

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## CONSUMER AGENCY BILL

**HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL**  
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, a battle is currently underway in the Senate Government Operations Committee involving the right of 100 men to vote and the right of 200 million American consumers to be represented and protected in the councils of Government.

The issue at hand is whether a few Members of the other body will succeed in preventing a quorum at the meeting of the Government Operations Committee and, thereby, forestall a vote on legislation to create an independent Consumer Protection Agency. If this "big stall" technique succeeds—and I trust it will not, then a few men will have been able to prevent the Senate from working its will and the needs of millions of consumers from being satisfied.

Mr. Speaker, final enactment of a strong Consumer Protection Agency bill, will be viewed by the Nation as a firm congressional commitment to excellence and even-handedness in Government. That view is well expressed in a recent editorial in the Long Island Press, entitled "Consumer bill: No time to waste".

The full text of this editorial is printed below:

## CONSUMER BILL: NO TIME TO WASTE

Congress will recess soon for the Republican convention. When it returns, the leaders hope for adjournment by Oct. 1, because the members want to get busy on the campaign trail.

That doesn't leave much time for legislative action, especially when some congressmen employ the "big stall" technique. Unfortunately, that's what is happening to an important consumer bill, to the delight of some segments of the business community, some senators and perhaps even the White House.

The legislation in question would create an independent Consumer Protection Agency, with power to represent consumers in actions before government departments. A similar bill passed the Senate 74-to-4 in 1970, but died in the House. This time the House has approved similar—though seriously debated—legislation on which consumer advocates would like the Senate to strengthen.

Unfortunately, that isn't what is happening.

Most senators are reluctant to oppose consumer legislation openly, especially in an election year, because such bills are popular with their constituents. Instead, they go in committee or, as in this case, stall by not showing up at committee meetings. Throw in a few delaying amendments, then the need for a House-Senate conference committee to resolve the differences if the Senate finally acts, and the session could be over before a final bill is approved.

On top of these problems, the death of Appropriations Committee Chairman Allen Ellender has put one of the leading foes of the consumer bill, Sen. Sam Ervin Jr., in that crucial spot. Sen. Ervin, one of the four senators who opposed the 1970 bill, is a fair man and has called a committee meeting for

next Tuesday to consider the bill. But he has repeated his position that Congress shouldn't pass a law or create a new agency every time a problem arises.

Despite Sen. Ervin's opposition, there are enough votes on the committee to bring the bill to the floor—if they all show up at the committee meeting.

This is the least the public should demand. The nation's consumers have been without an effective voice at the highest levels of government far too long. The Consumer Protection Agency would, and should, be that voice.

Moreover, it should have the power to intervene in federal proceedings involving consumers, not be gutted to friend-of-the-court powers as its critics would like—if they can't kill it altogether.

There is still a difficult battle ahead—against time and the powerful business lobbyists. It can only be won if the public lobbies even harder. If the voters let their senators know that they are watching their actions on this bill, the consumer cause could get the strong boost it needs.

CONGRESSIONAL REPORT  
NEWSLETTER

**HON. WILMER MIZELL**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I recently prepared a congressional report newsletter, which I distributed to every household in the Fifth Congressional District of North Carolina.

In this newsletter, I outlined for my constituents my views on the great issues facing the fifth district and the Nation today, and recounted my legislative efforts involving these issues.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to insert the text of this newsletter in the RECORD at this time:

## WILMER D. MIZELL REPORTS

## BUSING

The issue of busing for racial balance in our public schools continues to be one of the most controversial in the nation. I am continuing my efforts to eliminate racial busing from the educational process by seeking passage of a Constitutional amendment prohibiting the assignment of students to schools on the basis of race. Approximately 160 Members of the House of Representatives have joined me in calling for action on this proposal through a discharge petition to have the measure removed from consideration by the House Judiciary Committee and brought to the floor of the House for a vote.

The Judiciary Committee has completed hearings on this legislation and several companion measures. During those hearings I testified before the Committee in support of my anti-busing amendment. There is no guarantee that action will be taken on any of these bills now, even though hearings have been completed.

A more hopeful indication that effective action may yet be taken on the busing issue is a vote in the House recently instructing House members of a conference committee on education legislation not to compromise a series of strong anti-busing amendments attached to a higher education bill. The vote on this instructing motion was 275-124, with

the majority totaling more than the number needed to pass a Constitutional amendment. Immediately after the vote, I sent a letter to the 275-member majority urging those who had not already done so to sign the discharge petition to get my Constitutional amendment to the floor for a vote. The petition requires 218 signatures before becoming effective.

The anti-busing amendment attached to the recently-passed Higher Education Amendments of 1972 provides only for a moratorium on new busing orders and a stay of busing orders already under appeal until January 1, 1974. The effect of this amendment is to get northern school districts off the hook for 18 months, while doing nothing at all to alleviate the busing situation in Winston-Salem. I will continue to work for more effective anti-busing legislation.

## RURAL DEVELOPMENT

One of the most comprehensive and important legislative measures I have introduced in the 92nd Congress is my Rural Economic Development Act, which is designed to provide new opportunities in rural areas for education, health and housing, promote industrial development and better transportation systems, and protect the rural environment.

This legislation would establish a nationwide Rural Development Commission, comprised of the 50 State governors and a Federal Co-chairman representing the President, to fund and administer these programs. I have proposed a \$1 billion funding level for the first year of a five-year program. North Carolina would receive \$49,988,535 of these funds. As most of you know, I have not been one who favors great expenditures of public funds, so it is not lightly or extravagantly that I propose such a relatively high funding level. But successful development of rural America requires a massive effort, in terms of both energy and money, and I am convinced that the administrative structure that I have proposed in this legislation will insure that these funds are wisely and efficiently and effectively spent.

Projects would be initiated at the local level, with the assistance of local Rural Development Districts, and assigned priority ratings in a development plan prepared by the State government. This plan would be submitted each year for general approval by the full Rural Development Commission. The federal role in this program would be limited to general policy decisions and technical assistance in preparing projects.

This rural development program is patterned after the highly successful Appalachian Regional Commission, which has been very effective in assisting the fifth congressional district as well as the entire 13-State Appalachian region.

I first introduced this measure as new legislation, and it was referred to the Committee on Agriculture for consideration. After trying unsuccessfully to have the measure included as an amendment to another committee bill dealing with rural development, I have re-introduced the measure as an amendment to the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. It has now been referred to the Committee on Public Works of which I am a member, and has been taken up as part of the committee's general hearings on economic development. I hope to see further action on this legislation during this session of Congress.

## BLUE RIDGE PROJECT

As most of you know, the Appalachian Power Company has requested a license from the Federal Power Commission to construct a large hydroelectric power project on the New River. This project was first proposed

ten years ago, and it still is surrounded by controversy. One of the most controversial elements is a requirement imposed in 1967 by the Department of the Interior that thousands of acres of land in Ashe and Alleghany counties be flooded to provide water storage for flushing out chemical pollution in the Kanawha River basin 250 miles downstream in Charleston, West Virginia.

I have consistently and vigorously opposed this provision of the project, and several developments in recent months have given me, and thousands of residents of Ashe and Alleghany counties, reason to hope that the destruction of their land will be strictly limited or perhaps eliminated completely.

After several speeches I made in the House of Representatives and elsewhere on this subject, and after several direct contacts with the Environmental Protection Agency by telephone, letter and personal meetings, I was able to persuade the EPA to take an independent view of this case, rather than continuing to be represented by the Department of the Interior which, as I noted earlier, was and is strongly advocating the "pollution-dilution" theory.

The Environmental Protection Agency subsequently filed a report with the Federal Power Commission, asserting that greater efforts to treat the Kanawha pollution at its source—the Charleston chemical plants—should be made before allowing the flooding of thousands of acres of some of the most fertile and beautiful land in the Nation.

Since that time, the House of Representatives has approved a comprehensive Water Pollution Control Act, which includes a clause I sponsored requiring the Administrator of the EPA to specifically recommend implementation of "pollution-dilution" before it could be used in hydroelectric power projects, and strictly limiting the amount of water that could be stored in the event pollution-dilution was recommended.

The Water Pollution Control Act is now under consideration in a House-Senate conference committee, which will work out differences between the House and Senate versions of the bill. The Senate version does not include my clause, and it will thus be one of the points of difference to be discussed by the conference committee. I have sent letters to all of the committee members explaining the purpose of my amendment and urging them to do all that is possible to retain this important section. Final action on this measure is expected within the near future.

#### TOBACCO

Another House-Senate conference committee, this one dealing with tobacco legislation, has approved with certain revisions a bill I introduced earlier this year to provide for the lease and transfer of flue-cured tobacco allotments, within county lines, throughout the marketing season. This legislation is designed to have a stabilizing effect on the tobacco market and on the individual grower's income, preventing him from experiencing heavy losses in any given year by providing greater leeway in the amount of income he can receive through lease and transfer operations. I sponsored a bill passed by Congress last year giving these same privileges to burley tobacco growers.

I had originally sponsored a bill for flue-cured tobacco which simply provided for lease and transfer throughout the marketing season. The final bill reported out of the conference committee, on which I served, provides that, for farmers with more than a 2,000-pound allotment who wish to transfer allotments after June 15, both the lessor and the lessee must have already planted at least half of their allotments. Farmers with less than 2,000-pound allotments may lease and transfer portions of their allotments throughout the season without these restrictions.

When this legislation was first considered by the House Agriculture subcommittee on

tobacco, a proposal was made to allow the lease, transfer and sale of allotments across county lines. I led the fight to defeat this proposal, since it presented a direct threat to the small farmer by encouraging larger operations to consolidate individual allotments throughout the State. The proposal was defeated in a committee vote.

#### EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN AMENDMENT

Congress this year approved a Constitutional amendment guaranteeing equal rights under the law for women. The measure has now gone to the States for ratification by three-fourths of the State legislatures, as required by the Constitution. Several States have already approved the amendment, and I hope to see ratification achieved within the next several months.

#### 18-YEAR-OLD VOTE—BE SURE TO REGISTER

This is the first year that 18-20 year old citizens are eligible to vote in federal, state and local elections. The 26th amendment to the Constitution, which I supported in the House of Representatives and which has now been ratified by the required 34 States, enfranchised this age group just in time for the 1972 elections.

I was pleased to work for passage of this amendment, because I have confidence in our young people and in their ability to make reasoned and informed judgments on the political candidates who seek to serve them at various levels of government.

I would remind every voter, and especially this newly-enfranchised group, that you must register to vote before you can exercise this most basic right and most important responsibility in our democratic system of government. I urge every qualified potential voter to register and vote for the candidates of your choice in the upcoming elections.

#### NEW ENGLAND ECONOMY

### HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, below is the concluding segment of a four-part series on the New England economy done by the Associated Press. This article deals with the steps that must be taken if New England is to improve its economic position in the future.

The cornerstone of the policy is a creation of 695,000 new jobs by 1975. To accomplish this goal, it will take the concerted effort of all the segments of the New England community. The article points out the steps taken by the New England congressional delegation in the organization and staffing of a regional caucus to deal with the major problems confronting all of New England.

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

[From the Salem (Mass.) Evening News, July 27, 1972]

#### HARD WORK SEEN AS ANTIDOTE TO NEW ENGLAND'S ECONOMIC SLIDE

(By Daniel Q. Haney)

BOSTON—As the nation's economy recovers from its current slump, New England's may not. Some economists say it will continue to slide unless people work hard to save it.

"The New England economy won't recover unless we do something about it," says Arthur F. Snyder, executive president of the New England Merchants National Bank.

Just what to do is the topic of discussion in business circles, but many agree that it

means attracting new industries, perking up the healthy ones already here and easing the death pangs of the ones that are expiring.

"It is absolutely necessary that we deliberately pursue an industrialization program," says James Howell, chief economist at the First National Bank of Boston.

"In our mature economy," he said, "there is no inherent tendency to perpetuate a respectable rate of growth consistent with full employment."

"We must encourage and guide our economy along a carefully chosen path."

For New England to close its unemployment rate from the current 8 per cent to 4 per cent by 1975 will mean creating 695,000 new jobs, or about 175,000 a year, according to Howell. Presently, 435,900 New Englanders—eight per cent of work force—are unemployed.

Existing industries are now adding about 135,000 new jobs a year, Howell says, but that leaves 40,000 that will have to come from somewhere else.

He suggests nurturing five industries that he says could fill more than half this gap. They are electrical equipment and supplies, nonelectrical machinery, chemical and allied products, transportation equipment and instruments.

Several other New England industries, either because of custom or poor marketing, are not meeting regional demand and have to be supplemented by imports from other parts of the country, Howell says. They are lumber, furniture, printing and publishing, paper and fabricated metal products.

The gap between New England demand and production is about \$600 million a year. If that were filled, Howell says, it could open up 5,000 new jobs annually.

These 5,000 jobs, Howell says, would produce spinoff employment, and the impact could be as great as 10,000 new jobs.

"Our ultimate regional economic policy objective," Howell says, "should be to produce a favorable business environment in order to accelerate even more the rate of job creation in all industries."

Besides recruiting industry from other parts of the country, some businessmen say New England should try to coax European investments.

"I have a theory that international business is going to come the other way," Snyder said in an interview.

"I'd like to attract businesses in Europe to settle in New England. Just the jobs created by 10 companies coming into New England would be sizable."

A group trying to do this is the New England Council, which has sponsored two All New England Trade Missions. In the projects, 12 businessmen, two from each state, fan across Europe talking to industrialists about using New England as a base for getting into the American and Canadian markets.

So far, a spokesman says, two Swiss firms and one from Austria have come to New England, all settling in Massachusetts. They are creating about 100 new jobs.

Among New England's sliding industries are shipbuilding, textiles and leather.

General Dynamics' Quincy Shipyard is currently laying off about 75 men a week, labor leaders say and they predict another 2,400 workers could lose their jobs before summer's end.

However, Gov. Francis W. Sargent says he expects an announcement next month that the yard will get a federal contract to build 2 attack vessels for the Navy.

Sargent told an airport news conference Wednesday night after a trip to Washington to seek support for the Quincy operation that he was "very pleased" with the results of his meetings in Washington with Navy officials.

He said the contract would mean 20,000 jobs directly or indirectly.



Textiles still employ about 81,000 New Englanders and shoe and leather factories some 84,000. Both are fading rapidly, and together they have accounted for 40,000 lost jobs in the past decade.

John D. Coupe, chairman of the economics department at the University of Maine, a state where leather is still the largest manufacturing employer, says, "The shoe industry is in trouble, is going to be in trouble, and we'd better look at what can be done to maintain jobs and income."

