may have on other people.

How can we change these things?

Our nation's most urgent need is to once again find the kind of spirit that brought those 3,000 men to this grove of oaks in 1854; to prove to ourselves that the System

can work and that we as individuals have the power to make it work; and to realize that freedom and democracy cannot exist in a society of indifference.

We are, after all, free men. We recognize our problems. We have the world's most highly developed technology and the world's greatest wealth. And, above all, we are free. Little stands between us and the solutions to our problems except our own confusion, our inertia, and our fear of failure.

We, as a people, need to revive our belief in the duty we have and the capacity we have to help. And we need to make idealism respectable again in this country that was born in idealism.

May this dedication ceremony serve in helping all of us to rekindle the flame of freedom that burned so brightly here in the summer of 1854; help us to renew our belief in our institutions, our belief in our children, and, above all, our belief in ourselves.

THE MEANING OF CITIZENSHIP

HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, while Congress was in recess recently, an editorial of especial interest and profound significance appeared in a weekly newspaper of my district.

The Journal of West Columbia, S.C., printed as its lead editorial the winning essay in a contest sponsored by the West Columbia-Cayce Junior Women's Club. The author, Miss Jenny Sexton of West Columbia, chose as her topic, "The Meaning of Citizenship," and her thoughts are indeed inspiring.

I prefer to believe that the young people of this country are not as represented to us everyday—people who force themselves into the limelight by their outrageous actions and absurd demands. Rather, it is my conviction that there are numerous Jenny Sextons throughout this country who also understand the true meaning of citizenship—young people who realize that along with the privileges of being an American come responsibilities, and a duty to help preserve America's greatness.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand here and claim Jenny Sexton as a constituent; and because I know my colleagues will experience the same encouragement and optimism I did when reading her words, I include the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

CITIZENSHIP

Citizenship means full membership in a country. I am proud to say that I am a member of this country, the United States of America. My country grants me certain rights, and as I am an American, the government demands certain duties from me.

As I see the many privileges that the United States offers, I become thoughtful and realize how lucky I actually am. Staying well informed on local and world affairs makes me see that these "privileges" are not the only thing that I have to think about. Being an American forces me to cope with the problems of inflation, unemployment, the removal of our men out of Vietnam, pollution of our environment, and a long list of other woes. I can help to eliminate some of these troubles by writing to my elected representatives and expressing my ideas. These signs of interest in our nation's problems show that our country and its citizens are not really separate.

To keep this country a good place in which to live, I must fulfill the complex duties of my citizenship. I must learn to be courteous, unselfish, and friendly, and in addition to these character qualities I must be able to get along well with others so that I can accept responsibilities for future betterment of my community and country. Being an American means that I should be sincere and dependable so that I might become productive and render a worthwhile service to my fellow man. I must, as an American, accept these responsibilities and obey the laws of my nation.

America is a radiant symbol which is made up of freedom, justice, and peace. This symbol can be changed from good to bad by her citizens. I translate this symbol into a way of life, of liberty, and of the pursuit of happiness. May I always be proud to say that I am a citizen of the United States of America, for it is my faith and my beliefs that keep this spirit of liberty in America alive.

PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY REFORM

HON. CHARLES THONE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. THONE. Mr. Speaker, a concise and helpful summary of various proposals for reform of presidential primaries has been prepared for me by Linda Walker.

Linda Walker, who served as an intern in my Washington office for 6 weeks, will be a senior this fall at the University of Nebraska at Lincoln. She is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Cecil Walker of Lincoln. Linda's mother, Carol, has been one of the most enthusiastic and effective workers in the Lancaster County and Nebraska Republican organizations.

Because Linda Walker's qualitative analysis may be helpful to all those interested in improving the means by which we choose our candidates for President and Vice President, I ask that this summary be printed in the RECORD.

The summary follows:

PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY REFORM

The general argument in the field of primary reform is concerned with whether we should retain the current system of preferential primaries by states, or change to a national primary. There are variations of both sides, with some strong arguments for each, and it would seem that a combination of the two would be most ideal. Both editorialists and men in government have offered proposals for change in varying degrees, and it will now be up to Congress to decide on a course of action.

The advantages of the current primary system are apparent. They got people to think about which candidate is best, to discuss the issues, and then to choose for themselves who will be nominated. The disadvantages are equally obvious. Money has too much power; and a relative minority of voters determine the choice for the rest. The selection of delegates to the national conventions is unfair and confusing at best. About one-third of the states select delegates by direct vote, and the rest are chosen by party organizations. There is no guarantee that delegates will proportionately represent strength of individual candidates, and the candidates' time is spent electing delegates instead of discussing the issues.

The origin of the preferential primary was to indicate major candidates for the presidency in each party. But this was before the days of the public opinion poll or the widespread communications made possible by the news media. It is sometimes doubtful whether or not it is serving a useful purpose. When compared with the national primary proposal, however, there are some features inherent in the current system that should not be discarded.

The present nominating system has produced outstanding candidates with significantly differing points of view. It provides room for dissent within the parties that would not be possible in a sudden death national primary. The present combination of state primaries and party conventions, along with balloting in national conventions, provides the flexibility needed to sort out choices among multiple candidacies, and arrive at the most favored candidate.

The national parties would be adversely affected by a national primary. The national party is a loose confederation of state and local organizations whose main function is to recruit, select and elect candidates to public office. Establishment of a national primary, conducted by the federal government, would undermine these organizations, limiting their participation in the nominating choice which is related in many ways to the selection of candidates for lesser offices. Also in relation to parties, the voter likes to think his vote will count more if he registers to vote on the "winning side", the party in power.

The relatively equal strength that balances the two parties now could be seriously undermined if the party in power were to gain a lot of voters in primary registrations.

In the proposals for a national primary there are also desirable qualities. The main crusade is that people must democratically choose their nominees as well as their President. The critics of the current system are correct in saying that the convention procedures and the ways that delegates are chosen constitute cumbersome, uncertain machinery. With the national primary, there is less chance of political manipulation; and the rank and file voters feel closer to a system that is not confusing. And of course, it would be less of a carnival—the preferential primary focusing attention on certain states and money-backed "man who can win". It is also said that a national primary would control campaign expenditures, but the cost for two nationwide elections, and perhaps a third in cases of a run-off, would be prohibitive for any but the very wealthy candidate.

The range of recommendations for change made by editorialists is all-encompassing. Some do not want any open primaries; they say the party leaders should do the nominating. Others maintain that we cannot discard the contact with real people, the chance for a dark horse candidate, and the power of the states to formulate their election laws that our present system offers. Many favor the national primary, even though the selection process would be geared to big money, front-runner, or media candidates. There are those who would like to streamline our current system by passing a federal election law to consolidate the disparity of varying state elections—to eliminate the worst aspects such as the winner-take-all-the-delegates law, and cross-over voting. In addition, there is a proposal that would select a limited number of dates that the primaries can be held on, let them be known in advance, and have the federal government reimburse the participating states for the cost of the primary.

The members of Congress have mainly con-

centrated on the preferential and national primaries for their proposals. The highlights of the legislation include:

1. Only three possible dates for preferential primary (H.R. 13945, Udall).
2. All delegate selection not more than 30 days before party convention (H.R. 13985).
3. Direct vote for President, no conventions (H.R. 13995, H. Res. 1135, S. Res. 97); direct vote for President and Vice-President (H. Res. 1125).
4. All Presidential primaries to be held on first Tuesday in May (H.R. 14085).
5. Direct vote in primary and general elections (S. Res. 214).
6. Direct vote national primary (VP chosen by party) (S. Res. 215, Mansfield-Aiken).
7. Regional primaries (S. 3566, Packwood).
8. Primary to be held first Tuesday in July, with no advertising until three weeks before (S. 3655, Eagleton).

In my opinion, the best of these proposals is the Packwood bill. It combines the good qualities of both types of primaries, without drastically changing the system. It would provide primary sequence and still retain the convention to choose the most favored and toughest candidate to beat. It requires a uniformity of election laws to eliminate the inequalities found in state laws, while the states still control the election. For reference, the following is a summary of the bill—S. 3566 Presidential Regional Primaries Act.

Primaries: all states included.

Five regional primaries held each presidential election year.

First held on second Tuesday in March, and rest on four subsequent second Tuesdays.

Order determined by lot, 70 days before each primary except last.

Generally recognized candidate (primarily recognized by media).

Determined by majority of commission.

Others on ballot by notifying commission with:

1. Petition signed by 1% of registered voters in that region (not more than 25% from one state).
2. Paying filing fee of $10,000 (which is returned if 5% of vote gained).

Candidate's list—tentative 70 days before, final 30 days before.

Off list if affidavit filed to that effect.

Officials of each state conduct elections.

No cross voting—only vote for candidate of that voter's party.

Convention delegates—5% or more of votes cast entitles candidate to appoint his own delegates equal to the percentage of votes cast for him.

Under 5% can do nothing; percentage that he received is apportioned to all other successful candidates.

Commission appoints delegates if candidates will not attend convention balloting.

Delegates held until after 2 ballots or less than 20% reached on a ballot or released by candidate.

Majority of votes is nominee.

VP is chosen by convention in accordance with convention rules.

Commission—

"Federal Primary Elections Commission," bipartisan, 5 members, not more than 3 of the same party appointed by President, Senate consent; 5-year terms, with only one appointment per year—main duties—to reimburse state for costs of primary, etc., as mentioned above.

This plan seems to cover the best points of all the suggestions, with only one exception that I can think of. I feel that the law should give the states the option to hold a primary, but require those that do to conduct their primaries on one of the dates specified by federal law.

The following are analyses of the other main proposals that have some amount of support.

H.R. 1394—UDALL PLAN

This retains a 50% winner-take-all provision which would permit a candidate to gain momentum with a series of victories and would reduce the chances of a deadlocked convention. At the same time it preserves proportional representation in states where the votes were split. It would force each candidate to compete seriously for fractions of the delegation in every state, and it could encourage a proliferation of minor candidates who could not win any delegates themselves, but would hope to prevent an enemy from gaining a majority.

S. 3655—EAGLETON PLAN

It is difficult for any candidate to reach primary states without the media. A little known or under-financed candidate can't compete with other candidates in only three weeks.

FINCH PLAN

Summary—There are a limited number of dates known in advance, and not all states are required to have the primary. Expenses are paid by government; a commission is chosen to assign dates; there can be no more than six primaries on one date, and there must be a representative cross-section on each date. A candidate enters his own name; and the delegates are awarded on a congressional district basis, with a plurality getting all votes in the district.

Analysis—A candidate must enter primaries selectively, and the candidates with broad-based following in any one state could win all the delegates. The plan is less likely than the Packwood or Udall plans to result in a dead-locked convention. The mixture of nominating systems is confusing at best, with some states under the federal system, some under their own rules, and some under the caucus and convention system. When the candidates only enter the primaries of their choice, the resulting ballots could be different in each state, and as a result only a few voters, if any, would have the opportunity to choose among all aspiring nominees.

All of these proposals were introduced into the 92nd Congress, except the administration-backed Finch plan. There is virtually no chance of any reform in this Congress; the sponsors of these bills have said that they introduced their plans early for discussion and possible legislation. There are fears of inertia even then, because in areas such as this, there is a tendency to want to get things done when it's too late.

AHEPA SALUTED

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to have as close friends many members of AHEPA.

It is this personal knowledge of their good work that causes me to rise today to pay tribute, as well as sound a note of sincere admiration and appreciation, as this great organization celebrates its golden anniversary.

The American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association was founded July 26, 1922, in Atlanta, Ga. From that small beginning its works have become legend across the length and breadth of this land.

Whether fighting for education, for freedom and self-respect for all Americans of all origins, whether displaying benevolence and generosity to the victims of disaster, AHEPA has been instrumental in the promotion of good citizenship throughout the length of its domain.

During the past half-century, AHEPA has grown to an organization of over 50,000 in 430 local chapters.

The goals, accomplishments, and the fine members of this organization deserve the tributes we pay them on this anniversary—and more.

Certainly America has been enriched because of what they have done.

SENATOR ALLEN J. ELLENDER

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, today the Nation bids farewell to a distinguished American, Senator Allen J. Ellender, President pro tempore of the Senate and chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee. Senator Ellender's outstanding contributions to this country are too numerous to begin to detail. Rarely have we seen a man so totally dedicated to his work and responsibilities as a Member of Congress.

Senator Ellender was for many years chairman of the Senate Agricuture and Forestry Committee. In this position, his contributions to rural America were perhaps greater than any other single individual in the immediate past. As chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, the purse strings of this country were literally in his hands.

Senator Ellender's public career stretches back almost 55 years. He had already established a distinguished career in State government before coming to the Senate in 1936. As majority leader in the Louisiana State House of Representatives and protege of the late Huey Long, Senator Ellender was a driving force of domestic and social reform during the great depression. Succeeding to the seat of Senator Long in 1936, Senator Ellender served without interruption until his death last week. Everyone knows Senator Ellender's distinguished contributions to this country as chairman of the Agriculture and Forestry Committee and the Appropriations Committee, but few are aware of his great contributions to our Federal housing programs. He was the architect, along with Senator Wagner of New York and Senator Taft of Ohio, of the Housing Act of 1949. If it was not for his interest and support, the coalition that put together this important landmark in Federal domestic legislation, I believe that it would never have gotten through the Congress at that time. Senator Ellender may have been classified as a conservative, but when it came to helping people, he was indeed a generous public servant.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have included in the RECORD the award that Senator Ellender received along with me in March at the National Housing Conference regarding his contributions to our Federal housing programs:

IN RECOGNITION OF SENATOR ALLEN J. ELLENDER

The National Housing Conference honors Senator Allen J. Ellender of Louisiana for his 35 years of dedicated service in the United States Senate and for his long-term unswerving support for the cause of decent housing for all Americans.

In 1945, Senator Ellender joined with the late Senator Robert Wagner and the late Senator Robert Taft in sponsoring the Wagner-Ellender-Taft Bill. After many vicissitudes this pioneering legislation emerged as the Housing Act of 1949, still the magna carta of the movement for good housing and community development and notable for its first enunciation of the national goal of a decent home in a suitable living environment for every American family.

During the ensuing years, Senator Ellender has maintained his support for this goal. In his present role as President pro tempore of the United States Senate and Chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, Senator Ellender will be a powerful voice in support of our objectives.

The National Housing Conference applauds his distinguished career and looks forward to his continued leadership.

By Resolution of the Membership of The National Housing Conference, Washington, D.C., March 5, 1972.

THE NEW BARBARIANS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, in recent years there have been renewed attacks upon the Nation's campuses of traditional ideas of academic freedom.

New left philosopher Herbert Marcuse, for example, states in his essay, "A Critique of Pure Tolerance," that people who are confused about politics really do not know how to use freedom of speech correctly; they turn it into "an instrument for absolving servitude," so that "that which is radically evil now appears as good." Having established this premise, Marcuse recommends "withdrawal of toleration of speech and assembly from groups which promote aggressive policies—by his definition, of course—armament, chauvinism—or which oppose the extension of public services." For him, the correct political attitude is one of "intolerance against movements from the right and toleration of movements from the left."

The practical result of this philosophy has been the storming of university podiums by radical students who have prevented the free speech of all with whom they have disagreed. Those who have been victimized in this way and who have been denied their free speech have included Cabinet members, Members of Congress, newspaper editors, and visiting diplomats.

Charles Susskind, a professor of electrical engineering at Berkeley, and a man who lived through the period of the Nazi takeover in Germany, remarked that—

I don't know why they think of themselves as the New Left. Their methods look to me much more like those of the Nazi students whom I saw in the 1930s, harassing deans, hounding professors and their families, making public disturbances and interfering with lectures, until only professors sympathetic with the Nazi cause remained.

The Nation's university faculties and administrations have failed to speak out in clear and forceful terms in behalf of academic freedom and in behalf of quality education.

Discussing this unfortunate state of affairs, William V. Shannon, a member of the editorial board of the New York Times, wrote that—

More students are attending college and more money is being spent on higher education by their parents and by society than ever before. But there is great danger that much of this investment of time and money is being squandered because many college faculties and college administrations are intellectually irresponsible and incompetent.

Discussing the decline in standards and values Mr. Shannon points out that—

In countless colleges, the retreat from responsibility is far advanced. Required courses are abolished. The teaching of the traditional curriculum in the arts and sciences is abandoned, in whole or in part. Written examinations and formal grades disappear. Students, including freshmen, are invited to "design your own courses."

Mr. Shannon concludes that—

The responsibility lies with the administration and the faculty. The intellectual devitalization which has ruined many good high schools across the country is now rapidly spreading into colleges. The result can only be a swelling tide of New Barbarians, armed with college degrees and glib phrases but ignorant. If many parents are uneasy, they have good reason.

I wish to share Mr. Shannon's article, which appeared in the New York Times of July 2, 1972, with my colleagues, and insert it in the RECORD at this time:

THE NEW BARBARIANS

(By William V. Shannon)

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.—More students are attending college and more money is being spent on higher education by their parents and by society than ever before. But there is great danger that much of this investment of time and money is being squandered because many college faculties and college administrations are intellectually irresponsible and incompetent.

In countless colleges, the retreat from responsibility is far advanced. Required courses are abolished. The teaching of the traditional curriculum in the arts and sciences is abandoned, in whole or in part. Written examinations and formal grades disappear. Students, including freshmen, are invited to "design your own courses." Even when students begin to concentrate in some field of study, they may find that what used to be regarded as a major has lost its coherence and they are instead encouraged to slosh about in that primordial ooze known as "interdisciplinary studies."

Yet there is no mystery about what a college-educated person should know. It is not necessary to agree entirely with Robert M. Hutchins and the advocates of the "Great Books" to recognize that there are books every college graduate ought to have read and ideas he ought to be familiar with. An educated person should have studied literature, physical science, mathematics, history, philosophy, religion, music, art and the social sciences and know at least one foreign language.

Since there is not time in four years to learn everything that is worth knowing about all these important subjects, college should be a period of intense hard work, rigorous, concentrated and at times exhausting. Intellectual opportunities lost then may never be regained. The books not read, the ideas not mastered, the specific knowledge not acquired may never become part of one's intellectual endowment.

It is true, of course, that education is a lifelong enterprise. One can take a college course at 50 as well as at 20. But as most people sadly discover, the pressures of career and family life can block all but the strongest drives for intellectual self-improvement. It is a lot easier to learn Russian or study Kant or thread one's way through the labyrinthian passages of Proust and Joyce when one has no competing distractions. Moreover, the sooner one acquires knowledge, the longer one has to enjoy it.

If all this is as self-evident as it surely seems, why then are so many colleges in flight from their intellectual responsibility?

Unfortunately, education attracts an abnormal share of mediocre persons with little exact knowledge or useful talent. Men and women who cannot teach physics or Greek or history, who cannot heal a sick child or build a bridge or write a poem, such persons too often find a living in the intellectual wasteland of educational theory and educational administration. The one thing they can do is verbalize and generate a smog of memoranda.

Sooner or later, they wear down and override serious teachers and scholars who get bored with long committee meetings and circular arguments about the trivial, the abstract and the incomprehensible. Developing a protective mask of cynicism, serious men retire to their academic specialties, leaving the curriculum to the blighting touch of the so-called innovators.

There is rarely anything genuinely new in these "reforms." Charles W. Eliot abolished required courses and introduced the free elective system at Harvard nearly a century ago. After two generations of experimentation, most serious educators recognized that this smorgasbord or cafeteria approach to curriculum planning scarcely assured young people of the broad general education they need. Harvard and other colleges turned back 30 years ago to more coherent theories of general education. But the enemies of intellectual seriousness are once more going strong and with none of the restraints such as grades, written examinations, departmental majors and intellectual traditions which prevailed in President Eliot's day.

Many, though not all, students are delighted. Most young Americans are extraordinarily verbal. Instead of written examinations, they would naturally prefer to be judged on the quality of their class participation. They rarely know what is in their own intellectual best interest for the whole of their lives. They would much rather talk about homosexuality or the new wave in film making or the urban crisis than study irregular French verbs or calculus or the Treaty of Utrecht. There is nothing wrong with discussing sexual mores or movies or the urban crisis, but that is what students have bull sessions for and why they read newspapers and magazines. It is not why they go to college.

The responsibility lies with the administration and the faculty. The intellectual devitalization which has ruined many good high schools across the country is now spreading rapidly into the colleges. The result can only be a swelling tribe of New Barbarians, armed with college degrees and glib phrases but ignorant. If many parents are uneasy, they have good reason.

TEN YEARS LATER, DES IS FINALLY WITHDRAWN FROM ANIMAL FEEDS

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, it will be 10 years of September 27 since the House debated the safety of diethylstilbestrol in meat animal feeds and decided to permit this cancer-causing growth hormone to be used as long as no residues of DES showed up in meat intended for human consumption. Today, the Commissioner of Food and Drugs announced that new methods of detecting the presence of this material "cast serious doubt on our ability to set rules for the use of DES in animal feeds that will insure against residues remaining in animal livers at time of slaughter." He has therefore ordered an end to the use of this additive as a growth stimulant in animal feeds. All production of DES for use in feeds must be stopped immediately, and the existing stocks of DES for feed may not be used after January 1, 1973.

That means that for many months after January 1, 1973, we will continue to be eating the meat of animals which have been fed DES, knowing that the meat probably contains residues of this cancer-causing ingredient. Even though there is no evidence as yet that such residues actually cause cancer in humans, just as there has been no evidence as yet that the cyclamates cause cancer in humans, cancer scientists have maintained for years that there is no such thing as a safe level of tolerance of a cancer-causing agent in food. At the very least, consumers should be wary of eating the livers of animals fed with DES, for so far that is the only part of the animal in which the residues have been discovered.

As happened with the cyclamates, I sincerely hope that the committees of the House and Senate which have jurisdiction over this matter will promptly look into the reasoning by which the Commissioner, Dr. Charles C. Edwards, proposes to permit continued feeding of DES to meat animals until January 1.

DO WE NOW COMPENSATE THE MEAT INDUSTRY FOR ITS LOSSES?

And the House Members who voted for the recent bill to compensate the food industry for its losses from the ban on the use of cyclamates might well begin to ponder whether that bill sets a precedent for paying for all of the losses on DES. As I said in the House when the rule on the cyclamates compensation bill was being debated last month, the DES issue would probably come to a head very quickly. Now that day has suddenly arrived.

But it is about 10 years late in coming.

Under the Delaney clause which I cosponsored with Congressman JAMES J. DELANEY of New York as a provision of the Food Additives Act of 1958, no ingredient can be used in food if it can cause cancer in man or in animals. This was the provision which forced the removal of the cyclamates from the food market once scientific evidence established that the cyclamates caused cancer in test animals. But until 1962, there was a "grandfather's" clause in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act which permitted the continued use of any "new drug" which had once been cleared for safety by the Food and Drug Administration until such time as the Government could prove it was dangerous. The 1962 Kefauver-Harris Act eliminated that provision for drugs generally, but not as regards the use of DES in animal feeds.

As far as DES was concerned, the 1962 act provided that it could continue to be used in animal feeds unless residues turned up in the meat of animals fed with this growth stimulant. In recent years, such evidence began to accumulate, and FDA recently ordered that animals fed with DES must be withdrawn from feed containing the drug at least 7 days, instead of the previous 2 days, before slaughter. Dr. Edwards' announcement today reveals that even after a 7-day withdrawal, animals fed with DES show residues of the additive in their livers.

AMENDMENT IN 1962 TO DEAL WITH DES DANGER

At the time we debated the Kefauver-Harris Act, on September 27, 1962, I offered an amendment to strike out of the bill the special provisions it contained exempting DES from the Delaney clause. This would have forced the cessation of the use of DES yeas ago, because there is no dispute over its cancer-causing properties. My amendment was rejected after repeated assurances from opponents of the amendment that the consumer would not be harmed by this exemption because of the added language in the bill requiring its prohibition the moment residues showed up in the meat.

That moment, as I said, has now arrived—10 years later.

It is not a question of any scientific evidence being adduced of the danger of DES. The only thing new is the detection methods which now enable our scientists to discover what they could not establish before—that is, that the residue does exist in beef livers even after the animal has been withdrawn from DES feed for at least a week before slaughter.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD the text of the press release of the Food and Drug Administration in the matter of DES, as follows:

DIETHYLSTILBESTROL (DES)

The Food and Drug Administration today ordered an end to the use of diethylstilbestrol (DES) as a growth stimulant in animal feeds.

Charles C. Edwards, M.D., Commissioner of Food and Drugs, said: "New scientific data developed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and received by my office on July 28, 1972, casts serious doubt on our ability to set rules for the use of DES in animal feed that will insure against residues remaining in animal livers at time of slaughter. The Delaney amendment of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act explicitly forbids any such residues. Since regulatory requirements of the law cannot be met we have no choice but to discontinue approval for use of the chemical in animal feed."

Effective immediately, all production of DES for use in feeds must be stopped.

Dr. Edwards emphasized that the withdrawal order is an administrative action dictated by strict provisions of law which govern the use of products, such as DES, which have been shown to induce cancer in test animals. Dr. Edwards pointed out that levels found in livers of animals were far lower than those used in tests, and that today's action was not based on any known hazard to human health. DES has been used in the feed of cattle and sheep for nearly two decades, without a single known instance of human harm.

"Therefore," said the Commissioner, "in order to avoid an abrupt disruption in the production of the Nation's meat supply, the FDA will permit existing stocks of DES for feed to be used until January 1, 1973.

"This will permit an orderly phase-out and will provide the animal feeding industry an opportunity to switch to implants or to other methods of meat production," said Dr. Edwards.

Today's order makes final a preliminary proposal published for public comment on June 21. Under the law this proposal gave manufacturers 30 days to submit legal objections and to request a formal hearing.

Such objections and requests were received from 15 of the 25 holders of new animal drug approvals for the products.

In denying those requests, Dr. Edwards reiterated that the final withdrawal decision is predicated on new scientific evidence developed by the USDA's Agricultural Research Service and reported to him on Friday, July 28. This new study used an extremely sensitive radioactive tracer technique and showed that detectable residues could occur in cattle livers, even after withdrawal for seven days in conformance with current regulations. Prior to this experiment, all available tests had shown no measurable traces of DES in animal livers 48 hours after withdrawal.

On this basis, Dr. Edwards said: "We can only conclude that the animal feeding and pharmaceutical industries are unable at this time to suggest restrictions that are reasonably certain to be followed in practice and will at the same time eliminate all possibility of detectable residues. A hearing, therefore, would serve no useful purpose."

Use of DES as implants will continue to be allowed, pending results of tests now underway by the USDA and scheduled to be completed in the next several weeks. To this point USDA has never detected a residue when implants were used as the sole source of DES. Implants have been shown to be approximately as effective as DES in feed, even though used at a dosage level at least 30 times lower than that used in feed.

Further decisions on DES implants, including the possible need for a hearing, will await the results of these tests.

MANDATORY JAIL SENTENCES FOR NONADDICT DRUG PUSHERS

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, during the past 4 months a number of individuals and organizations in the Rochester area have endorsed a proposal I cosponsored providing for mandatory jail sentences for nonaddict drug pushers and providing Federal judges with additional discretion in deciding whether or not to release these nonaddict pushers on bail.

My constituents feel, as I do, that there is a different degree of culpability in-

volved between a professional pusher and his addict counterpart and that the law should reflect this difference between the two. Professional pushers are often involved with organized crime and, according to the Department of Justice, may have jumped bond and continue to supply American addicts from foreign bases.

This course of action has been endorsed by the Monroe County legislature; the council of the city of Rochester; Monroe County District Attorney Jack B. Lazarus; five Rotary Clubs; the Girl Scouts of Rochester and Genesee County; the Church of the Holy Spirit, Penfield, N.Y.; and over 1,200 interested individuals. These endorsements indicate the strong desire at the grassroots for tougher action against drug pushers. I hope every Member of Congress will review this proposal and aid the effort to secure its favorable consideration by Congress.

AN ALL-VOLUNTEER ARMY

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I count it as one of the most noteworthy accomplishments of the Congress and the Nixon administration that we are moving steadily toward our goal of an all-volunteer army. In that connection, Defense Secretary Laird has reported on the progress we are making toward achieving that goal. His report appeared in the July 28, 1972, edition of the Alexandria Gazette in the place usually reserved for a column written by Andrew Tully. I am sure my colleagues are interested in Secretary Laird's report. I, therefore, include it in the RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

[From the Alexandria, Va., Gazette, July 28, 1972]

A PLAN TO REACH THE GOAL

(By Melvin R. Laird, Secretary of Defense)

At this time next year, the military draft will be a relic of history.

The Department of Defense is highly confident that we will meet the President's goal of ending the draft by the target date of July 1, 1973. It is however, a complex and difficult job. It will not be easy to fill the ranks with volunteers.

In earlier days, when our country had all-volunteer military forces, the average strength of all of the military services was less than 300,000. That was in the 1920s and 1930s when military technology was simpler, and the need for high skill levels was limited.

Thus, as we gear ourselves for the final year's push to meet the President's goal of a volunteer force of 2,320,000 men and women, we are facing problems of both quantity and quality. The Administration has presented Congress a program to achieve the goal, strongly believing that it will require a combination of improved pay, beter housing, better educational and career opportunities, and a general improvement in the military "life style" to allow us to eliminate the draft and its inequities.

At this point, less than a year from the date of "zero draft," it is worthwhile to review our progress toward reaching this goal.

First, it is important to realize that the draft has been reduced greatly in the past three-and-a-half years. In 1968, some 299,000 young Americans were drafted into the military services. In 1969, that number slipped to 289,000, and in 1970—the first full year of our Vietnamization program—to 163,000. As troop withdrawals from Vietnam continued and the Administration reduced U.S. presence elsewhere in the world, only 98,000 were drafted in 1971. The quota for 1972 is down to 50,000.

As the numbers of men needed have fallen, our efforts to attract volunteers have risen. It is difficult to say which of the many approaches has been most successful, but the number of true volunteers—those not motivated by pressure of being drafted—has increased notably since the military pay raises went into effect in Nov. 1971.

An increase in recruiting has undoubtedly also contributed to raising the number and quality of true volunteers and attracting substantial numbers of draft-motivated volunteers.

New enlistment options are helping. These include guarantees of special schooling for those who qualify, broader selection of overseas assignments, more choice of unit assignments and wider selection of job skills. The services are continually extending these options.

Since the initial announcement of the all-volunteer goal, we have been improving the attractiveness of military life. Overcoming many of these problem areas, however, is not an easy or inexpensive matter. Progress has been steady.

With all of this effort, we are pleased to find that we are attracting true volunteers at a higher rate than this time last year. With concentration on quality manpower, the services today are filling, largely with volunteers, their needs for personnel capable of meeting school and on-the-job training goals for technical jobs.

Our figures indicate that our efforts have increased the number of true volunteers by a significant 31 per cent in the comparative periods of July 1970 through May 1971, and July 1971 through May 1972. Still, there must be an additional 20 per cent improvement in the level of true volunteers for the services. We hope that increased recruiting and new bonus programs will make this happen.