According to Howell, "Leather is the worst and weakest part of our economy, followed by textiles. There are some parts of textiles that can make it, such as synthetic milling and industrial textiles, but leather and most of textiles are on their way down."

How far they will decline in New England, Howell says, is uncertain, but he said that nationally the leather industry is expected to slip at a rate of one-half per cent a year between now and 1980.

In Maine, however, it is declining more rapidly than that. Employment in the industry has declined there from 26,887 jobs in 1968 to a projected 18,200 at the end of this year.

To Frederick Glantz, an economist at the Federal Reserve Bank, New England's biggest challenge is replacing the old manufacturing industries.

"The long term problem," he says, "is not one of growth but one of conversion."

"We must come to grips with the problems of the milltowns. They're still there, and nobody is doing anything about them."

Glantz believes there are two possible solutions.

"Either bring jobs to people or more people to jobs. The policy you ought to pursue is whichever is the more efficient for the particular area," he said.

"In the case of Worcester," he says, "the city has a lot of locational advantages. It's close to Boston and Hartford and on the main highways. It would pay the government to fix it up."

"But for the town that's extremely remote and doesn't have any locational advantage, it might be more efficient to move people to the jobs. It can work. It's a matter of educating the people who live there."

One way for New England to help itself, economists say, is through Washington-based action.

The New England Caucus, a group of congressmen and business leaders that meets periodically to discuss the region's economic problems, plans to open a Washington office with a professional staff to anticipate and solve New England's economic problems.

Another approach is for the states to lobby together for federal help.

"You can get a hell of a lot more in Washington when the six states work together than when they work alone," says Albert J. Kelley, dean of Boston College's School of Management. "They could have fantastic clout."

#### YCC SUCCESSFUL AT FAIRPORT

### HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, when President Nixon established the Youth Conservation Corps—YCC—on August 13, 1970, a program was begun which has proven extremely successful. This summer marks the end of the second year of this 3-year pilot program shared jointly by the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture. Over

2,600 young men and women between the ages of 15 and 18 had an opportunity to work, learn, and have fun this summer.

The YCC program, created by Congress to provide young people across the country with gainful summer employment as well as an opportunity to work outdoors and gain an appreciation for our changing environment, has proven very popular. Applications have increased in amazing numbers. The results of this summer program have also been remarkable.

The Fairport National Fish Hatchery near Muscatine, Iowa, is the site for one group of YCC students this summer. Eight young women and seven young men participated in the summer 1972 program at Fairport. They are:

Diane Ales, Roz Calvert, Laurie Kilian, Pam McBride, JoAnn Peniston, Nita Scherrer, Janet Titus, Ruth Wilson.

Dave Bunn, Kim Dickman, Terry Eagle, Keith Hoag, Tom Hinrichsen, Randy Lear, Eugene McBride.

Under the direction of Mr. R. L. Casini, Camp Director, and his staff, Group Leaders Richard Loy and Charles Bogardo, and Conservation Aide Jeanne Van Lent, these students completed several projects as well as assisting Mr. Wesley Orr and his staff at the fish hatchery. Among the projects completed were construction of nature trails, re-siding a barn, building footbridges, and construction of a high hut. These 15 students put in 600 man-hours per week, 450 dedicated to work projects and 150 dedicated to education. Two ecological studies were completed, as well as numerous other minor projects.

On Sunday, August 6, 1972, an open house was held so that Muscatine County residents, parents, and friends could view the summer's accomplishments. They can be duly proud of their work. These young people not only worked hard, they also had fun and benefitted educationally from their experience. In fact, they have become so dedicated they are vowing to return for an extra week—at no pay—to finish some projects they have been unable to complete.

The staff and the students deserve our warmest congratulations for a summer well spent. But most importantly they have shown us that the program we created is a good one, a worthwhile one. It is my sincere hope that the accomplishments, the fun and the educational experience the students at the Fairport National Fish Hatchery had this summer will be continued by Congress when this program comes up for review next year.

#### ACTIONS TO HELP OLDER AMERICANS

### HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1972

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, older Americans have given us a blueprint for action.

Last December, at the close of the White House Conference on Aging, the words of the elderly were inscribed in

reports containing recommendations in the areas of income, health, housing, employment/retirement, nutrition, transportation, education, planning, research and demonstration, training, retirement roles and activities, facilities, programs and services, Government and non-Government organization, and spiritual well-being.

The report is truly an historic document. It is a thoughtful statement of pressing needs. It is a blueprint for action by all who care.

It has been said that a society is judged by the care it gives to older people. Mr. Speaker, nearly 46,000 elderly persons live in Connecticut's Sixth District alone. Across our Nation, one out of every 10 Americans has reached or passed his 65th birthday. This group has increased by some 70 percent in the years since 1961. Twenty-eight million people will comprise its numbers by the end of the century at the present level of growth.

To their credit, our older citizens are speaking out. They tell us of their needs. Today, I am glad to say, Congress has begun an effective and constructive response to the needs of elderly citizens.

Last year, the Congress enacted a 10-percent increase in social security benefits. On July 1, 1972, another 20-percent increase, a bill that had my cosponsorship, was signed into law and will become effective in September. This law provides for an automatic increase in benefits beginning in 1975 for any year in which the consumer price index rises 3 percent or more. The House also passed a massive piece of legislation, known as H.R. 1, which provides for an additional 5-percent increase in benefits, and an automatic cost-of-living increase. This bill would also extend medicare to 1.5 million social security and railroad retirement fund recipients who were not previously eligible. The Senate has yet to act on H.R. 1, a bill which, to be sure, is far from adequate, but offers added assistance to many in need.

It was my special privilege and pleasure, as a member of the Special Committee on Education and Labor which prepares legislation for older Americans, to help draft the nutrition program for the elderly legislation. This program makes available \$250 million in grants to States to provide low-cost, nutritionally sound meals to millions of Americans 60 years and older. With 20 to 30 percent of our elderly living in poverty, and many others unable to afford an adequate diet, unable to go shopping, or in failing health, this program is essential to insure older Americans the strength that comes from balanced meals. People who cannot leave home will have meals delivered, while others will have the opportunity for companionship and counseling at drop-in centers and other facilities. In Connecticut, over \$1.3 million is slated for the nutrition program in fiscal year 1973 and over \$2 million in fiscal year 1974—for the benefit of nearly 415,000 State residents 60 years of age and older.

It is clear that we need to have a much greater understanding of the aging process, its causes and effects. Of every 10 persons age 65 and over, eight have at

least one chronic health problem, and four have some limitations on activity. As a result of declining health, citizens age 65 and over are twice as likely as younger people to be physically disabled and to require hospitalization.

The House recently passed important legislation to establish a National Institute of Aging within the National Institutes of Health. This Institute recommended by the White House Conference on Aging, would concentrate on research relating to the aging process, including efforts to find treatment and cures for health problems of the aged as well as preventive measures that would help avoid special problems of aging.

This legislation also authorizes \$20 million in appropriations for fiscal year 1973 for programs under the community mental health centers relating to mental health of the aged. The White House Conference on Aging noted among older people the widespread "depressive reaction to the changes in role, status, appearance," and ill health, as well as other problems including feelings of worthlessness, isolation, uselessness, and loneliness. The community mental health center is the logical resource for meeting the challenge of these very real and serious problems.

Most recently, on July 17, the House passed the Comprehensive Older Americans Services Amendments of 1972, a bill from the Special Education Committee on which I serve. This legislation extends, strengthens, and improves the Older Americans Act of 1965. It is a concentrated effort to provide comprehensive and coordinated services for the elderly and covers a wide range of needs: Transportation, social, recreational, civic, attitudinal, administrative, and financial.

The bill provides demonstration programs to improve transportation services for older persons through reduced fares, portal-to-portal service, and other programs to increase the mobility of the elderly. It is an important bill which, for example, would provide Connecticut with \$1.4 million toward a plan to develop a comprehensive and coordinated system of social services for older citizens.

H.R. 15657 also provides for the establishment of multipurpose senior centers. The purpose of a single source of social services is to allow an area to concentrate efforts and resources in a central, accessible gathering place. The center would serve as a source of information and activity, a nerve center for programs.

Provisions of this legislation call for the creation of an Administration on Aging in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The new administrative unit would include a National Information and Resource Center for the Aging. The Center would collect, review, organize, publish, and disseminate information and data related to the particular problems associated with aging.

There are so many areas in which the elderly need help. This is why I have introduced and cosponsored several pieces of important legislation. They include bills to establish a comprehensive drug insurance program for the elderly and to

allow social security payment for eyeglasses; to permit an exemption of the first \$5,000 of retirement income under a public retirement system; to remove the outside income limitation for social security recipients; to create a senior citizens Job Corps; to allow half fare in interstate travel during most of the year for older citizens; and to establish a House Select Committee on Aging.

I have introduced legislation to double the number of lifetime reserve days for hospital care from 60 to 120 days, and have called on the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to reexamine every 6 months allowed fees for physicians' services under part B of the medicare program. I have also cosponsored a bill to provide a Federal income tax credit to older Americans of low income in order to ease the crushing burden of State and local property taxes, whether the individual owns his own home or pays rent. This would be a valid extension to Connecticut's present tax credit program for the elderly. And I also gave strong support to legislation that became law and provided \$35 million in rent subsidies for older Americans in 1972.

Mr. Speaker, our older citizens have rendered loving gifts of service to our communities and States. It is time to say thank you for the gracious hand they have long extended to all around them. As Members of Congress we have a unique opportunity to help provide a better life for all our older citizens.

#### FORCED BUSING OF SCHOOLCHILDREN FOR RACIAL BALANCE

#### HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, on August 1, I presented testimony to the House Rules Committee on the subject of forced busing of schoolchildren for racial balance.

A short time after I presented this testimony, the committee voted to report my constitutional amendment to prohibit forced busing for a vote by the full House.

For the benefit and information of my colleagues I now insert the text of my testimony in the RECORD:

#### TESTIMONY OF HON. WILMER D. MIZELL

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to present my testimony before this Committee on one of the most controversial issues facing the Nation today—the forced busing of school children to achieve a racial balance.

In Winston-Salem, North Carolina, the largest city in my district, 32,220 of the school system's 44,000 students rode buses to school this past school year. About two-thirds of them were bused because they lived beyond walking distance of a school, but more than one-third—more than 11,000 children—were bused solely to achieve court-required racial balances in the elementary and secondary schools.

One hundred fifty-seven new buses were required to implement that order. Each of

those buses cost \$6,300 to buy and it costs \$1,600 a year to maintain them, without mentioning the additional cost in bus drivers' salaries. The superintendent of schools in Winston-Salem has told me that this massive busing program requires an operating budget of \$1.4 million. That figure represents almost exactly a 100 percent increase in transportation costs over the previous year.

Other major cities in the nation—not only in the south, but in every region—are now under court order to bus their pupils for racial balance and all of these cities are undergoing the same financial strains we have experienced in Winston-Salem.

The Los Angeles, California, school system is now under court order, subject to appeal to transport 240,000 children up to 25 miles to attend school. U.S. News and World Report recently reported that the cost of this massive program has been estimated by school officials at \$180 million over the next eight years.

And in Detroit, Michigan, a federal judge has ordered the purchase of 300 new buses in preparation for possibly the most extensive busing program yet required in America.

And there are numerous other examples one could cite, demonstrating the destructive drain on public finances that these massive transportation programs cause.

But I believe my point has already been made. Financial burdens already threaten to quite literally destroy hundreds of school systems throughout the country. The Dayton, Ohio school system had to close its doors for a time this past school term under the weight of budgetary pressures and others are sure to follow unless something is done to relieve those pressures.

We read of teachers in many cities striking for higher pay, of school buildings crumbling in disrepair, and of acute shortages in so many kinds of educational equipment.

When funds for these pressing needs cannot be supplied even now, how shall the cause of quality education be served by imposing overwhelming additional costs for purchasing and maintaining fleets of new buses?

In our admirable desire to provide a quality education for all, will we make it impossible to provide a quality education for any? This need not—it must not—be the case.

The American people, in poll after poll, have registered overwhelming opposition to busing simply to achieve racial balance, and I believe it is time that we in the Congress responded to the people's will in an effective way.

In the 92nd Congress alone, eighty-six legislative measures have been introduced in the House and Senate dealing with this problem that has perplexed scores of school boards, parents and children over the past few years.

I have introduced a Constitutional amendment which goes to the heart of the busing problem by declaring that "no public school student shall, on the basis of race, creed or color, be assigned to or required to attend a particular school."

By eliminating racial assignment of students to schools, this amendment also eliminates the need for massive cross-busing.

I am extremely pleased to see that this Committee is taking action on this proposal, after it lay imprisoned for so many months within the Judiciary Committee, even while the American people, almost as with one voice, called for action and relief from the madness of busing.

Passage of this legislation will represent a major step toward restoring reason to public education in America and I strongly urge the members of this Committee to report this legislation for consideration by the Congress as soon as possible.

Thank you for your consideration, and for this opportunity to present my testimony.



FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT,  
JUNE 1972

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I include a release highlighting the June 1972 civilian personnel report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Ex-

penditures, together with a summary of Federal employment changes during fiscal year 1972, ended June 30, 1972:

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT, JUNE 1972  
WITH FISCAL YEAR 1972 SUMMARY

Total civilian employment in the Executive, Legislative and Judicial Branches of the Federal Government was 2,865,216 as of June 30, 1972, as compared with 2,923,157 as of June 30, 1971—a year ago. This was a net decrease of 57,941.

This summary of Federal civilian employment changes for fiscal year 1972, following practice of many years standing, is submitted

along with the Joint Committee's regular monthly report for June 1972, the last month of fiscal year 1972. Figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled and published monthly by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures.

## EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Civilian employment in the Executive Branch in June 1972 totaled 2,823,258, a decrease of 59,736 as compared with the June 1971 total of 2,882,994. Employment by months in fiscal year 1972, which began July 1, 1971 (showing changes from previous month) follows:

Month	Full-time in permanent positions	Change	Temporary, part-time etc.	Change	Total employment	Change
July 1971.....	2,521,703	+1,391	381,448	+18,755	2,903,151	+20,146
August.....	2,524,098	+2,395	366,062	-15,386	2,890,160	-12,991
September.....	2,527,518	+3,420	317,021	-49,041	2,844,539	-45,621
October.....	2,529,832	+2,314	303,236	-13,785	2,833,068	-11,471
November.....	2,528,233	-1,599	300,256	-2,980	2,828,489	-4,579
December.....	2,525,858	-2,375	300,662	+406	2,826,520	-1,969

Month	Full-time in permanent positions	Change	Temporary, part-time etc.	Change	Total employment	Change
January 1972.....	2,552,081	+26,223	272,945	-27,717	2,825,026	-1,494
February.....	2,550,984	-1,097	277,284	+4,339	2,828,268	+3,242
March.....	2,539,790	-11,194	286,419	+9,157	2,826,209	-2,037
April.....	2,533,275	-6,515	297,057	+10,638	2,830,332	+4,123
May.....	2,511,380	-21,895	299,437	+2,380	2,810,817	-19,515
June.....	2,505,646	-5,734	317,612	+18,175	2,823,258	+12,441

## Total employment

Changes in total employment during fiscal year 1972 in Civilian Agencies of the Executive Branch, as compared with civilian employment in Military Agencies, were as follows:

	June 1972	June 1971	Change
Civilian agencies.....	1,715,607	1,728,618	-13,011
Military agencies.....	1,107,651	1,154,376	-46,725
Total, civilian employment.....	2,823,258	2,882,994	-59,736

The civilian agencies reporting the largest DECREASES during fiscal year 1972 were Postal Service with 22,511, State with 3,688, Agriculture with 2,532, General Services Administration with 2,493, NASA with 2,312 and Transportation with 1,011. The largest civilian agency increases were reported by Treasury with 7,760, Veterans with 5,440, Justice with 2,974, Environmental Protection Agency with 1,863 and Labor with 1,361.

Total Executive Branch employment INSIDE the United States in June 1972 was 2,670,959, a decrease of 23,569 for the fiscal year. Total employment OUTSIDE the United States in June was 152,299, a decrease of 36,167 from June 1971.

## Full-time permanent employment—ceiling effect

During fiscal year 1972, significant reductions were made in the category of full-time permanent employment—the relatively stable hard core of Federal civilian employment (excluding categories of temporary employment which are subject to sharp seasonal fluctuations). Agencies of the Executive Branch during fiscal 1972 reported a total net reduction of 14,666 in full-time permanent employment, to the June 1972 total of 2,505,646.

Much of this reduction may be attributed to the order issued in August 1971 by the President directing reductions in the fiscal 1972 budget projections of full-time employment in permanent positions of 5% in all agencies excluding the Postal Service. Originally estimated to reduce employment about 100,000 under the 1972 budget projections (or about 57,000 in terms of actual employ-

ment from June 1971), the projections were revised in the January 1972 budget document to accomplish a reduction of about 4%. This was a reduction of about 80,700 under the original 1972 budget projections (or about 37,400 in terms of actual employment from June 1971). The June 30, 1972, full-time permanent employment ceiling established by these actions was 1,918,100, excluding Postal Service, for a total of 2,531,500 including Postal Service.

In the agencies covered by the reduction order (that is, exclusive of Postal Service) full-time employment in permanent positions has been reduced 44,718 from the June 1971 total of 1,955,530 to the June 1972 total of 1,910,812. This reduction reflects a decrease of 52,671 in the Defense Department and a net increase of 7,953 in the civilian agencies exclusive of Postal Service. Among the civilian agencies the largest increases were reported by Treasury, Veterans, Justice, Environmental Protection Agency and Department of HEW, partially offset by decreases in General Services Administration, NASA, Agency for International Development, Agriculture and Transportation.

## LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIAL BRANCHES

During fiscal year 1972 employment in the Legislative Branch increased 1,258 to the June 1972 total of 33,691, and in the Judicial Branch increased 537 to the June 1972 total of 8,267.

## DISADVANTAGED PERSONS

The June 1972 total of 2,865,216 reported by the Committee includes 53,339 disadvantaged persons employed under Federal opportunity programs in all three branches of the government. This compares to 59,958 disadvantaged persons included in the June 1971 total of 2,923,157.

## MONTH OF JUNE 1972

Total civilian employment in the Executive, Legislative and Judicial Branches of the Federal Government in the month of June was 2,865,216 as compared with 2,851,958 in the preceding month of May. This was a net increase of 13,258, largely due to regular seasonal employment and summer employment of the "disadvantaged" under youth opportunity programs.

## Executive Branch

Civilian employment in the Executive Branch in the month of June as compared with the preceding month of May follows:

	June	May	Change
Civilian agencies.....	1,715,607	1,710,712	+4,895
Military agencies.....	1,107,651	1,100,105	+7,546
Total, civilian employment.....	2,823,258	2,810,817	+12,441

The civilian agencies of the Executive Branch reporting the largest increases during the month of June were Interior with 2,808, Veterans with 2,353, Agriculture with 2,180, Transportation with 1,814, Justice with 1,302 and General Services Administration with 1,256. The largest decreases were in Postal Service with 5,458 and Treasury with 3,967.

In the Department of Defense the largest increases were reported by Navy with 5,546, Defense Supply Agency with 1,680 and Army with 1,551. The largest decrease was in Air Force with 2,052.

Total Executive Branch employment inside the United States in June was 2,670,959, an increase of 20,977 as compared with May. Total employment outside the United States in June was 152,299, a decrease of 8,536 as compared with May.

## Legislative and Judicial Branches

Employment in the Legislative Branch in June totaled 33,691, an increase of 860 as compared with the preceding month of May. Employment in the Judicial Branch in June totaled 8,267, a decrease of 43 as compared with May.

## Disadvantaged persons

The total of 2,865,216 reported by the Committee for June includes 53,339 disadvantaged persons employed under Federal opportunity programs. This is an increase of 24,502 over the preceding month of May due to the hiring of temporary summer aids.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include a tabulation, excerpted from the joint committee report, on personnel employed full time in permanent positions by executive branch agencies during June 1972, showing comparisons with June 1971 and the Budget estimates for June 1972 and June 1973:

## FULL-TIME PERMANENT EMPLOYMENT

Major agencies	June 1971	June 1972	Estimated June 30, 1972 <sup>1</sup>	Estimated June 30, 1973 <sup>1</sup>	Major agencies	June 1971	June 1972	Estimated June 30, 1972 <sup>1</sup>	Estimated June 30, 1973 <sup>1</sup>
Agriculture.....	84,252	82,511	83,000	83,400	General Services Administration.....	38,076	36,002	39,400	39,400
Commerce.....	28,435	28,412	28,500	29,700	National Aeronautics and Space Adminis- tration.....	29,478	27,428	27,500	26,800
Defense:					Panama Canal.....	13,967	13,777	14,200	14,000
Civil functions.....	30,063	30,585	30,600	31,300	Selective Service System.....	5,569	5,791	6,200	6,100
Military functions.....	1,062,741	1,009,548	1,011,000	1,005,800	Small Business Administration.....	4,004	3,916	4,000	4,000
Health, Education, and Welfare.....	104,283	105,764	102,000	99,500	Tennessee Valley Authority.....	13,612	14,001	14,000	14,000
Housing and Urban Development.....	16,030	15,200	15,200	16,000	U.S. Information Agency.....	9,773	9,255	9,400	9,400
Interior.....	57,570	56,892	56,900	56,900	Veterans Administration.....	158,635	163,179	162,700	174,100
Justice.....	42,662	45,446	45,100	46,300	All other agencies.....	31,333	33,499	34,300	34,600
Labor.....	11,352	12,339	11,800	12,600	Contingencies.....			2,000	5,000
State.....	23,398	22,699	22,700	22,800	Subtotal.....	1,955,530	1,910,812	1,918,100	1,933,300
Agency for International Development.....	13,477	11,719	12,400	11,800	U.S. Postal Service.....	564,782	594,834	613,400	618,500
Transportation.....	68,482	67,232	66,400	69,200	Total <sup>2</sup> .....	2,520,312	2,505,646	2,531,500	2,551,800
Treasury.....	90,135	95,686	98,500	99,200					
Atomic Energy Commission.....	6,920	6,836	6,700	6,900					
Civil Service Commission.....	5,324	5,260	5,600	6,000					
Environmental Protection Agency.....	5,959	7,835	8,000	8,500					

<sup>1</sup> Source: As projected in 1973 budget document; figures rounded to nearest hundred.

<sup>2</sup> Includes approximately 39,000 postal employees subject to reclassification by June 30, 1972, under a labor-management agreement. Such reclassification of about 30,000 was reported to the committee in January 1972.

<sup>3</sup> June figure excludes 53,138 disadvantaged persons in public service careers programs as compared with 28,835 in May (see table 3, p. 14).

Note: In August of 1971 the President ordered reductions in the fiscal 1972 budget projections of full-time employment in permanent positions of 5 percent in all agencies excluding the Postal Service. Originally estimated to reduce employment about 100,000 under the 1972 budget projections (or about 57,000 in terms of actual employment from June 1971), the projections were revised

in the January 1972 budget document to accomplish a reduction of about 4 percent. This was a reduction of about 80,700 under the original 1972 budget projections (or about 37,400 in terms of actual employment from June 1971). The June 30, 1972, full-time permanent employment ceiling established by these actions was 1,918,100, excluding Postal Service, for a total of 2,531,500 including Postal Service.

In agencies covered by the reduction order (that is, exclusive of the Postal Service) full-time employment in permanent positions has been reduced 44,718 from the June 1971 total of 1,955,530 to the June 1972 total of 1,910,812. This reduction reflects a decrease of 52,671 in the Defense Department and a net increase of 7,953 in the civilian agencies excluding Postal Service. Table 1-8 above shows by major agencies the full-time permanent employment levels during the period covered by the reduction order.

## MARGARET SMALLEY ENDS 25 YEARS OF HELPING HAWAII'S YOUTH

### HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, Miss Margaret Smalley, a dedicated social worker whose career spanned 40 years—from the great depression to modern Hawaii—retired recently after serving for the last 12 years as director of the child and family service agency in Honolulu, Hawaii.

Miss Smalley, who began her career as the director of a Federal emergency relief program in Atlanta, arrived in Hawaii in 1947 aboard a crowded converted troop ship. She devoted the next 25 years to helping the youth of Hawaii.

Despite the fact that those who came to her for assistance were frequently sick, oppressed, and the victims of poverty and depression, Miss Smalley never failed to recognize the dignity of the human spirit, and she never ceased to care for those who came to her for help.

I believe that my colleagues will find Miss Smalley's story an inspiring one. I am submitting for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from a recent edition of the Honolulu Advertiser which describes her achievements during her 40-year career:

#### MARGARET SMALLEY RETIRES FROM SOCIAL SERVICE

(By Carole Hoyt)

Margaret Smalley retired this week after 12 years as executive director of the Child and Family Service and 25 years as a social worker with the agency.

Myron R. Chevin, who directed the agency in the 1950s before leaving for the Mainland, will replace her as head of the agency.

Miss Smalley's social work career has extended over 40 years from work with farmers

in the South during the Depression to helping families in modern Hawaii.

Throughout the 1930s she headed a Federal Emergency Relief Agency in Atlanta, Ga., with a team of nurses and Agriculture specialists. Typhoid and hunger swept the city packing Miss Smalley's offices with people asking for Federal help.

"We had a pot-bellied stove, a weak wooden floor and so many people in the office one day I thought the floor would collapse," she said. "I had to stand on a table to be heard and ask all but women with babies to leave." After spending the war years working in Walter Reed Army Hospital in Washington, D.C. as a social worker, Miss Smalley was asked to come to Hawaii.

She arrived in 1947 on a crowded converted troop ship named the "Matsonia" and began work the next day.

"The people we have now can afford to pay fees for our counseling, but then we had welfare cases and young people who were wards of the court brought to us," she said.

"I don't think I was as aware of poverty then as I should have been. I realized the housing on Vineyard was what we could call a slum, but I wouldn't think of it that way. The people had dignity. They didn't have the poorness of spirit you see now... I stayed in a hotel cottage when I came that didn't have windows, just screens. Can you imagine such trust?"

As agency director, she helped Child and Family Service increase its services from welfare to family and youth counseling, adoptions and unwed mothers.

"The greatest amount of work is with the youth now," she said. "Adolescence is just hell to get through. Most of us just didn't enjoy it and we wouldn't want to live through it again."

One of her favorite cases was a runaway girl in the 1950s who came to her whenever she needed help.

"I just adored her," Miss Smalley recalled. "She had a pride and dignity for all her impulsiveness. She's grown now with her own family, but she still calls."

Her most difficult cases were marital counseling. In one case, a man told her he planned to murder his in-laws. She talked him out of it.

"The only thing that hurt me was the frustration when you wanted to help and

couldn't," Miss Smalley said. "You can't solve everything. You don't have any miracles."

Miss Smalley will be the guest of honor Feb. 17, which is her 65th birthday, at the Child and Family Services annual dinner meeting at the Ala Moana Hotel.

## CHARLES W. YOST ON BOMBING THE DIKES

### HON. DONALD M. FRASER OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, former Chief U.S. Representative to the United Nations Charles W. Yost now writes a newspaper column that periodically is printed in the Washington Post. Wednesday, August 2, Ambassador Yost's analysis of the continuing U.S. bombing campaign in North Vietnam appeared. It ought to be read by all Americans.

The article follows:

#### BOMBING OF DIKES, DAMS? ARGUMENT MISSES HEART OF THE MATTER

(By Charles W. Yost)

The argument between the administration and its critics as to whether or not the United States is bombing dikes and dams in North Vietnam misses what seems to me the heart of the matter.

Bombing of North Vietnam on the vast scale we have done over the past three months cannot, as the administration itself says, help hitting some of the dikes which criss-cross so much of that country and on which its food supply depends. The real point, however, is that it does not make much difference to noncombatant men, women and children whether they are starved, drowned or blown up. As long as we continue bombing of the present magnitude—with such a loose application of the term "military objectives" and such reliance on the infallibility of "smart bombs"—we cannot help killing sub-



stantial numbers of noncombatants, whether or not we hit the dikes.

It will be argued that we and our allies engaged in World War II in large-scale bombing which incidentally killed many civilians and that this played a part in winning the war. The obvious difference is that at that time we were fighting against two regimes that we believed threatened both our national existence and western civilization. Even the most extravagant "hawks" would not make that claim about the regime in Hanoi in the summer of 1972. The question is whether there can be any justification, military or moral, for so lethal and prolonged a bombing at the present time and place.

This particular bombing campaign—by far the most severe since we entered the war seven years ago—was begun in response to Hanoi's offensive of last April, in order to prevent a disastrous defeat of the South Vietnamese and "humiliation" of the President just before the Moscow summit. That offensive has now been repulsed and rolled back. The Moscow summit is long since over and was a substantial success. Yet the bombing continues.