So, as we count down toward the July 1, 1973 goal we can show progress and an understanding that much work must still be done. Our confidence of reaching the goal is based on the belief that the time has come to end one of the last democratic aspects of this country's governmental processes—the military draft.

GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF THE ORDER OF AHEPA

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the golden anniversary of the Order of Ahepa, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, founded July 26, 1922, in Atlanta, Ga.

This order, with 430 local chapters in 49 States, Canada, and Australia has promoted warm fellowship, good citizenship, and strong support for the democratic ideals that blossomed in the Hellenic culture. Furthermore, AHEPA has extended a generous and helpful hand in supporting educational, charitable, and civic improvement projects around the United States and the world.

During World War II, the Order of Ahepa sold some $500 million in U.S. war bonds as an official issuing agency of the U.S. Treasury. In times of natural disasters—whether it has been a Florida hurricane, a Mississippi flood, or a Corinth earthquake—AHEPA has helped to bring relief to the human victims of these catastrophies. The list of AHEPA service is also long in the fields of cancer research, scholarships to worthy students, and aid to war orphans.

For all of these contributions to democratic government and to the betterment of societies throughout the world, the Order of Ahepa deserves our thanks and congratulations. May this distinguished organization continue to prosper as it begins its second 50 years of fellowship and service.

REASONABLE INTERNATIONAL AIR FARES FOR ALL

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, together with other Members of this House, I have long believed that U.S. scheduled airlines should be imaginative and farsighted in fulfilling the never ending requirement for low-cost, safe and convenient passenger service.

It is in accord with this concept and desire for high standards of service and lower international fares that I bring to the attention of the Members of this House an extremely interesting article on international aviation. The article, "Fill Scheduled Flights With Charters" appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, July 16, 1972. It is written by Mr. Willis Player, a senior vice president of Pan Am, who is well known to many Members of this body.

Mr. Player has a long and varied experience with commercial aviation matters. He is recognized as an expert in commercial aviation problems.

His article is the most understandable one I have yet read as to the basic economics of international passenger service in the jet age.

Probably the most significant part of the article is that in which Mr. Player points out the many advantages, from the standpoint of the traveling public, in the "part charter" concept. Simply, this calls for following the very logical procedure of including charter passengers in designated portions of scheduled international aircraft. Not only would this mark an additional forward step in more versatile utilization of scheduled aircraft, but it would also mean a high standard of service at a lower fare for air passengers and, very importantly, it would provide a method for the fuller utilization of the huge capacities of today's magnificent—and extremely expensive—747 aircraft.

Because of its pertinence to the international aviation issues confronting our

U.S.-flag carriers, I recommend this article to the attention of the House.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article by Mr. Willis Player of Pan American World Airways, from the New York Times, July 16, 1972:

FILL SCHEDULED FLIGHTS WITH CHARTERS

(By Willis Player)

For 2.9 cents a mile—if you buy the right fare—most of the North Atlantic scheduled airlines will package you in an envelope of pressurized air, feed you, show you a motion picture and hurl you across the ocean at 550 miles an hour in a $25-million flying machine.

Even if you buy the best seat in the house, you can't pay more than 12.5 cents a mile for the ride—somewhat less than the 17.5 cents a mile I pay for my two-mile ride to work on the subway.

That's why there are so many air travelers across the North Atlantic: 8.9 million in 1971, probably 10.8 million in 1972. It sounds like a success story, doesn't it?

It is, in a way, when you move all those people all those miles at those high speeds for those low fares and in an airplane that costs all that money.

There is one trouble: The North Atlantic scheduled air lines are losing money.

If they go on losing money, or not making much, somebody is going to have to pay higher fares, or somebody is going to have to pay a subsidy. Since both those horrid alternatives are politically obnoxious, the question is, can you figure out a better way to run the North Atlantic air system?

The answer is yes—maybe.

But if the answer is to be yes for certain instead of merely yes maybe, governments and customers and airline managements must all make themselves see an economic flaw they have so long taken for granted that it is almost invisible: The scheduled North Atlantic air system is operated on the basis that it will pay all its expenses through the use, in round numbers, of half of its capacity.

Translation: Those who use the half of the capacity that is used to pay for the production of all the capacity.

Second translation: The system is supposed to be profitable while flying half empty.

It is half-emptiness of the scheduled flights that nurtured charter flights. For a charter flight can wait until it is full; or it can go only where there are full loads wanting to go; whereas a scheduled flight must go, full or empty, when it has said it will go, day in and day out, and to destinations that are unpopular as well as to destinations that are popular.

A charter flight, being full or almost so, can cover all its expenses and offer a lower per-passenger fare than the scheduled flight that must cover all of its expenses through the use of half of its capacity.

A caveat here: A total analysis of factors determining the relative profitability of scheduled and charter services would be longer and more complex than that short paragraph. But it does identify the basic distinction.

So the scheduled and supplemental airlines rely on growing numbers of full-charter flights. Meanwhile, the essential scheduled services go along paying for all their expenses—or trying to—through half-empty flights.

Once upon a time it was thought, and in some quarters still is thought, that scheduled service is not doing its job properly unless it produces a lot of empty seats. The United States theory was and is that a scheduled air service that operates year-round close to 100 percent full is failing in its obligations to the public because it is depriving too many persons of the forever availability that is supposed to be part of the essence of scheduled service. (As to how close is too close, please consult another author.)

But simple arithmetic says that at a 50 per cent load factor a 747 has more empty seats than there are total seats in a 707; that the most economical use of an air transport system is to fill the seats already being flown, and that the least economical is to fly a "scheduled" 747 half full and a chartered 707 all full when all those passengers could fit on a 747.

So if we were to start over again to create a North Atlantic scheduled air system, would we really create one designed to operate at half capacity? Or would we conclude that a system designed to use only half of its capacity is neither logical nor sensible nor economic. What to do?

A first step is to ask what the new technology permits us to do. The new technology in this context means widebodied jet. On the North Atlantic, wide-bodied jet means Boeing 747. And the 747 means that we now have an airplane big enough to offer scheduled and charter service on the same flight.

A pause while we listen to the screams of the traditionalists.

A second pause while we reply that we are not being revolutionary, just evolutionary.

And now, let's invent the new system.

Today's 747 usually is fitted out to carry about 360 passengers. It has a first-class compartment and three economy-class compartments. It can be fitted out to carry perhaps 500 passengers and, as demand grows, most of them probably will be.

Meanwhile, let's take a 747 and give a first-class compartment to carry 40 passengers. Then give it 220 seats in economy class. That's a total of 260 scheduled service seats, far more than a big 707 can offer. But the 747 is a really big plane, so now, let's give it 100 seats for charter passengers, or a total of 360 seats.

There is nothing sacred about those numbers, either the totals or the allocations. They could and would vary with routes, seasons and airlines.

We then say to the scheduled passenger and shippers: More seats and cargo capacity than were ever before available to you on a scheduled 707 or DC-8 are now available to you on each 747 flight. But we can charge you a little less than otherwise would be necessary because of the revenues contributed by the charter groups.

We say to the charter groups: Because you pay long in advance, and because you guarantee long in advance either to make the trip or to pay a money penalty, you are enabling us to get more use out of our airplane, and in return for that consideration we give you a low per-passenger charter rate.

What's wrong with the idea? It's new; it's not yet tested; and it's unorthodox—but, of course, today's unorthodoxy is sometimes tomorrow's orthodoxy.

What's right with the idea? It gives the customers the services they want. It does so while supporting instead of eroding the essential scheduled services.

And it exploits the flexibility of the 747, the most efficient and most economical long-range airliner yet built.

ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGY IN DEVELOPING AND DEVELOPED COUNTRIES

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the great questions before us is whether or not we will proceed to the tertiary treatment of water throughout the United States and the recycling and reuse of such water, at least in part, for human consumption. The initial test of this concept and the actual use for drinking water purposes of recycled sewage water, is presently occurring in Windhoek, South Africa. The Windhoek plant has been studied by one of California's most eminent engineers in this field, Mr. Frank P. Sebastian of Menlo Park, who a few weeks ago presented a paper on that subject at Stockholm, Sweden, sponsored by the National Wildlife Federation of the United States, under the auspices of the Swedish-United Nations Association. A summary of that paper follows:

ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGY IN DEVELOPING AND DEVELOPED COUNTRIES

(By Frank P. Sebastian, Jr.)

I am going to describe to you today some advanced waste treatment developments on four continents concerning which I will synthesize a picture to demonstrate the following benefits from advanced technology:

1. Preserve wildlife.
2. Save money.
3. Enhance quality of life.
4. Avoid economic dislocation.

Specifically, I am addressing myself to the question: can advanced environmental technology contribute to improvement of the growth process of developing and developed nations? Even more specifically, can the developing countries avoid the errors of the developed nations which are now on the threshold of a very significant investment in corrective programs? My answer is yes! In particular, I submit that certain advanced technologies will yield the benefits I have shown here.

EXAMPLES OF ADVANCED WASTE TREATMENT

I will begin with some examples of advanced waste treatment technology and will show location, type, quality and use. In the land of the first heart transplant, Windhoek, South West Africa, is the leading wastewater treatment installation in the world with direct reuse. Windhoek had a conventional sewage treatment plant to which was added algae lagoons and physical chemical treatment. The product meets the United Nations World Health Organization standards and is used for tap water, supplying one-fourth of the tap water for this community of some 45,000. My son Alex tried it and liked it. At South Lake Tahoe, physical chemical treatment was added to a conventional biological plant, and that product also meets the United Nations World Health Organization standards and is equivalent to United States Public Health Service tap water. This water has been used to form Indian Creek Reservoir, a trout lake which is also used for swimming and for grazing areas. Colorado Springs is one of the most recent advanced waste treatment plants in the U.S., again a conventional plant to which physical chemical treatment was added. The parts per million of oxygen-demanding substances and suspended solids are low enough that the water, some two million gallons a day, from this treatment plant is sold to the local public utility for industrial cooling water makeup. The Rye Meads treatment plant in the U.K. has an extended conventional biological treatment plant. It has two standards: 10 parts per million of oxygen-demanding substances and suspended solids in the wet season, and only half that amount in the dry season. The effluent flows into the River Lee which supplies about 19 percent of the tap water for metropolitan London, commencing ten miles downstream.

With a quote from Chairman Mao, I should like to talk about the newest member of the

United Nations, the People's Republic of China:

"We must break away from convention and adopt as many advanced techniques as possible in order to build our country into a powerful modern socialist state in not too long a historical period."

China has identified itself as a member of the Developing Nations group. As such, it has announced that it is launching an all-out attack on three wastes: "gas, liquid and slag". During my visit last month to the Chinese Export Commodities Fair at Canton, I had an opportunity to discuss the advanced wastewater treatment facility installed at the Peking General Petro-Chemical Works. Two of my San Francisco associates have brought first hand reports of this plant to me and I was able to discuss it further in Canton.

The Peking General Petro-Chemical plant is part of the newly realized self-sufficiency in oil and oil products in China. Construction started in 1968 and now eleven of thirteen planned refinery units are on stream, and four of 22 planned sets of petro-chemical installations have gone into operation. Following the general government policy announced by Premier Chou En-lai to incorporate waste elimination in new industrial projects, the wastewater from this complex is passed through an eight-stage chemical physical biological treatment process. (The process includes sulfur removal, oil separation, pressure flotation, aeration and sand filters.) Fish and ducks are raised in the repurified water and are able to develop and lay eggs normally. Finally, the product water is sent to neighboring communes for irrigation of paddy fields.

Kirin Chemical Works is another example of environmental concern and leadership in China. An animated model of the Kirin Chemical Works was used at the Canton Trade Fair to further illustrate concern for environmental pollution and reclamation of wastes. To date, the chemical company there has treated 23 kinds of waste residue amounting to over 280,000 tons; 34 kinds of waste liquid, eight kinds of waste gas, and has recovered some 25 chemicals including benzene, para nitro toluene, hexanol and dilute hydrochloric acid, totaling more than 34,000 tons. Wastewater containing 200 ppm of phenol from coke processing is reduced by biochemical treatment to the 5–10 ppm range. The plant wastewater flows into the Tunhua River. Recently, fish life near the plant is reported to have improved.

But what about the sludges that are collected from advanced waste treatment plants? I feel it is particularly appropriate to comment on this because the report of the U.S. Secretary of State's Subcommittee on Human Settlements termed this as one of the "most perplexing and ironic of modern problems". But here too technology is far ahead of conventional awareness. Let me use the heavily U.S. government funded Lake Tahoe plant as an example. All the sludge removed, some 3 lbs. of wet sludge per family of four per day, is converted into a sterile ash in multiple chamber furnaces principally utilizing the fuel value of the sludge to destroy itself.

Highly efficient air cleansing equipment scrubs the air clean with less impact per family of four on the environmental air than driving an automobile equipped with U.S. 1972 control equipment only 500 yards and consuming only about 4 oz. of gasoline.

A task force study of the Tahoe and other modern incineration installations has been conducted recently by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency with the conclusion that these new incineration methods are environmentally viable and preferable to ocean dumping.

A further benefit is that pesticides removed from the water are decomposed and rendered harmless in the thermal processing; and in Tokyo and Nagoya, Japan, the ash material is being sold and used as a quasi-fertilizer with:

	Percent
Nitrogen	0.2
Phosphate	6.0
Potash	1.0

At Tahoe and other similar physical chemical process plants, most of the exhaust gases from the combustion processes are captured for their carbon dioxide value and recycled in the process.

So the sludges are not a "perplexing and ironic" problem at all, but rather turn out to be a valuable resource.

Windhoek and Tahoe prove over several years of operation that there can no longer be any doubt about the availability of proven technology to produce drinking water from sewage. This technology has special significance for wildlife propagation because not only are the drinking water tolerances equal to or tighter than those for some wildlife—fresh-water fish for example—but pesticides and certain trace elements can be removed along with organics, suspended solids and major inorganic ions in the advanced processes.

In this regard, it is startling to discover that in industrialized countries the major source of pesticide discharges into the oceans is not always rivers, as one might expect, but possibly from combined municipal and industrial sewage outfalls. California, with an area of 159,000 square miles and a population of 20 million, is larger than many nations. This state is one of the largest agricultural producers in the world. Yet all the rivers draining this enormous area of farmland discharge only about 50 pounds of pesticide per day into the ocean, while the sewage of the Southern California urban area alone was found to discharge about 525 pounds of pesticide per day: a ratio of 10 to 1. But the proper processing of sewage can eliminate the major proportion of pesticides that presently find their way to menace life in the seas.

COSTS

But what about the costs of all this? Fortunately, it costs far less than most anyone imagines.

The Tahoe Water Treatment facility I talked about earlier costs about $10.00 per capita per year—total operating and capital amortization costs. If the cost of sewers is added, the cost on a similar basis is $14.00 per capita, yielding a total of $24.00 per capita per year for drinking water quality. However, septic tanks, which are frequently considered a *first* stage sewage treatment systems, cost $35.00 per capita per year in the U.S.—a startling fact, I'm sure.

Another way of looking at the costs in a developed country is shown by this comparison:

In cents per person per day

Primary secondary treatment	3
Drinking water projection	7
Tahoe *actual* tertiary*	3
Telephone	22
Electricity	26

Source: *Envirotech Corporation; all others, U.S. Department of Interior.

BENEFITS

What truly is a surprice is that on a national accounts basis pollution abatement doesn't cost—but actually saves. I have already commented on the costs and potential benefits from the reusable effluent water, but let me touch for a moment on the third area: that is, deriving savings from the elimination of damage caused by pollution. The information in this area is far more sketchy but from a national and world point of view this is an important area and must be brought into the equation to determine whether environmental control costs or pays. These facts are just emerging in the U.S. and are not generally recognized. However, England was the first country to take stringent action on a national pollution problem and reap the national benefits.