It will also be argued that the bombing of the North is still necessary to prevent a buildup and dispatch southward of supplies which would be used in another offensive at a later date. However, President Johnson should be able to testify, on the basis of considerable experience, that even continuous bombing of the North does not prevent the dispatch southward of sufficient supplies to mount repeated offensives, that it tends to toughen rather than soften North Vietnamese morale, and that offensives will recur as long as the war continues.

Finally, the bombing can no longer be excused as essential to protect United States ground forces, since most of them have been withdrawn and the rest could be in a very short time. Indeed it is hard to see how the continuation of large-scale bombing of the North any longer has an American rationale except as a factor of the United States elections.

It would not seem unreasonable to presume that the bombing of the North is being continued—after the special reasons for it cited at the beginning of May have ceased to exist—as a means of pressure on Hanoi to accept before November 7 our terms for ending the war. Such a result might be a decisive factor in the elections, causing the average voter to forget momentarily that the Republican plan for ending the war, promised in 1968, was carried out only after four years and 20,000 additional American dead.

Every American wants an agreement in Paris and an end to the fighting but are we to be wholly indifferent as to how we go about getting it? Mr. Nixon has often spoken of the "respect" which he seeks for this country and the Presidency. Can he be unaware that the respect is being daily eaten away by what seems to many Asians and Europeans, not to mention Americans, to be a casual indifference to massive human suffering which we inflict, a moral unscrupulousness about the means by which we as a great power achieve our ends? Our new partners in creating a "structure of peace," the Soviet Union and China, may be prepared to swallow this behavior, but will all the others who have looked up to us in the past?

Of course the North Vietnamese have for years been committing, and still are, unspeakable atrocities in the South. But how relevant is that? It has always been the proud boast and belief of Americans that our democracy embodies certain principles which make us worthy of admiration and emulation by the rest of the world. We have been the first to claim a "double standard" which distinguishes us from totalitarian states and our behavior from theirs. Now much of the rest of the world is beginning

to see less and less moral difference between us and the adversaries we seem more and more to imitate.

The cold hard truth is that we cannot beat a small enemy "back to the stone age," abandon moral and military restraints in our war against him, without dangerously sapping the reservoir of international respect which our forefathers built up over two centuries and on which any claim we may have to world leadership must rest. Is the erosion of that respect worth "victory" in Vietnam or anyone's victory in November?

## SENATOR JORDAN HONORED

### HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, at the end of this year, one of the Senate's hardest working and most respected Members—LEN B. JORDAN—will retire after a quarter century of public service including 10 years as a U.S. Senator from our State of Idaho.

The high regard in which LEN JORDAN is held by his friends and colleagues was evidenced recently when the Idaho lawmaker was presented the distinguished service award of the Senate Interior Committee, a body on which he has served faithfully and tirelessly since 1963. It has been through his persistent efforts that numerous pieces of legislation dealing with water resources, land management, and other issues of vital importance to Idaho have become law. Among his credits is the recent approval of legislation creating the Sawtooth National Recreation Area in south-central Idaho after years of deliberation and hard work by the Idaho congressional delegation and by countless Idaho citizens concerned with preserving this priceless scenic treasure.

As part of my remarks I would like to include an article by Frank Hewlett of the Salt Lake Tribune relating the high praise showered on Senator JORDAN of Idaho by his Interior Committee colleagues at the time he was honored with the Distinguished Service Award. I am also including a feature about the Idaho Senator by Peter Walsh of Gannett News Service and commend both articles to the attention of my colleagues in the House:

[From the Salt Lake Tribune]

**SOLONS GIVE AWARD TO SENATOR JORDAN**  
(By Frank Hewlett)

WASHINGTON.—The Senate Interior Committee has presented its distinguished service award to retiring Sen. Len B. Jordan, R-Idaho.

Sen. Jordan has served on the committee since 1962, when he succeeded the late Sen. Henry C. Dworshak and became the 19th Idahoan to represent his state in the U.S. Senate.

Chairman Henry M. Jackson, D-Wash., was high in his praise of Sen. Jordan when he presented a plaque to him at a recent ceremony.

**NEVER BEEN PETTY**

"My good friend and good neighbor who has been a tremendous help to us on the committee," was the way Sen. Jackson introduced the Idahoan. Then he added, "He has never been petty, never been partisan."

Nearly three years ago Sen. Jordan was very much in the news when he knocked down and put to rout an assailant who tried to rob him in the elevator of the Capitol Hill Apartment Building where the senator lives.

This prompted Sen. Paul J. Fannin, R-Ariz., to call him "Mohammed Ali" and say to his colleagues, "Who knows when Len gets back to Idaho he may get back into the ring."

**HATFIELD'S PRAISE**

Sen. Mark Hatfield, recalling that Sen. Jordan was a graduate of the University of Oregon, said the Idahoan was so popular in his state that he "could come back to Washington as senator from Oregon."

Sen. Hatfield then hastened to express hope that Sen. Jordan wouldn't try to do so now since he (Hatfield) is up for re-election this year.

Sen. Clifford P. Hansen, R-Wyo., told one of his favorite Jordan stories about when he first decided to try for political office. He asked a man for his support and was told "you are my second choice." When asked who was his first choice he replied, "Oh, just about anybody."

**NEVADAN'S PRAISE**

Sen. Alan Bible, D-Nev., described Sen. Jordan as a hard worker and fine companion on the trips of his Parks and Recreation subcommittee but "one of the worst poker players I know."

Sen. Quentin Burdick, D-N.D., a former University of Minnesota football player, recalled Sen. Jordan's college football prowess saying "I know the quality of a certain halfback."

Idaho is the only state that has both of its senators on the Interior Committee and Democrat Frank Church heads the Public Lands subcommittee. Sen. Church praised the wisdom of his colleague and thanked him for his fine cooperation on getting such important Gem State projects like the Sawtooth National Recreation Area through the Senate.

**WATER AUTHORITY**

Others described the 73-year-old Sen. Jordan as one of the nation's leading water authorities and recalled his accomplishments during the Eisenhower administration as U.S. chairman of the U.S.-Canadian Commission handling boundary water disputes.

[From the Idaho Statesman, July 27, 1972]

**"SLAVE" TO SENATE ROLL CALLS LOOKS FORWARD TO RETIREMENT**

(By Peter J. Walsh)

WASHINGTON.—Although he says he hasn't firmed his retirement plans yet, Idaho Sen. Len B. Jordan is looking forward to the end of being "a slave to the buzzer" which signals roll calls in the Senate.

"With 15 roll calls in a day, there isn't much chance for speculative thinking," said the veteran, who has announced he will not seek another term. Jordan was appointed to fill an unexpired term in 1962 and won two more terms in Washington.

A moderate-to-conservative Republican, who began his career in public office in the Idaho Legislature in 1947 and served as governor from 1951 to 1955, Jordan is proud of his work but said he would like an opportunity now for uninterrupted research on several topics, particularly electoral reform.

He said he intends to keep his main base of operations in Boise. He has a farm in Idaho but will probably maintain a residence in Washington, where he will have access to the congressional library facilities for research.

Jordan, who was 73 in May, also said he would consider the possibility of teaching on a limited basis when he finishes his term and has had an opportunity to "catch up."

Asked about the possibility that he might take another active post in government, however, he shook his head emphatically and answered, "No. I don't want to be tied down to

any responsibility. I don't want to punch any clocks. We're got a lot of traveling to do.

"I'd like very much to have some seminars with young people, because I think with my experience I might be able to make a contribution," he said. "I like young people, I like to exchange ideas with them."

He said he had been approached about taking a teaching post but repeated that he did not want to be tied down to a particular assignment and would prefer a series of seminars rather than a permanent post.

Jordan's immediate interest is in the way the nation chooses its leaders, particularly what he terms the "haphazard" selection of vice presidential candidates.

"Because of the occupational hazards which go along with the job of being President nowadays, I'm not willing to leave it to the judgment of one single individual to choose his running mate, who could be his successor at any time," Jordan said.

"It's been said that the vice president is only one heartbeat away from the presidency, so I think we've got to pay a little more attention to his selection rather than have it so utterly irresponsible to the thinking of the electorate except by the confirmation of a convention."

Jordan said he is working now on a plan for a single, national "preferential primary" in which members of both parties would vote for their choice of candidate, but which would leave the final selection of both the presidential and vice presidential candidates to the conventions.

"That would eliminate the selection of 'Tom Who?' or 'Spiro Who?'" he said with a note of irony in his voice.

Under Jordan's proposal, the candidates would have to be chosen by the convention from among the top three or four in the primary, but he said he does not "favor a run-off primary, which would leave little of interest except drafting a platform for the convention."

Similarly, he said he would like to see the Electoral College, which actually selects the President based on votes cast in the general election, modified so the electors from a particular state would not have to vote as a bloc with winner-take-all.

He would not, however, go the final step to a direct, popular election of the President.

"There is too much chance for skulduggery and all the evils that come into elections where bloc votes are catered to, whether they are Puerto Rican or Chicano," Jordan said. "In a popular vote that kind of demagoguery might win the election."

Two other areas in which Jordan said he would be interested in research and reform efforts are taxation—"Everyone is for it, so long as you don't do away with the (special) consideration that falls his way"—and welfare, in which he said he would favor guaranteed employment.

"I'd have to take the position that every able-bodied individual is entitled to employment rather than a guarantee of income," Jordan said.

"We've got to be very careful that we don't discourage thrift and industry in one class of people in order to insulate another from the vicissitudes of the marketplace," he said.

Asked what he considers his principal accomplishments in office, Jordan points to his service as governor.

"My main objective was to get some efficiency in the state government machinery," he said, "to move away from the spoils system where the party in power cleaned the payrolls at every election. 'I moved wherever possible in the Highway Department and in Fish and Game to a professionalism, a merit system, getting people who were not beholden to any political boss for their tenure.'"

A "great believer in the committee sys-

tem," Jordan's pride in the American system of government shows through when he discusses his time in the Senate.

GEN. CREIGHTON W. ABRAMS, JR., REPLACES GEN. WILLIAM C. WESTMORELAND

## HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, some days ago Gen. William C. Westmoreland retired as Chief of Staff.

In the public's mind, General Westmoreland will undoubtedly go down in history for his association as Commander of Allied Forces at the height of the fighting Vietnam. He reserves an important niche in our military annals as a decisive, imaginative leader, a judge of good men and an astute strategist and tactician.

In what amounted to a valedictory address, reported in the June 25 edition of the New York Times, General Westmoreland reflected the tremendous pride he shared during his 36 years as a soldier and he ended his essay with the comment:

If I were to stand on the plain at West Point once again and take the same oath, I would do so with equal pride, and even more anticipation.

His successor as Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, is Gen. Creighton W. Abrams, Jr., a career combat officer who was first initiated to battle during World War II as commander of the 37th Tank Battalion. It was this battalion which led the breakthrough which eventually led to the release of American troops of the 101st Airborne Division at Bastogne during the Battle of the Bulge.

Mr. Speaker, General Abrams' dedication to duty, his thorough knowledge of the U.S. Army and his years of combat leadership eminently qualify him for the highest job in the U.S. Army. These qualifications are spelled out in the article "A Broad Pair of Shoulders at the Top," appearing in the August issue of *Army* and believing that a recount of the career of this great military leader will be of interest to our colleagues, I am inserting this article in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

### A BROAD PAIR OF SHOULDERS AT THE TOP

It was September, 1944, and a group of high-ranking U.S. Army officers was holding a council of war on the west bank of the Moselle River. The discussion was about the advisability of attacking in strength across the waterway to exploit a precarious bridgehead against a strong German counterattack.

Although assured by the corps commander that he would not be blamed for deciding against the highly risky venture, Col. B. C. Clarke, commander of the 4th Armored Division's Combat Command A, turned and asked the opinion of the leader of the 37th Tank Battalion, a quiet young officer who although only eight years out of the Military Academy was widely regarded as one of the most daring and brilliant tank commanders in the Army.

Lt. Col. Creighton W. Abrams Jr. pointed across the river and replied laconically: "That is the shortest way home." Col. Clarke told his man to "Get going" and there followed a series of brilliant maneuvers led by "Task Force Abe" which later was likened by the commander of XII Corps to Jeb Stuart's classic ride around the Union Army in front of Richmond.

Twenty-eight years and two more wars later "Abe" is on his way "home" again, this time to the Pentagon where, the Senate willing, he will become chief of staff of the Army. But, what with people like Senator William Proxmire sharpening their knives in anticipation of seeking at the outset to tie Gen. Abrams to the Lavelle case, plus the multitude of thorny problems with which the Army is beset today, the struggle at the Moselle and places like Bastogne may turn out to be tame by comparison. Too, Gen. Abrams has been commander of our forces in Vietnam for the past four years, and it is doubtful that he will escape unscathed during confirmation hearings, even though he should have no trouble receiving ultimate approval in the Senate.

I have a friend, a retired lieutenant general, whose favorite phrase when he is trying to understand an involved or complex issue is, "You'll have to go over that slowly—I'm just an ordinary foxhole soldier." He listens, asks some questions which always seem to get progressively harder to answer, and pretty soon a glimmer comes through your smugness that he knows more about the significant issues of your specialty than you do yourself.

The parallel in the case of Gen. Abrams is that if anyone has any ideas about verbally making mincemeat out of a seemingly "simple soldier" he would be advised to do some homework. Loquacious and glib Gen. Abrams is not, but as a former vice chief of staff and holder of several other key Pentagon posts, he knows his way around the Department of Defense and Congress. Moreover, it is mighty hard to bamboozle a completely honest and gulleless man.

As a West Point classmate and long-time friend observed about Gen. Abrams' prospects for success in the increasingly important field of getting along with the nation's lawmakers: "He understands the political aspects of being a general much better than people think. He should get along well with Congress but don't expect him to take any guff."

Editorially speaking and with all due respect to the other outstanding officers who were considered for the chief's spot, the Army could not have made a better choice at this crucial time of its development. It needs continued strength and integrity at the top. There must be imagination, the courage to experiment and to fight for the tools and men to do the job. And as important as all these is the ability to change with the times without compromising on the Army's mission.

These are tall orders, particularly when they will have to be executed in a national atmosphere which, while it is now less hostile toward the military with the winding down of the war and the waning of the draft, can be expected to take on an even deadlier character in the deceptively peaceful times ahead: apathy. But Gen. Abrams' career has been a succession of tall orders and he has never failed to do considerably more than his country could reasonably expect of him.

The first question that arises when a new boss takes over is "What is he like?" on the theory that when you know his likes and dislikes, how he operates and how he reacts in different situations you should have a pretty good idea of what direction the enterprise you share is going to take. It doesn't always go the way the indicators point, how-



ever, and this may be especially true in the case of Gen. Abrams.

The fact is that for a man who has been stereotyped as an uncomplicated (a "rough cobb" as one contemporary termed him), a blunt-speaking "soldier's soldier," Gen. Abrams has been doing a bang-up job in what is perhaps one of the most difficult and sensitive military assignments ever handed a general. As if Vietnamization with all of its headaches and international ramifications were not enough, he has been presiding over one of the most remarkable and potentially disastrous troop withdrawals in military history. When he assumed command of the Military Assistance Command Vietnam in April, 1968, the active commitment of U.S. forces in the fighting was still very high and, even though participation by American ground forces has for all practical purpose ceased, he is still in overall command of the considerable Air Force and Navy support operations that remain. Of prime importance, too, is his own role and that of his officers and NCOs in advising the ARVN and South Vietnamese regional and local forces as they strive to become a self-sustaining defense establishment.

To complicate the situation still further, like other U.S. commands, Vietnam has been up to its shoulder patches in troop problems such as drugs, racial discord, discipline and poor morale. Problems like these have a particularly sinister significance in an area where troops are actively engaged in combat. It is a tribute to Army leaders and the quality of their troops that, despite persistent published accounts that the Army in Vietnam fell apart long ago, our forces by all authoritative accounts are still a highly effective machine, whether in the role of fighter or adviser.

It is ironic that with all these thorny issues with which Gen. Abrams has had to deal on a day-to-day basis for the past four years—issues which in effect are as close to the mainstream of things as any which are being coped with at the Pentagon—doubts have been raised in some quarters about his ability to "relate" to the problems which plague the Army in the early 1970s.

As a person, those who have known him for many years describe him as extremely taciturn, "but in a warm way," said one old friend. "He just sits back, chews on his cigar, listens to all sides, and then makes up his mind after everybody else has had his say."

He is self-effacing to a fault, his reticence toward talking about himself perhaps being one of the chief reasons why, despite his prominence since World War II, relatively little is known about him. He has not added very much to this limited store in Vietnam where he seldom if ever has held a general press conference. Writers and other people who have gotten into his Saigon offices to see him are treated courteously and with candor, although, as more than one visitor has found, asking a question the general does not feel he should answer is apt to bring forth nothing more than a long stare.

Despite the paucity of his contacts with newsmen, Gen. Abrams has received remarkably little criticism in the press. Reporters generally praise him for his directness, the way he has conducted U.S. operations and for the way he has handled the delicate job of turning over South Vietnam's defense to its own soldiers.

My only contact with Gen. Abrams was during a visit to Vietnam in late 1968. Unless you knew something about his character, ability and combat record, it would have been easy to underestimate this kindly looking relaxed man with the ever-present cigar in the rumpled combat greens. Interviews with busy four-star generals can be extremely tense affairs, especially if the subjects offers nothing beyond bare answers to your questions or, as rarely happens, you're made to feel like a nincompoop because of the naïveté of your queries.

It turned out to be an extremely relaxing talk whose highlight was the most lucid description I have ever heard or read of what the enemy's aims were at that particular time of the conflict. His only "props" during this lesson were a much-erased blackboard which he covered with the simplest of diagrams, his voice and the cigar he used as a pointer, but no briefing I have ever received on the subject was more informative. At that time, as now, he was probably the busiest military man in the U.S. armed forces but he gave the impression of having all the time in the world.

There are other qualities which belie the image many people have of him as a simple, hard-driving soldier of the U.S. Grant mold, a poor comparison if the allusion is to show simplicity because Grant was anything but an uncomplicated man. Abe is known as a lover of fine music, his tastes ranging from Lawrence Welk to Wagner (one reporter has even claimed that he has used musical terms in sketching a battle plan to subordinate commanders). Although it is not generally known, he is a good pianist whose performances are confined to small gatherings of friends. He reads frequently, mostly history, and although he rarely attends parties he is described as excellent and witty company, especially when with close friends.

In his relations with subordinates, he has a reputation for being demanding but fair with little use for fawning, wasted motion, gobbledygook or people who try to cover up ignorance or poor preparation on a subject by trying to fool him.

"Don't ever try it," said a former staff officer who once tried to brazen out an obvious gap in his knowledge about the topic upon which he was briefing Gen. Abrams. "When he found out that I didn't know all I should he didn't say a word; he just got up and walked out."

Despite efforts to point up differences in the public press, there is little fundamental difference in the Westmoreland and Abrams fighting styles in Vietnam, particularly as they pertain to U.S. forces.

A February, 1971, article in *Time* magazine described Gen. Abrams' tactical aims as not only seeking out and fighting enemy troops, but also destroying their base installations and supply lines. Said the article:

"Where Westmoreland was a search-and-destroy and count-the-bodies man, Abrams proved to be an interdict-and-weigh-the-ricer man. Where Westmoreland insisted on outnumbering the enemy three or four to one with massive, multibrigade maneuvers, Abrams matched battalion against battalion and brigade against brigade. If a unit made contact with the enemy he hustled in reinforcements aboard helicopters. . . . He laced the countryside with small, defensible firebases. Heavy fighting bases were provided with overlapping artillery support, enabling units in trouble to radio for firepower instantly."

"Abrams ordered commanders to study enemy habits meticulously, then imitate them. As a result, small units began cutting paths through the jungle in the hope of finding a hidden base, hospital or supply trail. Says a commander who supports Abrams' ideas fully: 'Just focusing on knocking out men is illusory—they will just send more men down. But if you can get the system screwed up the enemy can be champing at the bit to fight but unable to do anything.'"

Maybe so, but Gen. Abrams would undoubtedly be the first to argue that many of these methods *Time* credited to a change in fighting style were being done when he was Gen. Westmoreland's chief deputy. However, it does give an interesting insight into Abe's fighting philosophy.

Creighton Williams Abrams Jr. was born in Springfield, Mass., the oldest of three children of a repairman for the Boston & Albany Railroad and his wife Nellie. At Agawam

(Mass.) High School, he excelled in scholarship and athletics. As captain and center of the football team, he led it to an undefeated season and the championship of Western Massachusetts. He also was editor of the school newspapers and president and orator of the Agawam graduating class of 1932.

He is said to have sought appointment to the U.S. Military Academy because he had been inspired by an address given by a graduate at his high school. He is remembered as an outstanding horseman, a guard on the "A" football team and as having a voracious appetite for practical jokes. According to the 1936 USMA yearbook, *The Howitzer*: "Wherever you find Abe, you'll find action. The two are inseparable. Catching hell as a plebe or dishing it out as a yearling, talking it up at football practice or driving the stage crew of Hundredth Night Show, he's always on the go. The lightest lineman on the Plebe squad, he started his football career on the sixth string; but his energy and spirit soon won him recognition, and though he holds the academy warm-up record, he stuck and made his letter. Never satisfied to be inactive long enough to do any heavy studying, Abe doesn't rank among the elite of the section room. Consequently, he'll probably be in the Calvary, and we believe that the horses will have to work hard to keep up with him."

According to *Current Biography 1968*, he is said to have recalled that "The only thing in which I was outstanding was discipline; I was at the bottom of the class." He graduated in the class of 1936, a class which included such other future luminaries as First Captain William C. Westmoreland and Bruce Palmer, who was to be vice chief of staff to them both.

The next four years after graduation were spent as a troop officer with the 1st Cavalry Division at Fort Bliss, Tex. In 1940, he was assigned to the newly formed 1st Armored Division where he spent several months as a tank company commander, and then in 1941 he went with the 4th Armored Division. Following a number of assignments, he was placed in command of the 37th Tank Battalion at Camp Bowie, Tex., and from the time it went into action in Normandy in July, 1944, Lt. Col. Abrams took part in all the campaigns of the 4th Armored, serving variously as battalion and combat command commander.

The famed 37th under Abrams was described in *Time* as "a fearsome weapon of destruction" and Abrams was hailed as having "the feel and flair of the born combat man." In the fighting in Europe, the brilliant young tanker was twice awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, among many other decorations, as he commanded units in the vanguard of Gen. George S. Patton Jr.'s Third Army. His exploits became legendary, one of the most celebrated being the 37th's breakthrough with two infantry divisions of the German lines surrounding the 101st Airborne Division at Bastogne during the Battle of the Bulge.

So outstanding was Abrams' record that Gen. Patton once said: "I'm supposed to be the best tank commander in the Army. But I have one peer—Abe Abrams. He's the world champion."

Promoted to colonel in 1945, Abrams was appointed to the War Department General Staff the same year where his duties included a study of the defense needs of the Philippines after independence. He later became assistant in the Plans Section (G3) at Army Ground Forces headquarters, and from March, 1946, to August, 1948, was director of tactics at the Armor School at Fort Knox, Ky. There he revised and updated the Army's manual on armored tactics, placing special emphasis upon the shock value of mass attack.

In 1948-49, he attended the Command and General Staff College, and in September, 1949, returned to Europe to take command of the 63rd Tank Battalion. He was com-

mander of the 2nd Armored Cavalry Regiment in 1952 when he was sent to the Army War College, after which he was assigned to Korea where he served successively as chief of staff of I Corps, X Corps and IX Corps. In 1956, he was promoted to brigadier general and assigned to the Army General Staff as deputy assistant chief of staff for reserve components.

In 1959 he returned to Europe as assistant division commander of the 3rd Armored Division. In May, 1960, he was promoted to major general and assigned as deputy chief of staff, operations, at headquarters, United States Army Europe. He returned to the 3rd Armored Division as division commander in October, 1960, and served in this capacity until he returned to Washington on 19 May, 1962, for assignment as assistant deputy chief of staff for military operations for civil affairs. On 23 July, 1962, he was appointed director of operations in the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Military Operations. On 15 October, 1962, he assumed the duties of the assistant deputy chief of staff for military operations for requirements and programs. In April, 1963, he was appointed deputy assistant chief of staff for force development. He became commanding general of V Corps on 15 July, 1963, and was promoted to lieutenant general on 1 August, 1963.

On August, 1964, General Abrams was appointed acting vice chief of staff. He was promoted to general on 4 September, 1964, and on the same date was sworn in as vice chief of staff.

In March 1967, Gen. Abrams arrived in Vietnam for an inspection tour which was widely believed to be a preview for his appointment to a key post in MACV. The next month, President Johnson named him second in command to Gen. Westmoreland. Among his early jobs was the sharing with civilian Presidential assistant Robert W. Komer of responsibility for the rural pacification program and supervision of the training and performance of South Vietnamese units. He has long been a champion of the fighting qualities of these forces.

In June, 1968, after Gen. Westmoreland was appointed chief of staff, Gen. Abrams was named commander of MACV.

He and Mrs. Abrams, the former Julia Harvey, whom he married on 30 August, 1936, have six children: Noel, Creighton W. Jr., John, Jeanne, Elizabeth and Robert. His recreational pastimes, besides listening to music and reading, are hunting, fishing and golf, according to *Current Biography*, and he is said to be a fine cook and aggressive poker player.

If those who know him were to pick one quality to epitomize those he brings to his new assignment it would be "strength." A retired general who has known him since pre-World War II days describes him as "one of the very strongest men I have ever known."

That strength will be vitally needed by the Army in the tough years that lie ahead.

#### ROGERS INTRODUCED EXPENDITURE BUDGET CEILINGS

### HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which would place a statutory expenditure limit of \$250 billion, as suggested by the President, on Federal spending during fiscal year 1973. This proposal will say to the American public

that we in Congress fully realize the seriousness of the problem and are ready and willing to do something about it.

In order to keep the Federal budget within this limit, my proposal also calls for a reordering of our spending priorities. The need to concentrate on America's domestic problems by giving them first consideration in our fiscal planning is paramount. My proposal would, therefore, make the American people the primary beneficiaries in any budget actions that are taken.

#### FROM YELLOWSTONE TO TOMORROW

### HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that a commercial television program intended only for an American audience generates such impact that it attains global recognition. Such is the case with a remarkable documentary presented last April on NBC-TV by the American Telephone & Telegraph Company's long distance division. It was designed as a tribute to and an assessment of our national parks system.

Called "From Yellowstone to Tomorrow" and starring George C. Scott as host-narrator, this innovative feature was most favorably received by a large viewing audience. Previous to this national telecast, the program had been screened for his colleagues at the United Nations by U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. George Bush. Here, too, the response was highly favorable.

Because of its relevance to the theme of the U.N. Conference on the Human Environment, "From Yellowstone to Tomorrow" was submitted to the Swedish Government-host country to the Conference held in Stockholm as a candidate for the daily screening of environment-oriented films held in Sweden House—Sverigehuset. This handsome edifice maintains a visitors center normally given over to information for tourists about Sweden.

"From Yellowstone to Tomorrow" was deemed so desirable and relevant to the theme of the Conference which it was my privilege to attend as a member of the U.S. delegation, that it was accorded twice the viewing time permitted other entries and screened on a daily basis for the benefit of the delegates to the Conference from 112 countries, members of the press, government officials, as well as the local Swedish people curious about how the United States manages its vast parks system.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to include in today's RECORD a copy of the press announcement distributed by the U.S. delegation on this matter. I am sure that if my colleagues saw this magnificent film, they would share in the delight and effectiveness of this production.

The press announcement follows:

#### "FROM YELLOWSTONE TO TOMORROW" FILM SHOWING AT SVERIGEHUSET

As part of the United States support for a World Heritage Trust to set aside natural treasures and parks for the benefit of all peoples, the Visitors Convention Center in Sverigehuset has begun a daily film showing of "From Yellowstone to Tomorrow".

This remarkable color film examines the 100-year history and vast extent of the American National Parks system. The world's first national scenic park at Yellowstone was established in 1872. There are 38 national parks and 250 national monuments, sea shores and historical sites.

Secretary of Interior Rogers Morton, a member of the U.S. delegation to the Stockholm Environment Conference, is head of the entire American National Parks system as Secretary of the Interior. He will discuss President Nixon's proposal for a World Heritage Trust before the Stockholm conference.

The film features George C. Scott as narrator and was produced for U.S. television by the American Telephone and Telegraph Company on the 100th anniversary of the parks system. It is being distributed overseas as part of the film program of the U.S. Information Agency. "From Yellowstone to Tomorrow" represents a two-year project involving 65,000 miles of air travel to visit parks all over the U.S.

#### FREEDOM OF THE PRESS, SAIGON STYLE

### HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, tight financial and other restrictions have been imposed on South Vietnamese newspapers in what the Thieu regime admits is an effort to put most out of business and make the rest follow the official line.