Let me shift the subject to air pollution and draw on the message from President Nixon to the Congress to illustrate:

"In London in December 1952 an air pollution episode lasted five days and was associated with 4,000 excess deaths. During the episode 1,100 patients per day, or 48 percent above normal, were admitted to the hospitals of London."

Damages were established at $700 million per year.

The postscript that I would like to add is that four years later stringent air pollution control legislation was passed in England, but it was not until fourteen years later that tangible benefits were broadly reported. Sunshine increased over 50 percent in London in December, infamous London fogs disappeared, and rare birds—the snow bunting, the hoopoe and the great northern diver—have reappeared, and house martins have returned to nest near Primrose Hill after an 80-year absence. Though no estimate is available, substantial savings can be expected in reduction of the $700 million of annual damages from air pollution. The national cost was $1 billion over ten years.

With regard to the U.S., there are numerous isolated reports of external costs from air and water pollution. The National Wildlife Federation, drawing on recent reports of the Council for Environmental Quality and the Environmental Protection Agency, was the first to bring together for the U.S. the savings to be realized as well as the costs for both air and water pollution. (*National Wildlife Magazine*, Feb.-March, 1972). These economics are given below:

BENEFITS OF AIR POLLUTION CLEANUP

	Annual amounts	
	All United States (in billions)	Per family
1972 damages	$16.1	$268
Cleanup savings	10.7	178
Cleanup costs	3.9	65
Net savings	6.8	113

BENEFITS OF WATER POLLUTION CLEANUP

1972 damages	12.8	213
Cleanup savings	11.5	192
Cleanup costs	6.3	105
Net savings	5.2	87

Thus, with regard to the question, "Is it possible for the developing nations of the world to incorporate environmental concern into development processes without retarding economic growth?", my answer is "yes". In both the air and water pollution sectors there are compensating revenues that can be offset against costs. Frequently, water development is also a limitation on economic development of a nation or region, and thus water pollution elimination and water reuse *may* go hand in hand with economic development. The development of the water reclamation plant can be part of the long range water planning; it may remove a limit to economic growth.

Thus, a particular opportunity lies with the developing countries at the beginning to strike the total profit and loss sheet of environmental control, including the cost to improve the water or environmental quality and benefits from reusable water, plus

other savings that are very seldom perceived—the savings from elimination of damage.

In summary, the benefits for *developing* and *developed* nations from available water pollution technology are:

1. Preserve wildlife;
2. Save money;
3. Promote economic growth
4. Avoid economic dislocations of catch-up investment cost, now facing developing nations.

NEW WAYS TO PAY FOR LEGAL SERVICES

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, last week a talented writer on the staff of the Evening Star and Daily News compiled a series of articles on new ways to pay for legal services. It is difficult for most middle-income Americans to obtain suitable legal services. They may have difficulty finding a suitable lawyer; and they surely will have difficulty paying the fee. Now many Americans are finding that they can overcome some of the difficulties by organizing client groups. First, the client organization can help each member find a competent lawyer to handle his specific legal problem. Second, the organization can serve as an insuror, protecting each member against unusually large expenses by spreading the cost among all members.

Mr. Speaker, I have a continuing legislative interest in making legal services more available to the average American. I introduced a bill recently which would encourage unions and employers to establish programs to help pay legal expenses. In addition, I intend to introduce soon a bill designed to make it easier for all Americans to obtain suitable counsel.

Miriam Ottenberg's excellent articles provide a valuable insight into new developments in this area, and I commend them to the attention of my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I include the articles to be printed in the RECORD at this point:

GROUP PLAN—LAWYER 50 CENTS A MONTH

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

A big chain store billed a Chicago woman $200 more than she owed. When she protested the overcharge, a credit clerk advised her to pay up because it would cost more than that to get a lawyer.

But a lawyer got the overcharge off her bill, the store apologized profusely and it cost her 50 cents a month for the legal help.

A Columbus, Ohio, man had his new car only three weeks when a faulty water pump caused the engine to burn up. He wanted a new car for the $6,500 he'd invested but the dealer offered only to repair the engine and said, in effect, "So sue me." A lawyer got him a new car without suing and it didn't cost him a thing.

Both the Chicago woman and the Columbus man and there are thousands more like them—belong to group legal service plans.

For their monthly dues or membership fees, they get free or low-cost consultation with lawyers in consumer cases such as these. If they have to go to court for a divorce, a bankruptcy or, in most plans, to defend a criminal case or a variety of civil matters, their payments into the plan cover them, too.

Or they know in advance exactly what they will be charged and usually this fee is far less than normal.

What people in these plans are paying for is a form of legal insurance, a way of getting advance protection against unexpected legal costs. It's like group medical insurance. They are spreading the risk to the whole group so the cost to the individual is reduced.

It's only within the past year and especially in the last six months that group legal or prepaid legal insurance plans have caught public attention. Some estimate that between 2,000 and 4,000 plans are now operating—but no one knows for sure how many and only a few states require registration. Most of these plans deal with job-related problems. Few cover the broad range of legal headaches.

The broad plans are still experimental and limited by roadblocks of laws or regulations that must be changed before they can go full speed ahead. Since there is no actuarial data on how often any one needs, uses or should see a lawyer, most commercial insurance companies have stayed out of the new legal insurance field.

FILED IN TWO STATES

Only one so far, the Stonewall Insurance Co. headquartered in Birmingham, Ala., has filed its proposed group legal insurance policies with insurance commissioners in two states. Both the Alabama and Minnesota insurance commissioners have approved the forms.

A company spokesman said Stonewall will file with the Maryland insurance commissioner because a union group and a credit union have expressed interest. He said he wouldn't know how much this insurance would cost until he looks at the groups, but that he's gotten much of the actuarial data he needs from Germany, which has had group legal plans for 25 years.

So far no commercial insurance company is actually writing group legal policies. It's being done variously by unions for their membership, nonprofit consumer groups and a few law firms which have banded together to offer free legal advice to groups in exchange for assurance that they will use these firms for their court business. There was even one company selling legal insurance from door to door, until it was stopped.

The American Bar Association has a pilot program of prepaid legal insurance operating in Shreveport, La., with a Laborers Union local, and hopes to get another started in Los Angeles with the police and firemen's protective league there.

BLUE CROSS, MAYBE

The New Jersey Bar Association is negotiating with the state's Blue Cross to expand its health services to cover legal services. California is also talking about a statewide plan to provide prepaid legal insurance.

Other state bar associations, some of which (like Virginia) fought the concept of group legal services through the Supreme Court, now are being urged by the American Bar Association leadership to investigate prepaid legal insurance as one way to make legal services available to more people.

Like the doctors of a few decades ago, the organized lawyers disagree on whether these plans represent a threat or a bonanza. But most state bars are now studying the possibilities and others are expected to be taking a look by year's end.

Union and consumer groups aren't waiting. Some are setting up group legal plans for their memberships, hiring lawyers to handle members' legal problems or tying up with law firms usually staffed by young lawyers.

POSTAL NEGOTIATIONS

Others negotiating to get group legal plans are teachers' associations, police, fire and other city employee associations, cooperatives, student groups, credit unions and others.

The rank and file of postal workers, more than 600,000 strong, proposed legal services during their first negotiations with the U.S. Postal Service, and a joint employe benefits committee is now studying it along with other fringe benefit demands.

What all these groups are looking for is a means of getting the legal help they need at prices they can afford to pay.

Some of their members often are not even sure that what they need is a lawyer. They just know they've been gypped or that the contract they signed doesn't seem to mean what they thought it meant. Or they need a lawyer in a hurry and don't know where to get one.

Some are separated from their spouses but can't afford a divorce. They know they should make a will but keep putting it off because they don't know a lawyer. They don't know how much a lawyer would charge but they're afraid it's more than they could pay. The less educated hesitate to try to bridge the cultural gap between them and the lawyer with the clipped accent and paneled office. More often than not, they don't go near a lawyer, until the damage is done and then they can't be helped or it's more costly than if they had sought legal advice in the first place.

These are the situations and attitudes that lawyers, union officials and consumer leaders have turned up as they investigate the need for some form of group legal services.

THE FORGOTTEN CLIENTS

The people they want to help are now being labeled "the forgotten clients". They're the people of moderate means whose incomes range from $5,000 to $15,000 for the family unit. About 28 million families fall in this category. They're not in the rich 10 percent of the population, the well-to-do who know when they need a lawyer and can afford a good one.

Nor are they in the poor 20 percent, people making less than $5,000 whose legal needs may be taken care of by OEO's Neighborhood Legal Services or Legal Aid Societies or public defenders.

Like the medically indigent of yesteryear, they are the legally indigent—not poor enough for free legal aid, not rich enough to pay the lawyer's bill. If the expense was unexpected, it can be catastrophic.

Many of these moderate income people neither like nor trust lawyers. Even the president-elect of the American Bar Association, Robert W. Meserve, concludes that the lawyer is generally regarded by the public as a necessary civil rather than as a helping hand" with a "far from winsome public image."

ASK ANYBODY

Although they could go to their bar association's lawyer referral service for an attorney specializing in the service they need, they're more likely to look in the yellow pages or ask a friend or relative or even the friendly neighborhood bartender to suggest a lawyer.

All this uncertainly, hesitancy and confusion comes at a time when the "increased complexities of life and the law seem to make legal representation a necessity," says Jules Bernstein, associate counsel of the Laborers' Union in Washington and one of the prime movers for legal service programs.

Bernstein is convinced that the programs can provide high quality legal services at moderate cost for the "forgotten client."

Could you get into a group legal program here tomorrow?

No, not yet in the Washington area, but the Prepaid Legal Services Committee of the D.C. Bar Association's Young Lawyers Sec-

tion has been studying the group plans and is about to write a report explaining to the membership what the plans are all about.

Committee Chairman Kenneth Allen visualizes adapting the prepaid legal insurance plans to the legal needs of District residents and hopefully finding some interested groups for which a plan could be tailored.

Lawyers who have been dragging their feet about prepaid legal insurance, he said, are talking from lack of knowledge and don't recognize the flexibility of the plans.

PREPAID LEGAL AID PLAN PAYS OFF

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

For the first time, the consumers of legal services—the clients of the lawyers—are getting organized.

Seeking ways to get high quality legal services at moderate cost are the "forgotten clients"—the moderate-income families who shun lawyers until they're sued or accused. For they, the lawyer is usually on the other side.

On the theory that providing effective representation for moderate-income families is "too important to be left entirely to the legal profession," consumer, urban, rural and union groups will convene here Friday and Saturday.

What they will be exploring are new developments in a new field—group legal service plans or prepaid legal insurance programs.

Although group legal plans are sprouting all over the country, only a few offer comprehensive legal services and stress "preventive law"—the seeking of legal advice early enough to avoid trouble.

A Star canvass of the few broad plans indicated:

People in those plans tend to go to a lawyer earlier than before the pre-paid program started. Some even show a contract to a lawyer before they sign it.

Con-men and "fast-buck artists" steer clear of people who they know have a lawyer behind them to protect their rights.

Couples who had separated as much as 10 years earlier but couldn't afford a divorce now go ahead and get divorced.

Lower-income workers in the plans reported they do not get pushed around by merchants and police as much as in the old days before they had access to a lawyer.

Gloomy predictions that people with access to lawyers would flood the courts with "nuisance suits" have not proved accurate.

This was attributed to the fact that some plans require members to pay a $10 to $25 fee to file suit, to the members' reluctance to go near a lawyer when they don't have to and, finally, to the duty of attorneys not to file suits lacking merit. One plan official said it was not making "legal hypochondriacs."

Only one of these plans offers a wide-open choice of lawyers or an "open panel." That's the type favored by the bar associations, mainly because it spreads the work and preserves the independence of the lawyers. It is similar to most Blue Cross medical plans.

QUALITY CONTROL

The other plans surveyed are all various forms of "closed panel" where the attorney is hired by the group to take care of the legal problems of members or a law firm is retained to represent the members.

The "closed panel" is preferred by most union and consumer spokesmen on the ground that costs can be better controlled and the quality of service would be uniformly good.

The merits of the two methods of seeking legal help undoubtedly will be debated at the upcoming consumer conference.

Helen Ewing Nelson, president of the Consumer Federation of America and one of the moving parties in the conference, has said the "open panels" of Blue Cross, where people go to their own doctors, has driven medical costs higher than ever before. She said she understood Blue Cross was moving toward "limited panels."

The one "open panel" plan now operating is in Shreveport, La., where the 600 members of Laborers Local No. 229 pay two cents per working hour to insure legal help for themselves and their family. Since this is the American Bar Association's experimental project to see how these plans work, another seven cents an hour is paid by the American Bar Foundation and the Ford Foundation.

The money goes to the Shreveport Legal Services Corp., set up to administer the fund and to pay the lawyers to whom the union members go with their legal problems.

The plan pays all costs incurred for legal advice and consultation up to $25 a visit or $100 a year.

DOMESTIC RELATIONS

After the member pays the first $10 charged, he can get up to $250 of legal services a year for such office work as negotiating a contract, drafting a will or researching a claim.

After paying the first $25 charged, the member who files suit could receive $325 worth of legal services or more in court costs and $150 in out-of-pocket expenses.

When he's a defendant, the plan pays 100 percent of the costs up to the limits set elsewhere in the plan and thereafter 80 percent of the next $1,000 of the costs. The member, however, has to pay the other 20 percent before any payments are made under this "major legal expense benefit."

Some legal services are excluded from the plan. In domestic relations cases, where members of the family are in conflict, only the insured member gets this service.

Also excluded are legal fees and expenses in connection with business ventures, cases in which a contingent fee is usually charged and cases involving the trust fund or the union. Disputes involving coverage under the plan go to mandatory arbitration.

Attorneys close to the Shreveport plan report that union members' negative attitude toward legal help gradually is being broken down. Twice as many are going to lawyers for help on legal matters although they still seek advice only rarely.

The number who choose a lawyer on the basis of what friends and relatives tell them has gone down sharply. Now they choose a lawyer on the basis of his community reputation and what they hear from union officials and co-workers.

These attorneys call the plan successful in its first 18 months of operation but they acknowledged that these union members aren't typical of the moderate income group for whom prepaid legal insurance is really designed because members of this laborers local are close to the poverty line and greatly mistrust lawyers.

"TIME AND DOLLARS"

In contrast, during the four months that Laborers' Local 423 in Columbus, Ohio, has had a legal service plan in operation, about 10 percent of the 2,500 members have used it.

As of July 6, a total of 129 criminal cases—mostly serious traffic offenses—were defended and 95 civil matters were handled.

Members went to lawyers to draft wills, to adopt children, to settle estates, to go through personal bankruptcy, to defend collection claims, to get advice on buying and financing a home.

Victor Smedstad, director of the union's legal service and one of the two widely experienced lawyers hired by the union to take care of members' legal problems, said many of the members had been to private attorneys earlier and gotten unsatisfactory service.

"Generally," he said, "lawyers have to consider cases in terms of time and dollars. So the members may get a brush-off. Since we are on salary, the money—while still important—is not the prime consideration that it is for lawyers in private practice.

By vote of the membership, 10 cents an hour of their union dues goes to the union's general fund to support the legal services program. All the services are free to members.

There is no limit on legal advice and consultation because the plan stresses "preventive law", seeking an attorney before making decisions. Members are entitled to 80 hours of legal representation and five matters in a calendar year, not counting the free representation offered in workmen's compensation and unemployment compensation cases.

Up to $500 in bail or collateral is provided but if it is forfeited the member has to reimburse the plan. The member pays the first $15 if he brings suit and pays his own traffic fines.