The vaguely worded restrictions of the press code contain a clear message for anyone who had the least delusion that South Vietnam harbors a free press.

Although the South Vietnamese press is already "cowed and acquiescent," according to veteran observers, "its docility failed to satisfy the Thieu government."

A Thieu spokesman, in announcing the press policy, paid lip service to freedom of the press and said newspapers would be permitted to criticize the Government only if they do it right.

This is further intimidation of a subservient press that is prohibited from printing not only unfavorable opinion but even the truth, unless authorized by psychological warfare authorities in Saigon.

Mr. Speaker, is this the kind of government we want to support? To sacrifice thousands of our best young men for? To spill our treasure and divide our own Nation for?

This is further evidence that our support of the Thieu dictatorship is morally indefensible.

Four successive administrations, two Republican and two Democratic, have said our goal has been to defend democracy and help the South Vietnamese people live in freedom. That is a fine goal, but a look at the facts shows something totally different.



Millions of South Vietnamese have been killed in this quest while a succession of dictatorships in Saigon have shown not the least inclination toward democracy. This new press policy is just the latest in a long string of repressive, dictatorial steps away from freedom, not toward it.

The silence from the White House in this matter indicates its own acquiescence and encouragement if not collaboration in these efforts. After all, let us not forget that this same White House has been engineering its own assault on the press.

## MONTHLY CALENDAR OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege each month to insert in the RECORD the monthly calendar of the Smithsonian Institution. The August Calendar of Events follows:

### CALENDAR OF EVENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

#### AUGUST 1

**Exhibition.**—*Motocopes*. "Peep-shows," the most popular form of moving-picture entertainment in America at the turn of the century, providing a glimpse of what was considered "naughty" down at the nickelodeon. First floor, National Museum of History and Technology.

**Exhibition.**—*The Textile Industry: New England 1800-1920*. Fabrics, sample books, old labels, and photographs showing the history of textile mills in New England. Great Hall, Smithsonian Institution "Castle" Building. Through September.

#### AUGUST 2

**Exhibition:** *Atlantic Cable*. An evocation, through paintings, photographs and artifacts, of the first undersea cable in 1858 linking North America with Europe—a technological triumph that prompted almost hysterical public enthusiasm. First floor, National Museum of History and Technology.

**Design Films.**—To be announced. Shown continuously from 11 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. The Renwick Gallery.

#### AUGUST 3

**Lecture/Film.**—*Exploring Queen of Sheba Land*, presented by the noted archeologist Dr. Wendell Phillips, at 8 p.m. in the Spencer Baird Auditorium of the National Museum of Natural History. The motion picture to be shown is the only one ever taken of the ancient sand-covered Old Testament cities of Southern Arabia. A selection of art treasures unearthed by Dr. Phillips on his adventurous explorations in this region is currently on view at the National Museum of Natural History and includes the Hellenistic bronze lions and cupids (75-50 B.C.) shown above. The exhibit, *Arabia Felix*, is scheduled to run through Labor Day.

**Creative Screen.**—*The West of Charles Russell*. An exciting commentary on the cowboy-artist who lived among the settlers and Indians of the Old West portrayed through the artist's works and their actual settings. 11:15 a.m., 12:15, 1:15 p.m. Lecture Hall, National Collection of Fine Arts.

#### AUGUST 5

**Creative Screen.**—*The West of Charles Russell*. Repeat. See August 3 for details.

#### AUGUST 9

**Design Films.**—To be announced. Shown continuously from 11 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. The Renwick Gallery.

#### AUGUST 12

**Exhibition.**—*Sculpture of Franz Barwig*. Twenty-one bronze and wood sculptures by the Viennese artist, and a plaster model made for the architectural ornamentation of Marjorie Merriweather Post's Palm Beach villa. Barwig's works, primarily animals and human figures, are a combination of simplification of form and rich, decorative effect. The Renwick Gallery, through October 23.

**Exhibition.**—*The Avant-Garde in Theatre and Art: French Playbills of the 1890's*. Theater programs, lent by the Atlas Foundation, created for the experimental Théâtre Libre and Théâtre de l'Oeuvre in Paris by Lautrec, Bonnard, Vuillard, Munch, Signac, Denis and others during the final two decades of the 19th century. The Renwick Gallery, through October 23. The exhibit is being circulated by the Smithsonian Institution Traveling Exhibition Service.

#### AUGUST 16

**Design Films.**—To be announced. 11 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. The Renwick Gallery.

#### AUGUST 17

**Creative Screen.**—*Grand Canyon*. Visual impressions of the Grand Canyon with Ferde Grofe's "Grand Canyon Suite" as background. A Walt Disney Productions. 11:15 a.m., 12:15 and 1:15 p.m.

Lecture Hall, National Collection of Fine Arts.

#### AUGUST 19

**Creative Screen.**—*Grand Canyon*. Repeat. See August 17 for details.

#### AUGUST 23

**Design Films.**—To be announced. Shown continuously from 11 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. The Renwick Gallery.

#### AUGUST 24

**Lecture.**—*Mails, Monopolies and the Mail Order*, by Wayne E. Fuller, professor of history, University of Texas, El Paso. Mr. Fuller analyzes the first century of mail-order business, which will be commemorated with a special postage stamp to be issued September 27 in Chicago. Second in a series by the Smithsonian and the Postal Service. 8 p.m., National Museum of History and Technology auditorium.

#### RADIO SMITHSONIAN

Radio Smithsonian, a program of music and conversation growing out of the Institution's many activities, is broadcast every Sunday on WGMS-AM (570) and FM (103.5) from 9-9:30 p.m. The program schedule:

#### AUGUST 6

**The New Deal Art Projects.** One of the most important influences on 20th century American art explored by Francis O'Connor and Jacob Kainen of the National Collection of Fine Arts, Karel Yasko, Director of GSA's Fine Arts Preservation Office, and Joshua Taylor, Director of the NCPA, then discuss new plans for preserving New Deal art.

#### AUGUST 13

**Around the Blues.** Martin Williams, Director of the Smithsonian's Jazz Program, discusses and illustrates the influence of the blues in American music.

#### AUGUST 20

**70 Years at the Smithsonian.** Dr. Charles Greeley Abbot, former Secretary of the Smithsonian who recently celebrated his 100th birthday, recalls some of his experiences at "the nation's attic."

**A Maverick's View of Music Critics**, with Henry Pleasants, London music critic for the *International Herald Tribune*.

#### AUGUST 27

**The Right To Vote.** A look at voting rights in the U.S. since the country's early days.

**What Can Fossils Tell Us?** with Dr. Frank Whitmore, Museum of Natural History paleontologist specializing in whale fossils.

#### AUGUST REMINDERS

The third semester of Associates classes sponsored by the Smithsonian Associates begins the week of August 15. For registration call Mrs. Arnette, 381-5157.

Prospective Volunteer Docents must be registered and interviewed before August 31 to attend fall training sessions for conducting school tours. Call 381-6471.

#### FOREIGN STUDY TOURS—1972

For members of the National and Resident Associates. For further details on tours, listed below, write Miss Schumann, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560.

**"No Tour" Tour:** (Dulles-London-Dulles) Sept. 11-Oct. 2.

**The Pilgrimage Road:** Sept. 11-Oct. 9 (Waiting list only).

**Russian Museum Tour:** Sept. 12-Oct. 3 (Waiting list only).

**Pakistan and Afghanistan:** Oct. 9-Nov. 8 (Waiting list only).

**Antique Tour in London:** Nov. 2-10. \$475. 1973

**Peru:** Archaeological sites, folklore, and anthropology (depart from and return to Miami). Feb 8-March 5.

**Morocco:** Atlas Mountains, archaeological sites. March 6-27.

**Cave Paintings:** Prehistoric caves of Spain and France, April 2-26.

**Middle East:** Classical sites, crusader castles, Arab cultures of Syria, Jordan, Lebanon (depart from and return to London). April 22-May 15.

**Baroque Tour of German and Austria:** May 13-June 4.

**African Safari:** Tanzania and Kenya. July 17, three weeks.

**Aerospace Tour:** Germany, Switzerland, Russia and London. Sept. 10, two weeks.

**Sites of Civilization:** Three weeks on the cruise ship *Argonaut* (depart from and return to New York.) Oct. 6-28.

#### DRUGS: A SPECIAL EXHIBITION

**Schedule of Special Activities—Arts and Industries Building**

(For last-minute schedule changes, call 737-8811)

August 1—Films: *Epitaph* and *The People Next Door*. Alternated continuously between 10:30 a.m.-1 p.m., 2-6 and 7-8:30 p.m.

August 2—*Inner Voices of Lorton*. Performances at 1:30 and 4:30 p.m. Film: *Epitaph*, 6-8:30 p.m.

August 3—Films: *US and Darkness, Darkness*. 10:30 a.m.-1 p.m., 2-6 and 7-8:30 p.m.

August 4—*Inner Voices of Lorton*. Performances at 1:30 and 4:30 p.m. Film: *Curious Alice*, 6-8:30 p.m.

August 5-6—*The Living Stage of Arena Stage*. Performances at 1:30 and 4:30 p.m.

August 7—Panel discussion: *Causative Factors in the Addictive Process*. 10:30-12:30 a.m. and 2-4 p.m. Presentation of original papers followed by full panel discussion and time devoted to questions from the audience.

August 8—Films: *David* and *11:59, Last Minute to Choose*. 10:30 a.m.-1 p.m., 2-6 and 7-8:30 p.m.

August 9—Films: *Skezag* and *The Opium Trail*. 10:30 a.m.-1 p.m., 2-6 and 7-8:30 p.m.

August 10—Films: *Speedscene* and *Brian* at 17. 10:30 a.m.-1 p.m., 2-6 and 7-8:30 p.m.

August 11—Films: *A Day in the Death of Donnie B* and *Ebena*. 10:30 a.m.-1 p.m., 2-6 and 7-8:30 p.m.

August 12-13—Film: *Wild in the Streets*. Continuous showings 10:30 a.m.-1 p.m., 2-6 and 7-8:30 p.m.

August 14—*Inner Voices of Lorton*. Per-

performances at 1:30 and 4:30 p.m. Film: *Slow Death*, 6-8:30 p.m.

August 15—Films: *Epitaph* and *Slow Death*. 10:30 a.m.-1 p.m., 2-6 and 7-8:30 p.m.

August 16—*Inner Voices of Lorton*. Performances at 1:30 and 4:30 p.m. Film: *Drugs of Abuse*, 6-8:30 p.m.

August 17—Films: *The People Next Door* and *To Find Our Life*. 10:30 a.m.-1 p.m., 2-6 and 7-8:30 p.m.

August 18—Films: *Curious Alice* and *Drugs of Abuse*. 10:30 a.m.-1 p.m., 2-6 and 7-8:30 p.m.

August 19-20—*Last Renaissance Players*, St. Elizabeths Hospital. Performances at 1:30 and 4:30 p.m.

August 21—Panel discussion: *Drug Abuse in Non-Western Cultures*. 10:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m. and 2-4 p.m. Original paper presented by Dr. Peter Furst, followed by full panel discussion and time devoted to questions from the audience.

August 22—Films: *To Find Our Life* and *Ebena*. 10:30 a.m.-1 p.m., 2-6 and 7-8:30 p.m.

August 23—Films: *The Opium Trail* and *US*. 10:30 a.m.-1 p.m., 2-6 and 7-8:30 p.m.

August 24—Films: *Darkness, Darkness* and *David*. 10:30 a.m.-1 p.m., 2-6 and 7-8:30 p.m.

August 25—Films: *Skezag* and *Drugs of Abuse*. 10:30 a.m.-1 p.m., 2-6 and 7-8:30 p.m.

August 26-27—Film: *Portrait of Jason*. 10:30 a.m.-1 p.m., 2-6 and 7-8:30 p.m.

August 28—*Inner Voices of Lorton*. Performances at 1:30 and 4:30 p.m. Film: *Epitaph*, 6-8:30 p.m.

August 29—Films: *Brian at 17* and *Curious Alice*. 10:30 a.m.-1 p.m., 2-6 and 7-8:30 p.m.

August 30—Films: 11:59, *Last Minute To Choose* and *A Day in the Death of Donnie B*. 10:30 a.m.-1 p.m., 2-6 and 7-8:30 p.m.

August 31—Films: *The People Next Door* and *Epitaph*. 10:30 a.m.-1 p.m., 2-6 and 7-8:30 p.m.

#### DEMONSTRATIONS

##### Museum of History and Technology

*Music Machines—American Style*. Mechanical and electronic music machines. Monday through Friday, 1:30 p.m., 2nd floor.

*Spinning and Weaving*. Tuesday, 11 a.m.-1 p.m.; Wednesday and Thursday, 11 a.m.-1 p.m., 2-4 p.m.

*Machine Tools*. Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, 1-2 p.m.

*Musical Instruments*. Temporarily discontinued.

*Hand-Set Printing Presses*. Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday, 2-4 p.m., 2nd floor.

Change of Address and Calendar Requests: mail to Central Information Desk, Great Hall, Smithsonian Institution Building, Washington, D.C. 20560. When applicable, please include old calendar label.

Dial-A-Museum—737-8811 for daily announcements on new exhibits and special events.

Dial-A-Phenomenon—737-8855 for weekly announcements on stars, planets and worldwide occurrences of short-lived natural phenomena.

#### SUMMER HOURS

Museum of History and Technology; Museum of Natural History; Arts and Industries Building: 10 a.m.-9 p.m. seven days each week.

Freer Gallery of Art; National Collection of Fine Arts; National Portrait Gallery; Renwick Gallery: 10 a.m.-5:30 p.m. daily.

National Zoo buildings: 9 a.m.-6 p.m., daily.

Anacostia Neighborhood Museum: 10 a.m.-6 p.m., weekdays; 1-6 p.m., weekends.

#### MUSEUM TOURS

Info 1972. Museum of Natural History, Museum of History and Technology, National Air and Space Museum (Arts and Industries Building). Walk-in tours are conducted by summer volunteers beginning every half-hour between 10:30 a.m. and 12 noon and be-

tween 2 and 4 p.m. at the Info Desks through August 17. Special group tours for these buildings can be arranged by calling 381-5304.

Group tours by appointment are also available at the following museums:

National Portrait Gallery—381-6285.  
National Collection of Fine Arts—381-6541.  
The Renwick Gallery—381-5811.

Freer Gallery of Art—381-5344.

The Smithsonian Monthly Calendar of Events is prepared by the Office of Public Affairs. Editor: Lillas Wiltshire. Deadline for entries in the September Calendar: August 7.