50 CENTS A MONTH

A less comprehensive plan, because of less financing, was launched by the Chicago Joint Board of Amalgamated Clothing Workers last April to provide legal service to some 8,000 union members in the Chicago area. Although the plan is voluntary, more than 6,000 signed up to have 50 cents a month taken from their pay to support the plan.

To keep costs down, the plan does not take criminal cases or contested domestic relations matters or cases that require jury trials.

Members start by seeing a social worker to determine if the problem can be straightened out without a lawyer. The next step is consultation with a firm of young lawyers hired by the union.

In the plan's four months of operation, 188 people visited the social worker with their problem and 113 of them went on to see the plan's lawyers. Their problems varied from garnishments to home buying, from wills to credit disputes.

"WILL HELP MILLIONS"

On the basis of success so far, Mrs. Joyce Miller, director of social services for the Chicago Joint Board of the clothing workers, concluded that group legal plans "will help millions of Americans to have access to the law they don't have without this kind of program".

Typical of consumer organizations now offering legal services to members is Consumers' Group Legal Services, Inc. of the Berkeley, Calif., Cooperative. The plan has been in operation since last October and has attracted more than 700 members of the Co-op who pay $25 a year for this added service.

The plan offers two consultants a year with a full-time staff attorney, access to a panel of attorneys whose schedule of fees is less than the prevailing rate and participation in the program's continuing education and preventive law sessions.

IRS, HILL OBSTACLES BLOCK GROUP LEGAL AID PLAN

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

Two major obstacles—one on Capitol Hill, the other at the Internal Revenue Service—are blocking the spread of group legal insurance plans.

Proponents of the various plans to make legal help available at low cost by spreading the risk over a large base had hoped it could be handled like group health or prepaid health insurance plans.

It hasn't worked out that way—at least not yet.

Employer contributions to labor-management trust funds established to defray the costs of medical services are specifically permitted under the Taft-Hartley Act. Employer contributions to help pay costs of legal service are not similarly permitted and, under court decisions, what is not specifically permitted under the Act is unlawful.

OPPOSITION

So two New Jersey Democrats—Sen. Harrison A. Williams Jr., and Rep. Frank Thompson Jr.—have introduced a short bill "to permit employer contributions to trust funds established for the purpose of defraying the costs of legal services."

They expected the measure to sail through Congress but spokesmen for the National Association of Manufacturers and other employer groups, particularly in the construction industry, contended that such a fund would increase the cost of doing business—a cost that would be passed on to the public.

The management spokesmen also contended that legal services had no real connection witht the employment relationship and might make it possible for union members to sue their employers with funds contributed by the employer himself.

"CONFLICT OF INTEREST"

Their arguments were refuted by F. William McAlpin, chairman of the American Bar Association's Special Committee on Prepaid Legal Services.

McAlpin, who "wholeheartedly endorsed" the Thompson bill at House Education and Labor subcommittee hearings in late April, denied that legal services had nothing to do with the employment relationship. He cited a defense plan which had its own legal aid department for its employes.

In one year, he reported, this plant legal aid department helped 3,461 employes and saved an estimated 15,364 work hours which might have been lost as workers pursued outside legal matters.

As for suing employers, he said the legal insurance and group legal plans he knew specifically excluded suits against the employer as a "conflict of interest."

McAlpin pointed out that National Health Insurance is on the way and when it comes the unions will be looking for other fringe benefits with which to use the money that now goes into Blue Cross and other health plans.

"If the employers think the money is going back to them, they're not being very realistic," he said. "What unions bargain for is not a specific benefit but so many cents an hour for fringe benefits. If the employer is going to have to pay 5 or 10 cents an hour for fringe benefits anyhow, why oppose use of the money for legal services that may keep employes from being garnished or evicted?"

Both legal and union officials said flatly that failure of this one-paragraph bill to pass would curb any widespread movement of group legal plans and prepaid legal insurance to unions since low and moderate income workers could not carry the cost of the legal fund without an assist from management.

One possible method has been suggested, however. Instead of joint mangement-labor trustees to administer a legal services fund, which is now forbidden, employers and employes could contribute to a fund administered by neutral trustees having no tie to either management or labor. Some union lawyers are considering that.

The other roadblock is at Internal Revenue, where a section of the code declares health, accident and other employe benefit plans to be exempt from federal taxation.

The IRS has never said what those other benefit plans are.

Back in 1968, IRS published proposed regulations defining "other benefits" but the AFL–CIO complained that the definition was too narrow and didn't include legal service plans as well as several existing fringe benefits which would be denied tax-exempt status.

The proposed regulations were rewritten but have never been published. An IRS spokesman blamed the delay on the Tax Reform Act which, he said, took the time away from other drafting chores.

The regulations have now been put together, he said, and are before the new assistant secretary of the Treasury for approval before they are published. He said there would be substantial changes made in other benefits.

Both the American Bar Association and the AFL–CIO are reportedly trying to resolve the IRS hold-up.

Meanwhile, in New Jersey, where ABA is working with the state bar on a state-wide legal insurance plan using Blue Cross in a new role, one of the attorneys working on the plan said he couldn't market it until the IRS and Taft-Hartley questions are resolved.

We're trying to establish a model for the country," said Emanuel Honig, who is shaping the New Jersey plan, but we can't get enough groups without unions and we can't get them until they know that employer contributions to a legal insurance fund are permissible and tax exempt."

What these roadblocks add up to is that the courts have moved faster than Congress or IRS.

In the latest of a series of court decisions knocking down state bar attacks on group legal service plans, the Supreme Court ruled last year that "collective activity undertaken to obtain meaningful access to the courts is a fundamental right within the protection of the First Amendment."

Once the court had finally made it clear that a group could provide legal services for its members as it has provided medical services in the past, union groups, consumer groups, rural groups, and others started exploring the possibilities. And that's when the roadblocks appeared.

EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN'S FOUNDATION OF LOS ANGELES

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the Exceptional Children's Foundation of Los Angeles, through its charitable work, is deserving of the highest esteem and gratitude. This fine group of people have dedicated themselves to the difficult task of improving the sad, indeed, often tragic, condition of mentally retarded children.

Recently, in their efforts to find ways to help adjust retarded children to social life, and perhaps more importantly, to help society adjust to the presence of, and responsibility to the mentally disabled, they have proposed two projects. One, the infant stimulation program, is designed to determine the best methods of raising retarded children through new educational approaches involving increased parental participation; the second, the citizen advocacy program, is to organize concerned citizens to attract public and governmental attention to the plight of the mentally retarded with the goal of protecting their rights and establishing new programs.

After careful study, and because of my knowledge of the fine past performance of the Exceptional Children's Foundation, I wholeheartedly support these programs. Application is currently before the Office of Child Development for funds for these two worthy projects. The combined total requested is $97,300—but this by no means represents their total value. Over 200 children will directly benefit from these programs. Many, many more, however, will benefit from the active interest, methods developed, and still more will benefit from the new educational methods developed, protection, and support of the citizens advocacy program.

I urge all my colleagues to join with me in support of these efforts.

DR. EDWARD W. MILL AND A NEW SOUTHEAST ASIA POLICY

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, concerned as all Americans are with the problems which plague Southeast Asia, few ever take the necessary time or thought to develop a concrete plan of possible action which would help to alleviate the perplexities of the existing situation. Dr. Edward W. Mill, chairman of the Chevalier Program in Diplomacy and World Affairs at Occidental College, has taken the time and thought upon many occasions to contribute to our understanding of the Southeast Asian dilemma. He has also suggested various programs which might allow the United States to assist in the peaceful development of this region.

Recently, Dr. Mill published an article entitled "Southeast Asia: Trends and Portents in the 1970's." In it he concerns himself with some of the problems faced by the countries which make up Southeast Asia. Also in this document, Dr. Mill presents a 10-point program, the elements of which should be considered as possibilities for future U.S. policy and action. The 10 points of this program are designed to assist the Southeast Asian nations, without our becoming involved militarily, in the full development of their individual growth as well as to promote regional cooperation.

One of the most difficult questions faced by the United States at the moment is what will be the course of future diplomatic relations between the United States and the Republic of China on Taiwan. Dr. Mill provides us with what he feels is one possible path to pursue with his proposal to create a Council on United States-Taiwan Relations. This would be a council composed of an equal number of members from each nation, serving without compensation, to further aid the economic, cultural, and educational relations between the aforementioned countries. The benefits of the success of such a program would be twofold: First, to further the friendship already enjoyed by the Republic of China and the United States, and second, to demonstrate that mutual cooperation between countries in a nonpolitical and nonmilitaristic manner can provide profits for both parties. The possibiilty of achieving such success should be cause alone for serious consideration of Dr. Mill's proposal.

At this time I include in the RECORD portions of Dr. Mill's article, "Southeast Asia: Trends and Portents in the 1970's"

and his proposal to create the council on United States-Republic of China Relations:

SOUTHEAST ASIA: TRENDS AND PORTENTS FOR THE 1970's

(By Edward W. Mill)

I. THE BROAD SWEEP OF AFFAIRS IN 1972

Since the end of World War II, Southeast Asia has been a region of marked change both politically and economically. But it is doubtful that any of the changes that have taken place in the past quarter of a century will have been greater than those which may take place in the decade ahead. Both old and new forces at work in the region are likely to produce a Southeast Asia—with the possible exception of the Indochinese states—which may be more politically alert and independent and more economically astute and hopeful. To say this is not to suggest that there will not be difficult problems ahead. In the extreme, some of the countries of the region could even fall apart or come under the domination of more powerful neighbors. But acknowledging all the existing and possible future problems, there are still reasons for believing that Southeast Asia could make substantial strides ahead in this decade.

Southeast Asia, of course, operates in the larger context of all of Asia and the world. What it does, or does not do, must be related to the larger world community about it. The main powers, such as the People's Republic of China, Japan, the United States, the Soviet Union, and India, all have a stake in what happens in this region. Their interests both diverge and coincide, depending on the circumstances and the countries involved. For some months now, all of them have been reviewing and reconsidering their future relationships in the area. In no case is this more true than in the instance of the United States. But none of the big powers can write their own prescription for the future. The countries of Southeast Asia of today insist on being masters of their own destinies. They seek, are even eager, for cooperation with others, but not at the price of domination, whatever the source may be.

XI. CAN SOUTHEAST ASIA UNITE?

One of the most hopeful trends in Southeast Asia in the post-war period has been the growth of regional cooperation. The nations of the region have sought to band together in various cultural, economic, and political organizations. One regional grouping, SEATO, has provided some military cooperation.

A major weakness of this cooperation has been its spotty and varied membership. Where countries like the Philippines and Thailand early pushed for regional cooperation, Indonesia and Malaysia stood to the side, with Sukarno often berating such efforts. With the coming to power of the Suharto group in 1965, Indonesia switched course drastically and began to join with its neighbors in efforts toward meaningful cooperation. The formation of the Association of Southeast Asian States (ASEAN) in 1967, with Indonesia and Malaysia both joining in the founding, provided a significant enlargement of cooperation in the region. This trend is continuing in numerous forms in Southeast Asia.

No account of the progress in regional cooperation can fail to acknowledge that much of the activity is as yet in its infancy and that there is often a large premium on rhetoric and too little on action. Any really significant association may be several decades away. However, this is a time of great readjustment and new thinking in Southeast Asia, and some bold, new proposals for wider, all-embracing cooperation may be timely. Perhaps Indonesia may sense the opportunity and provide the leadership Southeast Asia needs.

A PROPOSED 10-POINT PROGRAM

Throughout these pages, references have been made to United States interests and activities in Southeast Asia. In concluding this article, an effort will be made to summarize some of the points discussed above as well as to suggest some others of possible importance. This will be done through the framework of a possible ten-point program of policy and action for the United States in this region. The list will be far from all-inclusive, but it may provide some core thoughts for consideration and discussion. Herewith, the program:

(1) In the wake of the Vietnam conflict, to adhere to the basic Nixon Doctrine concept of non-involvement in the military affairs of Southeast Asia, while maintaining our treaty commitments in the region, particularly to Thailand and the Philippines.

(2) Continue and expand our program of economic and technical assistance to Southeast Asia. Such assistance is only a fraction of the costs of military involvement.

The specific Mekong River Project, involving Thailand, Vietnam, Cambodia (Khmer Republic), and Laos, should be given major American help.

(3) Encourage Indonesia, with its great potential, to play an increasingly active role of leadership in Southeast Asia.

(4) Continue to make efforts to improve United States relations with China and the Soviet Union while being under no illusion that these efforts are going to be rewarded with great results in the near future.

(5) Work closely with Japan in fostering economic ties in the region, in a manner acceptable to the states therein.

(6) Encourage greater participation by the United Nations, and its specialized agencies, in the economic and social affairs of the region.

(7) Encourage the greater spread of education, through programs of bilateral and multilateral assistance. Much emphasis should be placed on vocational education, and education at the elementary and secondary levels.

(8) Expand the programs of student and faculty exchange with the United States.

(9) Encourage the expansion of American private investment in Southeast Asia, this investment to be a thoughtful one, with personnel attuned to the national feelings, sensitivities, and culture of the people, and willing to develop some language competence. Continued national safeguards should be sought for American business.

(10) Propose for consideration the formation of a Federation of Southeast Asia, having political, economic, and social powers beyond any existing arrangement in the region, the goal for consummation of the idea being 1980, or sooner.

Such is a possible ten-point program. Obviously, each such point is susceptible of a more expanded treatment. But they may provide some guidelines for assessing the future of Southeast Asia and for the role that the United States may play in that future.

Today's Southeast Asia clearly has serious problems. Tomorrow's Southeast Asia will also have its difficulties. But new tides are running in the region, and the opportunities for political and economic and social development are great. Hopefully, the United States will choose to join with Southeast Asia in a positive way to help chart a successful future for the region.

THE COUNCIL ON UNITED STATES-REPUBLIC OF CHINA (TAIWAN) RELATIONS—A PROPOSAL

For almost a quarter of a century, the Republic of China on Taiwan, and its offshore islands of Kinmen (Quemoy) and Matsu, have maintained an independent existence. Despite the severe tensions and hostile relationship with nearby mainland China, the Republic has steadily gained in strength, particularly in the economic field. Today in Asia, it ranks only after Japan in its standard of living. In its fifteen million people, it has a resource rich in talent, experience, and determination.

In the world community, the Republic of China has had to learn to live with both defeat and triumph. In October 1971, the Republic was unseated from its place in the United Nations by mainland China. This was a severe blow, but in the months since that time Taipei has shown a remarkable resiliency. It has aggressively sought to strengthen its bi-lateral relationships with individual nations and to continue to participate in various regional organizations in Asia such as the Asian Development Bank and the Asian and Pacific Council (ASPAC). Its viability as an independent nation continues.

For the United States, the maintenance of the freedom and the development of the Republic of China have been important ingredients of its Asian policy. On February 9, 1955, the Senate of the United States approved a Mutual Security Treaty between the two countries. The economic relations of the two countries have also prospered. Most significant has been the determination of the Chinese to help themselves. In 1964, U.S. economic aid to the Republic ceased, making it a rather different case from that of many other countries still dependent on U.S. aid. In these and other ways, the relations of the two nations have become and are still close.

New relationships are obviously emerging in Asia these days, none of which is perhaps more spectacular than the efforts by the United States and the People's Republic of China to ameliorate old hostilities. In this situation, the exact nature of the future relationship between mainland China and Taiwan becomes unclear. But, acknowledging these important developments, and, in general, supporting the President's approaches to mainland China, it is the considered judgment of the proponents of this idea that ways and means should be sought to strengthen the independent Republic of China (Taiwan). One of the main means of achieving this, the authors feel, would be through the creation of a Council on United States-Taiwan Relations, composed equally of members from the United States and Taiwan. Some tentative thoughts on the nature, goals, means, financing, and administrative direction of the Council follow:

I. NATURE OF THE COUNCIL

The Council would be composed of an equal number of members from each country, perhaps twenty from each. For the United States, it is suggested that the membership be constituted as follows: 5 members from the House of Representatives; 2 from the Senate; 7 business leaders; and 6 from the academic, legal, and other professions. Presumably, the Chinese group would be formed in somewhat the same manner. All persons considered for membership should be persons of significant experience and knowledge of Asia. They would serve without compensation.

II. GOALS

The three main goals of the Council would be:

(1) To maintain and expand trade and other economic relationships.

(2) To encourage the educational progress of Taiwan.

(3) To stimulate a greater cultural awareness and appreciation between the two peoples. Support would be given to programs of cultural and educational exchange, and where possible, to the initiation of new programs.

In indirect ways, the Council might be of assistance in helping to encourage the development of new and more effective governmental institutions. To some extent, the approach of the Council should be along multi-disciplinary lines, with professional insights from both U.S. and Chinese members

contributing to an over-all picture of the problems and opportunities of Taiwan.

III. MEANS OF ACHIEVING THE GOALS

(1) The convening at least twice a year, once in January and once in June, at one time in Washington and the next time in Taipei, of the full Council, to deliberate on the goals and policies of the organization and to formulate statements for public consumption.

(2) The establishment of an Executive Committee, composed of five members in each of the two countries, to act as an interim decision-making unit, subject to the general policy-making guidelines of the Council.

(3) The calling of conferences and the holding of forums on subjects of interest in the Chinese-American relationship, the participants to include both members of the Council and professionals and businessmen not members of the Council. Consideration should be given to holding a *Annual Conference on Taiwan*.

(4) The publication of statements on contemporary aspects of Chinese-American relations, designed to help mold an intelligent and balanced public opinion, and to influence the deliberations and activities of the appropriate Congressional committees and subcommittees, and such executive agencies as the Department of State and the U.S. Information Agency.

(5) The publication of scholarly monographs on Taiwan by academicians and other writers.

(6) The establishment of contacts and associations with various universities and colleges as well as with various business organizations and professonal groups, all designed to promote closer cooperation and understanding between Taiwan and the United States.

IV. FINANCING THE COUNCIL AND ITS WORK

No government financial support, either from the Government of the United States or that of the Republic of China, is contemplated. Funding will be sought from foundations and other private groups. Initial inquiries of a few foundations provide some grounds for optimism.

It is also contemplated that the Council will be incorporated as a non-profit corporation.

VI. ADMINISTRATIVE DIRECTION

In order for the Council to function effectively, it will be essential to have an Executive Secretary in each country, who will carry on his duties subject to the wishes of the Executive Committee (see previous mention in Part III, Section 2). He should be assisted by a secretary. These positions initially might be part-time but conceivably could become full-time positions as time goes along. A small office should be established, presumably in Washington. The Executive Secretary should be a person of high competence in the Asian field who subscribes wholeheartedly to the goals of the Council.

In sum, through the medium of an active Council on United States-Taiwan Relations, an important step can be taken to preserve and expand on our economic, cultural, and educational relations in East Asia. With malice toward none, we can, in our way, seek to expand on the frontiers of freedom in a way mutually beneficial to both the Republic of China and the United States of America.

TELEPHONE PRIVACY—XXX

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I reintroduced the telephone privacy bill on May 10, 1972, with a total of 48 cosponsors.

This bill would give individuals the right to indicate to the telephone company if they do not wish to be commercially solicited over the telephone. Commercial firms wanting to solicit business over the phone would then be required to obtain from the phone company a list of customers who opted for the commercial prohibition. The FCC would also be given the option of requiring the phone company, instead of supplying a list, to put an asterisk by the name of those individuals in the phone book who have chosen to invoke the commercial solicitation ban.

Those not covered by the legislation would be charities and other nonprofit groups, political candidates or organizations, and option polltakers. Also not covered would be debt collection agencies or any other individual or companies with whom the individual has an existing contract or debt.

I have received an enormous amount of correspondence on this legislation from all over the country. Today, I am placing a 28th sampling of these letters into the RECORD, since they describe far more vividly than I possibly could, the need for this legislation.

These letters follow—the names have been omitted:

MENDOTA, ILL., *July 16, 1972.*

Representative LES ASPIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I applaud your efforts in introducing the bill, HR-14884, in an effort to protect the privacy of a subscriber's telephone.

As soon as I detect the nature of a call that solicits business, I cut them off by stating that I do not accept such calls—but I already stopped whatever I was doing in order to answer a nusiance call. It is characteristic of such calls that they frequently come at meal time when most people are at home. It is also the time that I want such calls the least!

I have long contended that a service for which we pay should be ours to enjoy; and I urge the passage of this bill.

Yours truly,

———— ————.

VILLA PARK, ILL., *July 18, 1972.*

DEAR SIR: I'm interested in seeing Bill H.R. 14884 passed. Nuisance phone calls can be mighty annoying.

———— ————.

NAPERVILLE, ILL., *July 16, 1972.*

Hon. LES ASPIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: May I join the list of supporters urging the passage of your bill, H.R. 14884, concerning telephone solicitors?

These annoying telephone calls come with such frequency that they are indeed one of the greatest nuisances a homeowner experiences. It is indeed a shame that so many people secure unlisted telephone numbers for that reason alone. Unlisted numbers cause a great deal of inconvenience to the holder but the privacy and the lack of interruption and inconvenience is well worth it.

Best wishes for the passage of your bill.

Sincerely,

———— ————.

DOWNERS GROVE, ILL., *July 17, 1972.*

U.S. Representative LES ASPIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It has come to my attention that you and Rep. Harley Staggers are sponsoring a bill, H.R. 14884. I am very much in agreement with this bill and would like to see it passed.

It is such an invasion of privacy to be constantly interrupted by telephone salesmen.

Yours very truly,

———— ————.

CHICAGO, ILL., *July 14, 1972.*

Hon. LES ASPIN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please do all in your power to put H.R. 14884 on the books. This bill refers to phone solicitation. Hardly a day passes without at least one call from some potential swindler who wants to sell real estate, home improvements, landscaping, furniture, etc., etc. I am retired and alone a good part of the day and have a hobby which necessitates spending much time in the basement of my home. When these unwanted calls come I must dash up the stairs to answer the phone. Calls from these usually "fly by night" operators are an infringement on my civil rights. Another source of irritation is the huge amount of "junk mail" the costs of which must be born, in part, by first class mailers such as myself.

Yours truly,

———— ————.

CRYSTAL LAKE, ILL., *July 17, 1972.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ASPIN: My thanks to you for introducing bill HR–14884.

We moved to Crystal Lake, Illinois just two months ago and in that short time have received countless calls from solicitors. Calls to buy carpets, land, *magazines*; to join clubs and churches, and many asking for donations. Most of the calls come at the busiest times of the day for us; usually just as we sit down for supper. These calls are a nuisance and as invasion of privacy.

I was so happy to read that someone was working on this problem. You have the support of this family and I'm sure many others, for I can't imagine anyone enjoying these phone calls.

Thank you.

———— ————.

INADEQUATE PUBLIC BROADCASTING BILL BETTER THAN NONE

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is with easily restrained enthusiasm that I rise to support a bill designed to breathe some life, if only a little, into noncommercial, educational broadcasting, for the next year.

This bill is short and simple; it calls for Federal funding, in fiscal year 1973, in the amount of $45 million, for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. It also calls for a badly needed increase in the appropriations for technical facilities at the local stations that broadcast television and radio programs on educational channels, from current levels in the $15 million range, to $25 million.

This is a far cry from the bipartisan bill that passed this House in June and then was passed by the Senate in identical form. That bill called for 2-year funding instead of 1, at a substantially higher level; it called for representation on the CPB Board by station representatives, and it called for other safeguards to insure that public broadcasting would

have a fair chance to fulfill the mission this Congress assigned to it when we passed the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967.

However, as you know, the President vetoed that bill just before the July 4th recess, and we are reduced to getting this modest—and incidentally inadequate—funding for public broadcasting for the coming year, or getting no bill at all.

It is not my desire to take up the valuable time of the House by rehashing the arguments that occupied so much of our time and energy during long hours in my subcommittee, in the full Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and on the floor of the House.

Needless to say, I have not retreated from the position that I held then. Stated in its simplest fashion, I believe that the people to whom we have entrusted public broadcasting over the past 5 years have done a good job in upgrading it from a group of weak, disjointed stations with virtually no audience to a viable medium that offered the American public a choice in their viewing and listening.

That progress, which was proceeding in a sturdy, healthy way until this roadblock in the form of a presidential veto was thrown up requires some assurance of operating funds for the years ahead. Since 1967, the Congress has been assured by successive administrations that a plan for long-range funding of public broadcasting would be forthcoming. This type of funding is not only needed so that important programs which require 2 or 3 years lead-time can be undertaken; it is urgently needed if we are to achieve the kind of insulation from governmental pressure that the original act envisaged, encouraged and legally prevented.

If we needed an illustration of how that pressure can be applied in order to reduce public broadcasting to a frightened, unsure, bland medium, we have only to look at the record of the last 8 months. The Director of the White House's Office of Telecommunications Policy was sent on a speaking tour to warn public television people against the use of national programing, particularly in the area of public affairs. I repeat "public affairs" not news, because everyone understands that public television broadcasting news has no ambitions to compete with Cronkite or Chancellor or Howard K. Smith, but serious examination of the issues facing this country, using the essential tool of national television that commercial TV cannot use, which is prime time exposure. Public television has done a good job along this line, despite the dire predictions of those to whom the very mention of certain so-called liberal commentators' names was like waving red flags or the ringing of bells in front of Pavlovian-type trained bulls. For the most part, public affairs presentations have been fair and balanced; and where they may have failed to present some particular point of view with the weight some critics want, it was not for the lack of their trying to do so.

I will continue to oppose, as strenuously as I know how, the naked pressure that the Office of Telecommunications Policy puts on public television by implicit or direct threats, promises or divisive tactics. I resent their attempts to weaken public broadcasting by false labels like "localism" when they know that we all want the local voices of noncommercial, educational broadcasting to be strong. We must also face up to the reality that they can only be strong if they can also present compelling national programs on their schedules that local personnel want to be aired but lack the funds to produce.

Just as we will be watching the Office of Telecommunications Policy to make sure that they do not step further out of line by trying to tell public television what they should or should not put on the air, we will be watching with equal diligence the performance of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the Public Broadcasting Service and the local stations. None of these entities are created or licensed to serve a partisan political purpose, either. Their use of public funds for public purposes will be scrutinized by the Congress, which is our responsibility. I know well we exercise that responsibility responsibly, meaning that I hope we do not try to intimidate creative people who need encouragement instead of threats if they are going to give us superior television and radio programs which are the reason for their existence. Therefore I am still waiting for the Office of Telecommunications Policy to make good on its many promises to submit a plan for long-range financing to the Congress by the end of this calendar year. And I challenge the public broadcasters to give us more programs of the caliber of Sesame Street and Masterpiece Theater, so we can finally convince the doubters that we are capable of making room in our outstanding, free broadcasting system for educational, cultural and public affairs programing that will keep television stimulating instead of boring, involved instead of escapist, and truly educational instead of time wasting and enervating.

With all these reservations, I still urge you to pass this bill, which will at least provide public broadcasting enough money to keep up with inflation, as well as letting them get on with the job of producing, and exhibiting superior television fare.

WOLFF'S NEWSLETTER

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, periodically I send a report to my constituents to inform them of my activities here in Washington as their representative. At this point in the RECORD I include the text of my most recent newsletter:

NEWSLETTER

DEAR FRIEND AND CONSTITUENT: Confronted with runaway costs and staggering budget deficits, NY State has had to curtail services and programs, NYC is near bankruptcy and Nassau County must opt to either cut services or raise taxes. This is the typical dilemma today in our cities and suburbs across the nation.

Rising welfare costs, widespread inflation and unemployment, the war, demands for increased services and, yes, waste and padded payrolls, all contribute to the rising cost of government—and, adding to the acute problem is the narrow tax base upon which our communities must determine their local revenues.

One answer is to cut out excess spending; another is to effect welfare reform that will see to the needs of the indigent and dependent children but not to those who do not want to work. I believe the federal government should assume all welfare costs—this is a federal problem, not one to be borne by the cities and suburbs. The welfare problem, as it exists now, is created by these states and communities which, by failing to take care of their own, precipitate the influx of welfare cases to us.

Until such time as the federal government does assume full welfare responsibility, an alternative has been effected to secure federal aid for localities. The Administration advanced a Revenue Sharing plan whereby each community would receive federal funds based on population. This plan, however, did not take into consideration community needs or already existing local tax burdens.

Therefore, late in 1971, Rep. Hugh Carey and I introduced our Revenue Sharing bill, HR8762, that was to become the backbone of the Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972, as introduced by Rep. Wilbur Mills, Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee. This bill, passed by the House and awaiting Senate action, appropriates nearly $30 billion over a 5-year period to state and local governments and stipulates distribution according to population, degree of urbanization, community need, local tax revenues and per capita income. (Table shows sample distribution of funds).

I am proud to be an original sponsor of this landmark "tax reform" bill, for it is my sincere opinion that this type of Revenue sharing will work. I am satisfied that, under its provisions, our states and localities will be afforded the long awaited "no strings attached" opportunity to meet individual community needs, without depending to a greater extent on already outmoded property and sales taxes.

While Revenue Sharing is certainly not the total answer to the tax dollar ills that today beset our states and communities, it *is* a new beginning.

Sincerely,

LESTER L. WOLFF,
Member of Congress.

THE $$ FLOW*

State of New York	$317,000,000
City of New York	158,800,000
Nassau County	16,600,000
North Hempstead	1,000,000
Village of Mineola	200,000
Great Neck Estates	21,000

* Estimated amounts.

ENVIRONMENT

As part of my ongoing efforts to upgrade our environment, I am working closely with the Environmental Action Coalition to expand its Trash is Cash recycling program in Queens. Recycling, as you know, is a major solution to our mounting waste disposal crisis and I am gratified to have been able to help secure the $32,000 federal grant (HEW) that funds your EAC.

Concerned non-profit community groups and school organizations are being asked to participate by seeking out new sites and volunteers for the collection and processing of materials. EAC provides supplies. Currently, discarded glass, newspapers, aluminum and all steel cans may be brought to any of the following community collection centers:

Glen Oaks—Garage Reclamation Center,

70–45 260th St., glass, cans, Saturdays, 10 a.m. to 2 p.m.

Fresh Meadows—Environmental Project 1, 67–10 192nd St., cans, glass, paper, Saturdays, 10 a.m. to 2 p.m.

Flushing—Francis Lewis High School, 58–20 Utopia Pkwy, newspapers, Thursdays, noon to 4 p.m.

Flushing—St. Melvin's School, 154–24 26th Ave., aluminum cans, Saturdays, 10 a. m. to 2 p.m.

Flushing—First United Methodist Church, 149th St. and Roosevelt Ave., glass, aluminum cans, papers, second Saturday of each month, 9 a.m. to noon.

AID TO EDUCATION

Today, as never before, the middle income family bears the brunt of the great economic crisis facing our higher education institutions. While the deserving needy are granted scholarships and the wealthy provide for themselves, it is the middle income family that often is without the resources to finance their children's college education.