#### ARTS AND INDUSTRIES BUILDING

*Ballooning (1782-1972)*. The colorful history of ballooning from earliest ideas to balloonomania to a modern science. Through December 1972.

*World War I Fighter Planes*. Aviation history of WWI era depicted through the recreation of front line fighter aircraft, including uniforms, models, recordings and actual aircraft.

*Drugs: A Special Exhibition*. A comprehensive exhibit on the history and use of drugs. Special related activities are held each day in the Rap Theatre (see front side).

#### FREER GALLERY OF ART

*Recent Accessions in Japanese Art*. Approximately twenty works of art including paintings, metalwork and ceramics purchased by the Freer Gallery during the past ten years.

*Early Christian Manuscripts*. Illuminated leaves and ancient Biblical manuscripts from the Freer collections.

*Eugene and Agnes E. Meyer Memorial Exhibition*. Chinese and Japanese objects including bronzes, archaic jades, stone sculptures, paintings and ceramics.

*2500 Years of Persian Art*. Decorative work from manuscripts metalwork, ceramics, and architectural decorations. Through December 1972.

#### MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY

*Insect Zoo*. Live insects including Allegheny mound ants, bees, termites, and a butterfly flight cage. Through August 31.

#### CONTINUING EXHIBITIONS

*Art of Simon Yavitz*. Unique botanical subjects sculpted in gold and silver enhanced with gems and ivory. On display indefinitely.

*Arabia Felix*. The art and culture of an ancient civilization regarded as the wealthiest in the 1st century B.C. Through August 31.

#### MUSEUM OF HISTORY AND TECHNOLOGY

*A Children's World: Sears, Roebuck & Co. Collection of American Toys. 1890-1960*. Over 500 cast iron and tinplate toys. On display indefinitely.

*Music Machines—American Style*. Barrel organs and player pianos to the most up-to-date high fidelity equipment. Tapes of the machine sounds are played and excerpts from filmed musical productions shown throughout the day.

*Contemporary Counterparts of Early American Craftsmen*. Crystal-glazed ceramics created by Erni and Rose Cabot of Tucson, Arizona. On display indefinitely.

*Art and Physics*. "Astralites" and other light sculptures by Washington artist Adam Pelperl. Through September 30.

#### NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY

*"If Elected . . ." Unsuccessful Candidates for the Presidency 1796-1968*. More than 80 portraits and 500 campaign items of the also-ran candidates and their contributions to American political history. Four 30-minute films entitled *Al Smith*, *Wendell Willkie*, *Norman Thomas* and *The Women Get the Vote* are shown daily beginning at 11 a.m.

#### NATIONAL COLLECTION OF FINE ARTS

*National Parks and the American Landscape*. 125 paintings, drawings, watercolors,

photographs and memorabilia commemorating the centennial of the national park system. Through August 27.

*Artists-Naturalists: Observations in the Americas*. Prints and watercolors by Mark Catesby, Alexander Wilson, John James Audubon, Martin Johnson Heade, the Thayer family and Louis A. Fuertes. Through September 10.

#### THE RENWICK GALLERY

*Woodenworks*. Contemporary furniture by five wood craftsmen.

*Pueblo Pottery: Zuni and Acoma Designs from Smithsonian Collections*.

*Selections from the Index of American Design*.

*The Glass of Frederick Carder*.  
*James Renwick in Washington*.

*Design Is . . .* Elements of design in diverse objects encountered in daily life.

#### THE SMITHSONIAN RESIDENT PUPPET THEATRE

*The Wonderful Land of Oz*. Based on L. Frank Baum's sequel to his classic *The Wizard of Oz*, and performed by Allan Stevens and Company. Schedule through Labor Day: Wednesday through Sunday (including holidays) 11 a.m., 12 noon, 1 p.m. Admission \$1 children, \$1.25 for adults. Reservations are recommended—call the box office at 381-5395. The Smithsonian Resident Puppet Theatre is produced by the Division of Performing Arts.

Use of funds for printing this publication approved by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, June 3, 1971.

#### ENGLISH VIEW OF NIXON BOMBING—BRUTAL

#### HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, paying attention to what others think of us can sometimes lead to wiser decisions. I commend to my colleagues the following editorial from the August 5, 1972, Manchester, England, Guardian.

No doubt most world opinion would agree with this venerable and distinguished newspaper's view: "His—Nixon's—whole bombing policy is a brutal error."

The full text of the editorial follows:

#### BRUTAL BOMBING

President Nixon's anger at being accused by the UN Secretary General, Dr. Waldheim, of a deliberate policy of bombing the dikes in North Vietnam is an almost irrelevant furore. The case has not been clearly proven. The North Vietnamese are undoubtedly out to wring as much propaganda benefit from the bombing as possible. Their public evidence has been somewhat weak, in spite of Swedish and French television films and the accounts of visitors of varying commitments. But the American record leaves little room for confidence. Bombing of the North was being carried on without authorisation before Nixon's announcement. In the course of the war in Vietnam, the United States has tampered with nature by using defoliants, fire bombs, herbicides, "daisy cutter" bombs to make clearings the size of football pitches, and artificial rainstorms. President Nixon is on weak propaganda grounds, as well as moral grounds, when he gets angry at the discussion of bombing dikes. His whole bombing policy is a brutal error.

The initial contradictions in US policy have not changed since the bombing was re-



started officially in May. While the US withdraws on the ground, it carries out the most concentrated bombing Vietnam has ever sustained. And for what? It only remotely protects the lives of the withdrawing Americans. The bombing of North Vietnam has shattered what little industry there was in this mainly agricultural State. It has killed civilians and made refugees of thousands of others. President Nixon on July 27 made claims for his bombers' restraint and accuracy in the face of a 2,700-mile dike system. The State Department says minor damage in 12 locations alone has been detected. But dikes only need to be weakened to provoke a hideous flood in monsoon time in the Red River Delta, where three-quarters of North Vietnam's population lives. Mr. Nixon's claims are like putting icing on a rotten cake.

#### NIXON DOCTRINE ANALYZED

### HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, for many years following World War II the United States conceived the Communist world to be unified and hostile in ideology, monolithic and aggressive in purpose, and dedicated to totally and ruthlessly to sweeping away everything before it. We conceived the free world to be a mirror image of the Communist one and this concept of opposing and opposite worlds dominated our foreign policy and shaped our defense posture for over two decades.

Faced with aggression, our logical strategy was to isolate and contain it within the Communist world. Simultaneously we worked to bring order, stability, and economic opportunity to allied and friendly nations, whose freedom and safety seemed intertwined with our own. A threat to any one of them was seen as a threat to all, to be countered by cold means if possible, but hot war if necessary.

Thus in 1950 when the Republic of Korea was attacked by the Communist North, containment of the forces of total aggression seemed essential, not just to save this particular ally, but to keep other free world countries from thereafter falling like dominoes.

In retrospect the two worlds in conflict concept and our strategies to cope with it seem to have worked reasonably well throughout the 1950's. But events are not static and by the early 1960's evidence began to appear that some things in the Communist world, as well as in our own, were changed or changing. As time passed the evidence of change mounted. Even so, revision of our concept of the enemy, long tempered by years of hot and cold war, did not come quickly. It is the way of men and nations alike to hold to the old patterns until some significant event triggers movement, and then change comes swiftly.

The succession of Presidents in 1969 was such an event. It forced into our national awareness the reality that the Communist world is no longer unified and monolithic. Rather, it is severely strained inside by major centrifugal forces. There-

fore, replacement of the Containment doctrine by a doctrine more responsive to current U.S. national interests was called for. This is being accomplished in the form of the Nixon doctrine, formulation of which began at Guam in 1969 and still continues.

Let us see how the situation of the 1970's differs from that of the 1960's.

The escalation of North Vietnam's aggression which began early in the 1960's appeared in the context of the times as another centrally directed Korean-like probe, shaking the dominoes, testing the climate for worldwide aggression and justifying commitment of half-a-million American ground troops to hurl back the aggressor and reveal the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

But viewed in the less monolithic context of the 1970's, the continued Vietnamese aggression appears in a more localized image, devolving upon its victim the primary responsibility for its own defense and obliging allies to assist reasonably with materials, but only sparingly, if at all, with men. It was with this vision that the new President at once began repatriating American forces from Asia at a pace and in ways calculated to avoid leaving geopolitical wreckage in the wake to spark renewed hostilities.

The Nixon doctrine is basically an ongoing effort to perceive the world accurately as it now is and as it changes and evolves. Then, upon this factual basis, U.S. policies, doctrines, and strategies are conceived, modified or discarded as appropriate for responding quickly to current realities, evolving challenges and emerging opportunities. The new Doctrine puts heavy reliance on negotiation, partnership and strength as techniques for forwarding U.S. national interests. It recognizes defense priorities in this order of importance: first, continental defense; second, protection of lines of communication; third, maintenance of alliances; fourth, protection of U.S. overseas interests; and, fifth, capability to assist in local conflicts when advisable.

It is obvious that our troop withdrawal, the Vietnamization of the war, and efforts to end it by diplomatic and military pressure on Hanoi fall neatly into the new fifth priority concept of limited partnership with allies engaged in local conflicts. And whereas, the older Containment doctrine assigned first priority to stemming aggression, as in Vietnam, the Nixon doctrine now highlights continental defense as our realistic first priority. To this end Strategic Arms Limitation Talks were begun in 1969. They aimed initially at freezing nuclear stockpiles at levels assuring mutual deterrence and thereafter, at reducing their size and cost to society. The initial agreements were recently negotiated in Moscow and knowledgeable observers believe they will extend for several years the time during which our country will remain secure from nuclear attack.

It is interesting to note that the superpower strategic stockpiles are practically all that is left of our former bipolar concept of the world. Polycentrism in Communist and non-Communist countries alike is the order of the day. During the past 12 months' its ubiquitous influence

has flooded the international scene. America's decision announced only a year ago to back seating the People's Republic of China in the United Nations stripped away the fiction of a lurking conspiracy led by the United States to unleash Chiang Kai-shek's illusory prowess upon the mainland. It brought into sharp focus the conflicting ideological, geographic and historical forces which are repelling from each other the Chinese and Russian societies.

It is compelling Peking's leaders to acknowledge that their greatest peril is not America, but the pincers of Soviet power encircling China from the north, from the west and from the south. It has abruptly forced Moscow's leaders to start seeing the collision course being set by China's need to expand into the same vast spaces of the Siberian heartland that they themselves must occupy if their own national destiny is to be fulfilled.

From Peking's viewpoint encouragement of the Vietnam war to harass the United States shifted from an asset to a liability because, under the guise of military aid to Hanoi, it helps keep open a channel for Soviet enlargement of its influence at China's southern border. From the Kremlin's viewpoint meddling in Vietnam for similar disruptive reasons also has changed from a plus to a minus in recent months. The Soviet Union now must gird its resources for the upcoming competition for Siberia. That will be costly and require decades to resolve. The remarkable acquiescence by the Soviet Union only in the last few days to withdrawal of its forces from Egypt may be in response to a perceived need for detentes in Europe and the Mediterranean while the problem of Asia is dealt with.

The fact of our President's visits to the PRC and the Soviet Union tacitly acknowledges the self-interest of these states in normalized relations during the pendency of their Siberian contest. And such normalization is in the United States' self-interest, too, since it will promote a healthier climate for our second, third and fourth defense priorities relating to the viability of worldwide communications, the well-being of our alliances and the protection of our interests in foreign lands.

The changes in the world scene and the enhancement of United States national interests which have occurred during the short year since the China seating decision are so swift and so staggering that we in their midst have difficulty comprehending their magnitude.

The interpretations I place upon them may be optimistic. My model of today's global geopolitics on which they are based may be somewhat flawed in concept and imperfect in detail. But my research and my instincts tell me that the broad outline I have presented to you is substantially correct and that the U.S. Ship of State has entered a new ocean upon which it will sail for the balance of this century. It is an ocean still only partially charted, but it seems to be marked by less rocks and fewer shoals than the one from which we have lately departed. That is meaningful to our national safety. It is encouraging for our individual welfare.

# THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT IN THE DELIVERY OF HEALTH CARE SERVICES

**HON. HUGH L. CAREY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been gravely concerned about the inadequate health services some of our citizens receive. Every Member has received complaints of shortcomings of our present health care system together with suggestions as to how this system can be made responsive to our Nation's health-care needs.

As a member of the Ways and Means Committee I have heard numerous proposals which have been advanced to solve this problem. It seems to me that there is some merit in a number of these proposals which have been advanced to solve opportunity to enunciate my own views as to the role the Federal Government will have in the provision of health care for our citizens when I addressed the American Physical Therapy Association's Annual Conference in Las Vegas on June 11.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of this speech in the RECORD at this point:

## THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT IN THE DELIVERY OF HEALTH CARE SERVICES

Mr. Michaels, Mr. Noland, Ladies and Gentlemen: Several months ago when Mr. Noland came by my office in Washington to invite me to be your keynote speaker, I accepted readily. Even though he told me your meeting was to be in Las Vegas, I knew that speaking to this association would not be a gamble—for to speak to the physical therapists is to speak to one of the largest—and strongest—groups of health professionals anywhere.

By strong, I mean organizationally as well as physically. Of course, one reason you are so physically strong is because of your great dedication and constant practice. I know—I've been watching you give range of motion exercise to the slots.

But this morning I want to talk with you about other strengths—the strengths that the APTA can bring to the debate now going on in Washington and throughout the country over national health insurance.

Your association can bring a great deal to these discussions. More than any other group of health professionals, you have stood by rehabilitation as an essential component in the continuum of health care when for too long it has been neglected by others.

Because there have been insufficient funds to pay for it, the necessary services in rehabilitation have not developed to meet the need. As a result, many hundreds and thousands of patients are not getting the complete range of health care they need and deserve.

Rather than returning to society as contributors to our economy, they have become a drain, discarded by the health care system before reaching their full potential for rehabilitation.

We have a national attack on cancer. But we must not be lulled into a false sense of complacency. Cancer is a disastrous illness whether the patient lives or dies.

And management of the cancer patient is less than complete if it fails to include rehabilitation of the patient together with his family. But where in our attack on cancer is there emphasis on rehabilitation?

I might add that the same situation prevails in the case of stroke patients, persons disabled by arthritis, and the tens of thou-

sands of paraplegics trying painfully to find some niche in life where they can be productive to themselves and society.

Now through the ironic and tragic assassination attempt on the life of a presidential candidate, all the world will be looking to see what physical rehabilitation can do for George Wallace.

It would appear that medicine has done almost all it can.

His future hope is in your hands.