The newly enacted Higher Education Bill, which I supported as I have all other aid-to-education legislation since I was first elected to the Congress in 1964, will provide long overdue assistance to our colleges and universities. It is the aim of this bill to enable these institutions to cope with rising program costs without placing further burden on the middle income family.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Social Security payment checks this month will reflect the 20 percent across-the-board increase recently approved by the Congress to help our millions of older Americans meet today's higher cost-of-living expenses.

The increase means the average monthly retirement benefit for an individual will rise to approximately $168 and the average retirement benefit for a married couple will go up from $223 to approximately $267. Those persons who receive maximum benefits also will receive the 20 percent increase.

The economic position of the aging has long been of primary concern to me for I know full well that inflation affects the purchasing power of those living on fixed incomes more adversely than it does any other income group. This new Social Security increase, which I strongly supported and voted for, was initiated as a measure of assistance to offset the rising costs of essential items—rent, nutritional food and medical care.

NEW VET HOSPITAL FACILITY GAINS IMPETUS

As the downstate NY member of the Subcommittee on Hospitals of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I have been concerned for some time with the glaring lack of adequate medical care facilities for veterans in the counties of Nassau and Queens. A new hospital is needed—and attempts have made stops at Fort Totten in Bayside where for our nation's former and returning servicemen.

Recently, at my request, my colleagues on the Subcommittee, joined me in a tour of the metropolitan area's VA facilities and met with our local veterans organizations to determine how and where increased services could be implemented.

On our official tour we visited the Bronx and Brooklyn VA hospitals where we spoke at-length with patients and personnel about the conditions in these facilities. We also made stops at Fort Totten in Bayside where we discussed the possibility of adding veterans nursing care facilities at St. Alban's Naval Hospital.

As the result, the Subcommittee is taking steps to pursue the establishment of a new facility to serve the Queens and Nassau area. While there is no doubt that VA services here must be increased, the Congressional committee can only recommend and authorize new construction; by law, it is up to the Administration to approve appropriations.

I have recommended to the Subcommittee that the 300–400 bed excess now at St. Alban's be turned over to the VA, on a contract basis, for use in the care of Queens and Nassau veterans. I anticipate early action on this proposal.

A BILL OF RIGHTS FOR POLICEMEN

As co-sponsor of the Law Enforcement Officers Act, an innovative "Bill of Rights" for policemen, I have urged the Congress to give prompt approval of this legislation to afford police officers the same rights and privileges as other citizens.

For example, in certain areas policemen, if arrested, may be jailed and denied their right to immediate legal counsel. Obviously, this second-class treatment of our law enforcement officers is an injustice and must be corrected. If we are to expect the right protection from our policemen, they are entitled to the same rights and considerations as the rest of society.

THE TENANT

A great deal has been said about the need to reform our entire system of taxation to equalize the burden among persons at all income levels and to eliminate discriminatory features. Homewoners already are afforded some consideration, yet little emphasis has been placed on one glaring inequity in the present system of property taxation—that of the tenant who is not permitted to take any tax deduction for his rent, even though it includes a proportion of the property tax passed on as rent by the landlord.

I introduced legislation in the House of Representatives this past month to remedy this unfair situation. My bill, HR 15378, would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a flat deduction of 25 percent of rent on federal income tax returns for persons who rent their principal residence. It is my hope that the Congress will act swiftly on this legislation to ease the tax burden of the tenant.

CRIME

Crime continues to plague our communities at unprecedented levels. While efforts are being maximized to stem the incidence of unlawful acts, little has been done to aid the innocent victims of crime—the people who really have to pay.

Since government has been unable, or unwilling, to afford its citizenry adequate protection against the criminal, Rep. Claude Pepper and I have introduced legislation to provide a tax deduction, up to $300 annually, to cover the cost of installing crime prevention equipment, including locks, burglar alarms and other warning devices. Thus, added incentive would be given the apartment dweller, homeowner and businessman who cannot afford these methods of crime prevention to better protect himself and his family.

Additionally, this bill, HR 14805, would provide tax relief for theft losses and related medical expenses by permitting the aggrieved individual to deduct from his federal income tax the amount of the loss and all expenses incurred for injury sustained in the commission of a crime.

My concern with crime is not new. I am the co-sponsor of legislation which created the House Select Committee on Crime and I supported the enactment of the Safe Street Act of 1968. I am now equally hopeful that my proposal to aid the victims of crime will meet with similar Congressional action and approval.

THE DISABLED

There are 22 million disabled persons in our country, who, as members of the tax paying public, pay their share to help subsidize our public transportation systems. However, because of barriers, such as the lack of ramps for wheelchairs, public transportation is rendered virtually useless for the disabled who are forced to rely on special vehicles to travel to work and engage in other essential daily activities.

To overcome this unjust obstacle confronting the disabled, I have introduced legislation, HR 15255, which will permit the disabled and the handicapped to deduct from their federal income tax the annual cost of such necessary transportation. I believe it is high time that the problems and needs of our disabled be given their just priority in our tax system.

NEWS BULLETIN OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD the July 31, 1972, edition of the news bulletin of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission I take this action to help my colleagues be informed of developments across the country leading to the commemoration of the Nation's 200th anniversary in 1976. The bulletin is compiled and written by the staff of the ARBC communications committee of which I am vice chairman. The bulletin follows:

BICENTENNIAL BULLETIN OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The ARBC will testify at Senate Hearings, August 1 and 2, before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays and Celebrations, chaired by Senator Roman Hruska (Nebraska).

The ARBC Executive Committee on July 24th took favorable action on a Maritime Bicentennial proposal presented by Federal Maritime Commission Chairman Helen Delich Bentley. The concept would employ ships, either displays in themselves or containing exhibits by a variety of sponsors, that would circulate among a nationwide network of special exhibition piers prepared by participating port cities so that each city would have a continually changing array of ships on display throughout the program period. The supportive resolution passed by the ARBC encouraged the Federal Maritime Commission to develop a feasibility study and an action plan for the Maritime Bicentennial.

The ARBC announced on Friday, July 28th, that a contract has been awarded to the management consulting firm of Booz-Allen and Hamilton, Inc., to explore the feasibility of the Bicentennial parks concept initially proposed earlier this year.

Dr. Frank Angel, ARBC Commission member and President of New Mexico Highlands University, told newsmen in Las Vegas that although he is the only New Mexican on the Commission, he does not represent the state as such. Rather, he represents all Spanish-speaking Americans.

Vicky Nash has been named the new State Director for the Nevada ARBC. At a recent meeting in Carson City, Chairman Fred Gale said, The Bicentennial was designed to make Americans aware of where we've come from, where we are, and where we're going."

At a recent annual meeting, the American Legion's National Executive Committee authorized the expenditure of up to $125,000

from previously appropriated funds for the creation of a statue of Gen. John Pershing. The Statue would be placed in a memorial setting in Washington, D.C., as part of the Legion's participation in the Bicentennial.

"United States of America Bicentennial FOCUS 1976," published by the Daughters of the American Revolution is an excellent guidebook for Bicentennial planning. It is an invaluable tool for historical societies, schools, organizations and local Bicentennial commissions. The booklet contains suggestions for commemorative activities and projects, Bicentennial programs, study units and reference materials. Copies of FOCUS–1976 may be secured from the Corresponding Secretary General, NSDAR Administration Building, 1776 D Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006. Price per copy: $1.00 per copy. Make checks payable to the Treasurer General.

Princeton University will publish a biographical dictionary in 1976. The volume will detail Princeton graduates' contributions to American life in the 30 years prior to the Revolutionary War and will cover the lives of more than the 900 men who attended the University from 1747–1776.

Gov. Kenneth M. Curtis has named a 12-man panel to the Maine State ARBC to serve with the seven members of the state Commission. One of the first tasks of the Commission will be to canvas the State and determine what interests there are in designing local Bicentennial events.

A six-cent postal card in honor of John Hanson, a Maryland delegate to the Continental Congress, will be issued by the Postal Service at Baltimore September 1 as part of commemoration of the Bicentennial of the American Revolution. Hanson was the first delegate elected to head the Congress and is sometimes considered the first President. However, provision for an executive of the Nation was not made until the Constitution was ratified. Therefore, historians recognized George Washington as the first President of the United States.

The Dallas City Opera is seeking funds for the commissioning of a new opera from a distinguished American composer for the Bicentennial.

In Nebraska, a state Bicentennial Commission is getting underway. A nominating committee for selecting commission officers will meet July 28th. Marvin F. Kivett, Director, Nebraska Historical Society, has stated that $5,000 in state funding is available to supplement the $45,000 federal grant for the coming year to get the Nebraska program going.

Restoration of a north Florida mission, a Seminole Indian village in the Keys, and Tampa's Fort Foster, a base for American soldiers who fought the Seminoles, are planned by the Florida Bicentennial Commission to celebrate Florida's participation in the Nation's 200th anniversary in 1976.

President Nixon's Bicentennial Coordination Center for the District of Columbia has started a year-long Bicentennial Transit Study to be completed in July, 1973. Using funds included in an April, 1972, federal grant of $3.1 million to the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, the study will identify metropolitan area transit requirements for the Bicentennial years and make recommendations for their permanent implementation. The Bicentennial Coordination Center, Metropolitan Council of Governments and Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (Metro) share responsibility for the effort. (Originally, the Bulletin reported that the District of Columbia government made this announcement, when in fact it was the Coordination Center.)

IN MEMORY OF FRED S. ROYSTER OF HENDERSON, N.C.

HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, on June 3 of this year, North Carolina and the Nation lost much, in the passing of Mr. Fred S. Royster of Henderson, N.C., a distinguished citizen of towering stature.

Mr. Royster, with whom I had served in the North Carolina State Senate, one who I was proud to call friend, was rightly known as "Mr. Tobacco" because of his countless contributions to the tobacco industry.

He was an articulate, wise, and respected spokesman for tobacco, a commodity of prime importance to America since the first colonists landed on the shores of the new world.

Recently, the Bright Belt Warehouse Association, in convention assembled at Nags Head, N.C., unanimously adopted a resolution in memory of Mr. Royster. I think it is most appropriate that this resolution become a part of the permanent record of the Congress as another kind of memorial to the many public services of Mr. Royster.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

RESOLUTION IN MEMORY OF FRED S. ROYSTER

Whereas, on the third day of June 1972, God the Father of Mankind, in the exercise of his Almighty Power and of his Unsearchable Wisdom, took from us our respected and beloved leader, Fred S. Royster;

Now therefore be it resolved: That we deem it right and proper for us, for our own satisfaction and for the record and for the future uplift of our successor generations, to express the sorrow which we feel at this loss and the appraisal which we make of his career.

Fred S. Royster was a man on whom had been bestowed many talents, notably quickness of mind, a capacity to reason logically, a wisdom to arrive at sound conclusions, a courage to declare such conclusions and to stand by them, a genial and warming personality, and a lucidity of speech which was convincing and moving and which at times reached superb oratorical heights.

Those talents made Fred Royster exceedingly effective.

But Fred Royster was more than merely an effective man. He was a great man.

And what made him *great* was his complete dedication to the cause of the successful operation and defense of the Federal Agricultural Program of tobacco acreage control and price support.

Fred Royster was born and raised on a tobacco farm in Vance County, of which he was a part owner at the time of his death.

As a teenager he worked in the tobacco fields and barns and so helped in the support of his farming family.

As a mature man he was a producer of flue-cured tobacco for the remainder of his life.

In his early maturity he became an operator of a warehouse for the sale of tobacco at auction in Henderson, North Carolina.

In June 1945 he became a leading organizer of this tobacco auction warehouse trade association, the Bright Belt Warehouse Association. It embraced in its original membership practically all of the auction warehousemen selling flue-cured bright tobacco in Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia and Florida. For the next 27 years until the date of his death, that Warehouse Association continued to represent the great majority of those warehousemen.

For those 27 years Fred Royster, first as President and later as Managing Director, led this Association to its accomplishments. Those accomplishments are a matter of history.

Fred Royster passionately believed that the tobacco program, acreage control and price support, not only was of great benefit to farmers but also to the State and to the Nation.

He clearly saw that to achieve success, there should be made the utmost effort toward harmonious cooperative action by the 5 groups, the farmers, the warehousemen, the buyers, the Stabilization Corporation, and the Department of Agriculture of the United States of America. To secure such joint action was his first burning objective.

Throughout the 27 years of the operation of Bright Belt Warehouse Association, he made strenuous and outstanding efforts to establish and continually improve an operation that would confer the maximum benefit upon the farmers and impose the minimum burden upon the Government. The record of the past 27 years vividly portrays the success of those efforts.

But the Royster activity to meld the auction warehouse operation into a smooth unitary operation was only a part of his notable activities. His dedication covered the whole field of the tobacco programs, its operation and its defense.

As a founder and as a member of Tobacco Growers' Information Committee, he fought the battle against unfair attacks on tobacco.

As President and Chairman of the Board of the Tobacco Tax Council, he fought the fight against the discriminatory taxes on tobacco, against making tobacco the whipping boy of tax hungry legislative bodies.

As a participant in those organizations and as a farmer and as a citizen Fred Royster was alert, vocal and active in the defense of the tobacco support program and its retention.

Fred Royster was a firm believer in the *good* of tobacco and in the justification for a producer of tobacco to be proud of his accomplishments.

He insisted in meetings of warehousemen, in public gatherings, in state legislative assemblies and in the Halls of Congress, that in this world of human tension the enjoyment and relaxation to be gained through the moderate smoking of tobacco by the many outweighs the danger which might be threatened to the few who foolishly and willfully engage in excessive smoking. Among the Members of Congress he was called "the poet laureate of tobacco".

Fred S. Royster was the passionate, tireless, effective and *totally dedicated* spokesman for the farmers who grow tobacco.

That dedication made him great indeed.

Such greatness left its mark on all with whom he came into contact.

We will nourish his memory and pass it on to our successors.

Resolved further, that this Resolution be spread on the minutes of this Association, that a copy be sent to each of our members, that a copy be sent to the family of Fred S. Royster, that a copy be sent to the several tobacco organizations of which he was a member and with which he worked, and that a copy be furnished to the press.

(Adopted unanimously at the 28th Annual Convention of Bright Belt Warehouse Association, Inc. at Nags Head, North Carolina, on the evening of the 21st day of June 1972.)

THE SMALL BUSINESS COMMUNITY

HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the National Committee for Small Business Tax Reform, a committee of the National Small Business Association, has been waging a battle to help the small business sector of our country survive.

In the committee's efforts toward achieving meaningful tax reform for small business, it has enlisted the aid of 170 Members of this body who have either introduced, cosponsored, or supported tax reform for small business. Moreover, 28 Members of the U.S. Senate have so acted during this Congress.

I am proud to say that I, too, have sponsored legislation which will assist in preserving a competitive place in our free enterprise system for the small businessman. Mr. Speaker, many have discussed the underprivileged of this country during numerous hours of committee and floor time. However, small businessmen are in numbers alone the largest group of underprivileged in the United States who have suffered a neglect which appears to be almost by design.

Who are they, these second-class citizens? By our own official record they are—

Ten out of every 20 firms in the United States; American small business—11 million of them. They employ almost 50 percent of the private work force. Ninety-seven percent of them have less than 100 employees. Small businessmen, their employees, and their families equal 50 percent—one-half of our total population. They have had no favorable tax legislation since 1958.

Who are they? They are the ones who cannot accumulate capital, cannot adequately expand, have been plagued by concentration in industry after industry, have seen their profits decline over 50 percent in less than 20 years. These are the underprivileged and second-class citizens who have had no tax equalization or legislation in 14 years.

Because of the treatment small businessmen have received, profits for manufacturing corporations with assets under $1 million declined 44.8 percent between 1969 and 1970, and there was an additional decline of 3.9 percent between 1970 and 1971. Yet, manufacturing corporations with assets over $1 billion declined only 7.2 percent between 1969 and 1970, then increased 14.3 percent between 1970 and 1971.

The small business community has been further relegated to a second-class position by virtue of consolidation, amalgamation, and power. Witness: The 500 largest corporations account for 66 percent of all industrial sales, 75 percent of all industrial profits, 75 percent of all industrial employment, yet, over 189,000 small industrial firms account for less than 2 percent of industrial sales.

The small business community is the sole remaining factor that can put the United States back on its economic feet. Given proper tax treatment, small businesses can expand, reduce welfare rolls, and convert tax takers to taxpayers by increasing employment. I hope my remarks have helped to illustrate the need for consideration of the small business tax simplification and reform legislation. It will wipe out a particularly bad kind of discrimination in America.

GUN LEGISLATION

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, once again the advocates of restricting the law-abiding American citizen's right to keep and bear arms are pushing hard for legislation to accomplish their goal. I have presented testimony on this important issue to the Judiciary Committee which has been considering this legislation, which will be included in the committee's hearing record. My testimony to the committee includes a statement by the National Association to Keep and Bear Arms which has gathered 1.5 million signatures nationwide on petitions for repeal of the 1968 Gun Control Act and in opposition to new gun control legislation. I urge your careful attention to this material, which follows:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN G. SCHMITZ TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY ON GUN LEGISLATION

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I would like to recall to your minds as forcibly as possible a saying you have heard many times, but whose impact may have been dulled through repetition to the point that you do not fully appreciate the strength of the argument it states.

It is this: When guns are outlawed, only outlaws will have guns.

Some slogans obscure the truth, while others clarify it. The familiar, punchy statement just quoted is an excellent example of a slogan that clarifies and points up a vitally important fact.

It should be obvious that a man intending to commit a crime with a gun is not likely to be deterred from doing so because it is also a crime to have a gun. He may be deterred if there is a much stiffer penalty upon conviction of a crime committed with a gun, and a reasonable prospect of his apprehension, conviction and the infliction of this stiffer penalty upon him. But he is not much more likely to worry about laws against illegal possession of a firearm in this situation than about accumulating parking tickets.

Nor will gun control laws prevent such a criminal from obtaining the weapon needed for his crime. If a gun is essential, he will obtain it outside the law; if not, he will use some other weapon, perhaps more bloody, but just as final.

His law-abiding victim, on the other hand, will be disarmed.

Our first line of defense against crime is our local police, just as our first line of defense against enemy attack are our national armed forces. But first lines of defense become much stronger and more effective when backed up by adequate reserves. Citizens capable of and willing to defend themselves are the reserves in the fight against crime. They make the task of the police easier and that of the criminal harder. Such citizens also give pause to foreign aggressors or home-grown would-be tyrants who might seek to deprive us of our liberties by force.

Yet the agitation for the forcible disarming of law-abiding American citizens never ceases, despite the explicit guarantee in the Constitution of their right to keep and bear arms. (Much is made of the fact that this provision of the Bill of Rights is introduced by a clause referring to militia. We are told that because we have no organized body today called a militia, this guarantee of our rights no longer applies. But a militia in essence simply consists of law-abiding citizens, still living at home, who are prepared to defend their country when necessary by force of arms. It does not always have to be established in organized units, but may remain a potential reserve available in time of crisis—*if* the right to keep and bear arms has been preserved.)

To take just one example of the kind of bill now before you, H.R. 8828 introduced by your Chairman would (1) require the registration of all firearms; (2) require the purchasers of firearms and ammunition to be licensed; (3) outlaw the possession of handguns by private individuals, with only a few execptions; (4) reinstate the record-keeping requirements on rifle and shotgun ammunition sales first imposed by the regrettable, hysteria-induced Gun Control Act of 1968 and wisely removed by Congress last year; (5) require the States to enact gunowner licensing laws or lose the revenue they receive from the Federal excise tax on sales of firearms and ammunition, which is now applied to State fish and game programs.

As the California Rifle and Pistol Association well said in its July 1971 newsletter, this bill, if enacted into law, would "accomplish about all that the gun abolitionists have hoped for except the outlawing of rifles and shotguns which will come later."

Such legislation must be unwaveringly resisted. The very last think we need, in a country so deeply threatened from both within and without as the United States is today, is to disarm its law-abiding citizens, leaving them helpless before any degenerate or destroyer who can get past our first lines of defense.

Now let's look at some very revealing statistics. Crimes committed with firearms have not been increasing relative to our population. For example, in 1930 (when very few gun controls existed in law) the national homicide rate with firearms was 5.7 per 100,000, while by 1968 the rate was 3.5 per 100,000—despite the fact that, as gun control advocates have been loudly proclaiming, there has been a substantial increase in the number of firearms in the United States.

States with tough anti-gun laws have not succeeded in taking guns out of the hands of criminals and in fact the statistics show that states which have enacted restrictive gun laws have experienced an increase in homicide rates. In New York, for example, where gun laws are very strict and private ownership of firearms has long been for all intents and purposes totally banned in New York City, the overall homicide rate has been steadily increasing, from 3.7 per 100,000 in 1960 to 6.5 per 100,000 in 1968. The homicide rate in New York City is now nearly two and one-half times the national average.

The National Association to Keep and Bear Arms, headquartered in Medford, Oregon, with chapters all over the country, has gathered no less than 1.5 *million* signatures from residents of all 50 of our States on petitions

for repeal of the 1968 Gun Control Act and in opposition to new gun control legislation. They inform me that nearly everyone asked to sign these petitions did so. Following a very fine statement prepared by the National Association to Keep and Bear Arms for presentation to this committee, which I am happy to have the opportunity of bringing before you:

"Today we have more restrictive firearms regulations than ever before in the history of the United States; and today there are more crimes of violence (more in actual number, and more in proportion to the total population) than ever before. This is not coincidental; it is inevitable. Criminal violence against law-abiding citizens will always increase as citzens are reistricted in their right to defend themselves. A free man must have the unrestricted right to own and use personal firearms in defense of his family, his home and his own person against any marauder. If a man loses his right to free, lawful use of personal firearms, he loses his identity as a free agent in a civilized country. He becomes totally dependent upon centralized police authority for protection of his life, liberty and property.

"Former President John F. Kennedy said: "By calling attention to 'a well-regulated militia,' the security of the nation, and the right of each citizen to keep and bear arms, our founding fathers recognized the essential civilian nature of our country. Although it is extremely unlikely that the fears of political tyranny which gave rise to the Second Amendment will ever be a major danger to our nation, the amendment still remains an important declaration of our basic civilian-military relationships, in which every citizen must be ready to participate in the defense of his country. For that reason, I believe the Second Amendment will always be important."

"One interested group that will applaud H.R. 8828, or any other restrictive gun bill, if it becomes law, is the growing numbers of criminals who enjoy a special status in this land: they are excluded from such laws because they already operate outside the law. No doubt they are very enthusiastic about H.R. 8828 and similar bills.

"To those who seek firearms prohibition or any other type of firearms legislation, we must assert that the right of the people to keep and bear arms is still, indeed, the law of the land. Those who hold legislative responsibility must not subvert the law, for the law then becomes corrupt and of no force or effect except to bring about chaos. If the people are no longer to be trusted with the right to keep and bear arms, then the law should be changed by Constitutional amendment and not circumvented by devious means."

A BOOTSTRAPS PROGRAM FOR SMALL AEROSPACE SUBCONTRACTORS

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call the attention of our colleagues to an innovative program being cosponsored by the National Association of Aerospace Subcontractors and the California State University, Long Beach.

The program is called Project Sales-Gap and it is designed to help bring the academic resources and talents of the university into phase with those of the 5,600 small, high-technology firms in California specializing in aerospace products.

As this body is no doubt aware, the cutbacks in the aerospace industry have hurt many businesses, not only in California, the heart of the U.S. aerospace industry, but elsewhere across the Nation. This has been particularly true of the 22,000 small business in the country that subcontract on various aerospace programs.

To counter this trend and help these businesses expand their product base, the NAAS and California State University, Long Beach, have launched Project Sales-Gap. Their goal is to give these firms the diversity necessary to stay alive and continue their contributions to the Nation's economy and goals.

For several months now, I have been working with the officers of the NAAS in trying to identify sources of support for this program, which I consider to be not only worthwhile but vital to the continued health of the California economy.

While much ado is made of the plight of the aerospace giants—the prime contractors—I feel that the smaller, more vulnerable small businesses are too often overlooked.

So that the Congress can be aware of the efforts being made in California to develop this "bootstrap" program for small, aerospace subcontractors, I include in the RECORD at this point an article on the program from the Southern California Industrial News of July 17, 1972:

COOPERATIVE PROGRAM AIMS AT SMALL SUBCONTRACTOR RESCUE

A cooperative program to enlarge the business base of small, high-technology aerospace subcontractor into new markets while improving their usefulness to present aerospace customers, will be undertaken jointly by the California State University—Long Beach, and members of the National Association of Aerospace Subcontractors (NAAS).

The pact is said to be the first in the nation to enlist academic resources in the battle for survival of the small aerospace businesses.

Dr. Arthur Prell, dean, school of business administration of Cal State, said that substantial improvement in the business prospects of the subcontractors, now greatly depressed as a result of the decline in aerospace activities, was anticipated through Project "Sales-Gap."

Dr. Prell said that he is eager to have his faculty and students assist in solution of the business problems of the small high-technology firms.

"Most business schools and faculty have little interaction with the real world of industry problems," he said. "The business curricula of a university must reflect more of a businessman's attitude towards business problems," he said. In Dr. Prell's view, programs like Project "Sales-Gap", will speed these changes and help the university apply its combination of academic strength and student and faculty involvement in business problems that are part of the national interest.

David B. Mulgrew, Jr., president of NAAS, welcomed the help of the university in the solution of survival problems of the small aerospace subcontractors.

"The 5,200 small high-technology aerospace subcontractors of Southern California are operating at 45 per cent of capacity. They are exiting from business at rates approaching 2 per cent per month, as their usual aerospace markets decline. These represent an average of 60–80 per cent of our members' business," said Mulgrew.

At this exit rate, the reservoir of small aerospace subcontractors could be depleted within five years, he forecast.

Mulgrew pointed out that the small firms lack vision, staff, finances, entree to new markets and capabilities in forecasting and planning, to carry them over the long haul.

"Without help, the small high-technology subcontractor will not identify new opportunities, nor attempt growth in new areas. He will increasingly fail. If this vital national resource does not survive, the nation will lose the small firms contribution to higher productivity and advanced technology," said Mulgrew.

The aerospace industry is becoming increasingly concerned over the plight of its small subcontractors.

Mulgrew pointed to the recent statement of William P. Gwinn, chairman of the board of United Aircraft Corporation, demonstrating fears by the prime manufacturers over the contraction of their subcontracting base. Said Gwinn, in Washington, May 16:

" 'We in the industry are becoming increasingly alarmed at the erosion of the valuable national resource represented by the small, highly skilled, specialized subcontractors serving us. A continued shrinkage of the subcontracting base is a grave threat to the country. It not only results in joblessness and a weakening of the economy, but it impairs the ability of the aerospace industry to respond in a defense emergency.

A base of reliable vendors, laboriously built up during prosperous years is not easily or quickly rebuilt if it is allowed to disintegrate.' "

Mulgrew said the 4800 small aerospace subcontractors in Los Angeles County, and the 400 in Orange County were 24 per cent of the nation's total of such firms. They employ 195,000 workers and support an additional 300,000 jobs. The group contributes $8.1 billion to the state gross product and generates state and federal tax income $2.25 billion yearly.

Mulgrew said that Project "Sales-Gap" would not emphasize make-work or modern day WPA techniques. Instead, technical advances and higher productivity of project participants would be spurred.

Forty NAAS member-firms will participate in the 12-month-long Phase One program to get underway July 15 at Cal State, with an all-day orientation workshop.

Procedures and results of the Project "Sales-Gap" program will be communicated throughout the aerospace industry through the members of NAAS' Industry Advisory Board, said Mulgrew.

THE HATCH ACT

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1972

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the Federal judiciary has spoken. The constitutionality of the punitive Hatch Act has finally been called into question. Without waiting for further appeals, this Congress should act to repeal the Hatch Act and restore to millions of Americans their rights to participate in our political process.

This law was developed with good intentions. At a time when politics was vicious and partisans went to every extreme to gain victory, protection for the

small numbers of Government workers was needed. In recent years, however, the Federal Government and those bureaucracies of the States and localities—which have similar provisions—brought millions of voters into their fold. At the same time, politics has mellowed and been controlled sufficiently to prevent the abuses so flagrant when the Hatch Act was first enacted.

This Congress has been regrettably unwilling to take up the issue of reform of the Hatch Act. I and several of my colleagues have introduced legislation to repeal these provisions. It is clear that those people whom the act was intended to protect are now most anxious to be free of its burdens. The National Association of Letter Carriers, which represents some 200,000 postal employees, must be lauded for its efforts in the recent court case. The association has acted where Congress has failed to do so.

Our entire system is dependent on good people getting involved in political dialog, running for office, working for the candidates of their choice and, in general, exercising their citizenship without restriction.

The Hatch Act and similar State and local laws have politically emasculated over 12 million Government workers. These are among the best educated and qualified people in the country. Yet they are not available to help elect responsible men and women to public office; their services are barred at the risk of losing their jobs.

With the Civil Rights and Voting Rights Acts of the 1960's and the recent constitutional amendment giving 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds the right to vote, I see no reason to continue to refuse Government workers the right to participate in the political process. While they have the right to vote, they should also have the right to express their personal beliefs without interference, a right which is basic to the functioning of the American system. They should have that right restored to them in this Congress, in this election year. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues will join me in seeking such reform.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, August 3, 1972*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The eternal God is thy refuge and underneath are the everlasting arms.—Deuteronomy 33: 27.

O God, our Father, we humbly beseech Thee to purify our minds of all negative thoughts and with positive thinking prepare our souls to worship Thee in spirit and in truth. Set our affections on things above this moment and all the day long and give us grace to receive Thy word into honest and good hearts.

Guide us as we give ourselves to the service of our country. Grant that with faith and fortitude we may minister to all our people, particularly to the needy. May we continue to work to release the captives and to set at liberty those who are oppressed.

Make us sensible of our union with one another as Thy children that we may strive wisely to order all things according to Thy will.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 489. An act to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior canceling irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Modoc Point unit of the Klamath Indian irrigation project, Oregon.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 15495. An act to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1973 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to authorize construction at certain installations in connection with the Safeguard antiballistic missile system, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength for each active duty component and of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 15495) entitled "An act to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1973 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to authorize construction at certain installations in connection with the Safeguard antiballistic missile system, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength for each active duty component and of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. DOMINICK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 247 An act for the relief of Albert G. Feller and Flora Feller.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6957) entitled "An act to establish the Sawtooth National Recreation Area in the State of Idaho, to temporarily withdraw certain national forest land in the State of Idaho from the operation of the U.S. mining laws, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2969. An act to declare title to certain Federal lands in the State of Oregon to be in the United States in trust for the use and benefit of the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon; and

S. 3157. An act to promote maximum Indian participation in the government of the Indian people by providing for the full participation of Indian tribes in certain programs and services conducted by the Federal Government for Indians and by encouraging the development of the human resources of the Indian people, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 63, 92d Congress, appointed Mr. CANNON to the joint committee to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice President-elect on the 20th day of January 1973 in lieu of Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, resigned.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 15495, MILITARY PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION, 1973

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 15495) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1973 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces and to authorize construction at certain installations in connection with the Safeguard antiballistic missile system, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength for each active duty component and of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and ap-