And through your efforts in Washington, it will be up to you as an association to see that the rehabilitation services provided to a wounded state governor are made available to all who need them through national health programs.

For the past few years, national health insurance has been a controversial subject in the Federal City—and indeed, practically anywhere a handful of health professionals gathered together.

One reason is that it means so many things to so many people.

To physicians, it can mean a national health service such as the British system.

To the AMA, it is health insurance through tax credits.

To hospitals, it may mean total health care for all, centered in the hospital.

To the public it means something that pays the bills.

To Senator Edward M. Kennedy, it means a top to bottom shakeup of the health care delivery system and a total restructuring of the economic base upon which care is funded.

The Ways and Means Committee of which I am a member has a stack of national health insurance bills embodying most of these approaches piled up before it. I can tell you right now that none of them—not a single one—will be enacted into law in its present form.

Congress will not pass any national health insurance bill this year, and it is doubtful that our committee, from which that bill must come, will even hold further executive sessions.

But the fact that Congress will not enact a national health plan in 1972 should be regarded as a period of pause and not a period of inaction. We are not indifferent to the severity of the problem.

Quite the contrary, it is the gravity of the health problem which makes caution imperative.

The hearings our committee held last fall convinced us that nothing short of a single, coordinated national health plan will bring our citizens the quality health care they demand, when and where they need it, regardless of their personal ability to foot the bill. Going halfway, by patching up medicare and medicaid, will not do the job.

Medicare and medicaid have taught us that we cannot simply pass another bill-paying program which will touch off an inflationary blaze in the house of health. Massive Federal subsidization to a health care system which in its present form is inadequate to meet the demands for health care of more than 200 million Americans might do just that.

That is why our committee, when it does sit down to hammer out a bill, will be concerned with the manner in which care is provided as well as the costs of that care.

There will have to be cost controls. There will have to be reasonable standards. The challenge is to design national health insurance machinery which protects the public interest, serves the health consumer, but at the same time is professionally acceptable . . .

The latest push for national health insurance started, as you know, in 1968, when the late Walter Reuther announced formation of the Committee for National Health Insurance. For two years, that group and its

technical staff labored to produce the outlines of what is now known as the Health Security Act.

Sponsored by Senator Kennedy and by Representative Martha Griffiths in the House, health security became the first major national health insurance plan to be put before the Congress. The debate began.

I mention the Health Security Act because it became the symbolic trigger of the current debate. It forced us to face up to certain serious questions about the structure of the health care delivery system, about the need to develop ways of reaching more people in need of health care, with the same number of resources.

It recognized that the so-called doctor shortage is more a problem of poor distribution than a problem of actual numbers.

It raised the hard issue of profit-making in health by proposing to do away with the commercial health insurance industry.

It posed the basic question—has our society reached the point in its life where the provision of health care ought to be provided by society to all its individual members, with the costs of that care borne through taxation?

To obtain the facts and insight necessary to grapple with these and other issues, several committees have been holding hearings over the past two years, the testimony has been predictable. Labor leaders calling for the Health Security Act, the AMA plugging medicredit, the hospitals calling for health care centers built around hospitals, the chiropractors demanding a piece of the pie, consumer groups demanding greater control in health care.

The cynic calls it hot air. The press now ignores all but the most outspoken and controversial of witnesses.

Repetitious? Yes.

But ladies and gentlemen, all this rhetoric is part of the painful process this nation must go through when it anticipates a major social change.

And today, boring or not, this country's leaders in and out of government are rethinking our nation's commitment to health as a basic requirement, a right if you will, of a vigorous and productive people.

I was pleased to note that your association has been going through this same exercise, and last year put forth a strong statement on health care priorities. What you did is all the more significant because of your position in the system. What you do is dependent upon the orders of a physician. Your control over the system in which you work is, therefore, once removed.

Yet you declared that "Health care is second in priority only to an environment that contributes positively to human health."

You called for changes in our health care priorities which if adopted "would promote the right of all persons to have equal access to, and equal availability of, high quality health care services."

You said that "the health care system should be accountable to the public and should include effective mechanisms for peer review, multidisciplinary review, and consumer participation in policy and audit of the system."

You called for training of more health personnel, for the expansion of health screening, the preventive, and early care services.

You advocated financing health care through both public and private funding mechanisms.

Then last fall you came to our committee with a proposed approach to national health insurance which embodied these concepts. In it, you proposed a consumer-controlled national health care commission to oversee the plan through similar commissions at the state level.

You recommended that the costs of edu-



cating new health professionals be kept separate from the costs of providing care, you and I agree that the cost of health education must be borne by all of society and not just the ill and disabled who can least afford it.

You called for three levels of health care. Preventive services to be paid for by government, episodic health services to be paid for under existing employer-employee plans with government paying for low income persons, and health catastrophe services paid for by government.

Your position is statesmanlike and realistic. It set high goals, but attainable goals. Most important you propose a structure for a house of health where all can live, not just catastrophic cases, or partial coverage or patchwork plans for some.

It is only when an organization such as yours is willing to put aside its own professional traditions and venture out into the area of national policy debate, that we will ever be able to solve the problems confronting our society in health and in many other areas. By so doing, you will be numbered among the problem solvers, rather than part of a problem to be solved by Congress. It is the public, the consumer, who is demanding change, not just the Congress. The public is tired of calling doctor after doctor before finding one who will accept new patients.

It is tired of paying more than \$100 a day for impersonal hospital care. Those less fortunate are fed up from waiting hour after hour on hard wooden benches in public hospital outpatient clinics for "free medical" and often losing a day's pay in the process.

The public is sick of paying expensive health insurance premiums only to find their benefits do not cover catastrophic medical bills. And I submit, the public will no longer accept tokenism from health providers more interested in protecting their own economic self-interest than in helping bring about constructive change on behalf of the patients they serve.

The public has decided. It has decided that access to health care is a right of all.

The Congress will provide a national health insurance plan. Only the administration can make it work. Unfortunately, the present structure of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has already charged two strikes against the success of a national health plan. The department today does not have the wherewithal to tie together the Federal effort in financing health care and changing its delivery that national health insurance will require.

Without a Department of Health and a chief health spokesman who can tie these two now disparate elements together and represent health before the Congress, the White House and the American people without compromising those needs with the demands of education and welfare, a national health insurance plan, no matter how well thought out will be less than successful.

Rep. Paul Rogers, Chairman of the Public Health and Environment Subcommittee in the House, has introduced a Department of Health bill and I have joined him. It is being co-sponsored by Senators Kennedy and Ribicoff in the Senate. Next year it should receive the highest priority among those members of the Congress concerned with health. I shall give it my strongest support.

The Ways and Means Committee hearings last fall convinced us that it will take days, weeks and months of concentration to arrive at what will be at best a compromise national health insurance bill—one that will pick up elements from many of the proposals before our committee.

If it won't be perfect, it will be sound.

We all hope that it will represent the best thinking of the Congress, and the consumer and health professional groups who work on it.

It will be a plan which cannot be graven in stone but will more than likely have to be

encased in a looseleaf notebook. It will be a first-generation health plan that, like a computer, will be subject to continuous redesign as expanding technology and changing social policy dictate.

Today I don't want to bore you with a tedious account of the major bills before the committee. Their names and sources really don't mean much at this stage. Rather, I would like to take the time I have remaining to go over some of the major elements which I believe will be in the health plan we develop.

First, as to the financing, I don't believe we will go as far as the Health Security Act proposes and recommend a public takeover of health care financing.

Our nation has had some sad experiences when the public sector has tried to go it alone in such areas as housing and the environment. After this week's hearings on debt and deficit the fact is plain, we cannot afford it this year.

Going the public route we immediately lose the financial support of the private sector, and then we run out of dollars—fast. So I believe we must maintain some plurality in national health insurance financing, and beware of putting all the bucks in one bureaucratic basket.

I believe it is possible for society to guarantee to its members that costs will not be a barrier to care, without having to nationalize the financing mechanisms. It will be possible, also, in my opinion, to build in standards of control to ensure that these dollars—although they remain in private channels—do not pay for unnecessary or low quality services.

The Government would provide financing only for special groups who cannot compete for health insurance on the outside, or who do not have the resources to pay for it.

As to how comprehensive the benefits will be, or the extent to which deductibles and co-insurance will be utilized, we just don't know. Certainly, the plan would cover hospitalizations, physician services, skilled nursing home care, home health care, outpatient drugs, and perhaps preventive services such as physical examinations.

But these certainly are not the limits of health care. No one escapes dental problems. Mental ailments are affecting more and more of our citizens, and thanks to the development of new drugs and the existence of community mental health centers, we are able to help more and more of them.

I can assure you that I will make every effort in the Ways and Means Committee to see that dental and mental health care get some coverage. How much I cannot say at this point. Certainly in this first bill we are not going to be able to cover everything. But I am going to make it my business to see that we at least make a start.

Now, to look at the major elements of the plan.

First, we will likely see a new program of health care for the poor to replace the ailing medicaid program. Such a plan would offer uniform benefits across the country, which would be at least as comprehensive as those available to persons in middle income groups.

For the main bulk of the working population, the plan would probably set forth a basic set of health benefits which every employer must provide his employees.

This differs from the Nixon administration plan which would only require that employers offer the plan to their employees.

Several of us believe that we may have to take extra steps to provide coverage to the self-employed and perhaps to employees of small businesses since these persons may not be able to afford the full cost of health insurance as the larger employers can. How to do this we just don't know.

For people who are between jobs, Mr. Mills has suggested we borrow on the unemployment compensation approach, so that health insurance would not lapse.

Again this presents problems of administration which we have not yet resolved.

All these groups—the poor, the employed, the self-employed, and the employees of small businesses—need coverage of catastrophic health care costs. And catastrophic costs will be covered in a national health insurance plan. Whether they will be borne through Federal funds for all, through employer-employee premiums as will be the case for regular insurance, we have not agreed.

One thing we are certain of is that passing a catastrophic health insurance plan by itself, as has been proposed in the Senate as part of the social security amendments, would be a mistake. Yes, it would pay some big health care bills. But it would further fractionate our already disjointed health insurance system.

I don't believe the social security amendments now pending should become the vehicle for a patchwork national health insurance plan. But they can fill in some glaring inequities in health coverage.

First, as the House voted, the amendments would make disabled persons eligible for medicare benefits. This is an important group to reach because their health costs are higher than the average for persons under 65, and even if they can afford it, they often have trouble securing outside health coverage.

A second change in the social security amendments which should be of great satisfaction to physical therapists is the change in the extended care facility benefit which the Senate Finance Committee has tentatively adopted. It is aimed at solving one of the problems many of you face every day—the dilemma of the elderly person in an ECF who needs rehabilitation services, but who does not require daily skilled nursing care. Under present medicare regulations, his ECF bill won't be covered. The Senate Finance Committee has changed that so he will be covered if he needs daily skilled nursing care and/or rehabilitation services, which are not available on an outpatient basis. This is one amendment which I believe the House should accept if the bill ever gets through the Senate this year.

Although the social security amendments contain some regulatory features, no one can say at this point how far national health insurance can, or should go toward influencing the quality of care and the manner in which it is delivered. Most certainly, the plan will offer a dual choice to the consumer. That is he can if he wishes, elect to receive his health care on a prepaid basis from health maintenance organizations. These are essentially pre-paid group medical practices like the Kaiser permanente plan of California, Oregon and Hawaii, although the HMO concept is flexible enough to allow medical foundations to qualify as HMO's right now, other committees in the Congress are wrestling with the definition of an HMO, and the services it must offer in order to qualify for Federal development funds. Suffice it to say that HMO's over the next several years will develop more fully as an alternative source of health care for many millions of people.

But when we start Federal funding of HMO's we can't avoid the responsibility of setting reasonable standards for their operation. And now is the time to begin—at the beginning of the movement—rather than later when too many habits and customs have crept into the field.

With new systems of health care such as HMO's coming on the scene, other problems are going to arise. Take licensure laws. Already, pressure is building to relax state licensure laws and allow hospitals and other health care facilities of proven quality to use health workers with greater flexibility.

Thus we are confronted with sticky questions of whether or not to go to Federal licensure of health professions, allowing flexibility for such things as professional qualification through proficiency testing.

I personally tend toward relying on the states to handle licensure and licensure problems, since they are clearly proximate to local situations. But at the same time, we don't want to open the door too wide and allow wrongs to creep in. I need not to tell you the degree of pressure at all levels of government that chiropractors and other groups are exerting in an effort to gain entrance to Federal health care programs.

No, we don't want to put strictures around the professional, but at the same time we must and we will be more specific about what constitutes good patient care.

Another element of federal control centers on the costs of care. You know the figures as well as I do—hospital costs rising at better than 14 percent a year, physician services running between seven and eight percent. Certainly, costs have to be contained.

I believe that better planning and regulation on a local level to avoid duplication of facilities and services is part of the answer.

I believe that adequate professional peer review of the utilization of health facilities such as hospitals is part of the answer. But let me insert here, that I do not believe that physicians should be the sole judge. When the service being evaluated involves physical therapy, then therapists must be part of the review team.

Finally, I believe that the existence of a national health plan emphasizing outpatient care rather than hospitalization, one that stresses prevention and rehabilitation rather than paying for acute episodic illness, will in the long run go far toward containing rising health care costs.

Now there is one area of control over which the Federal Government must tread lightly if at all. And that is saying how much a health professional is entitled to be compensated for his services.

I understand that your association has been waging a small scale war with the Social Security Administration over a plan to change the way medicare pays for therapy services rendered by a self-employed therapist. As I understand it, the medicare people want to count as a reasonable charge, no more than what a salaried therapist in the same locale is paid for an hour of his or her time.

Certainly I am not in favor of allowing health professionals to charge all the traffic will bear. They must show restraint by not taking advantage of their right to operate on a fee for service basis. But by the same token, this Federal dickering around with the basic economic framework of a profession, be it physical therapy or any other, is a dangerous precedent for any bureaucracy to set—that is, if we are going to maintain some element of free enterprise in our health care system.

The basic issue here is that such a method of reimbursement does not relate income to effort, earnings to productivity. It ignores the fact that self-employment is the type of working environment in which the therapists involved have chosen to practice.

To my way of thinking, the best way to get people to work is to reward them for that work. We simply can't have one bureaucrat sitting in Washington—or Baltimore in this case—telling people out in the 50 States what he thinks their services are worth.

In a day in which demand for health care is outstripping the supply we must be very careful not to do anything which will compromise productivity. But if we are going to do it for one, we should do it for all. And if that is the case, then let us start with the physical.

By now, I hope you have some idea of the enormous problems which the Congress must attempt to solve before it can report out a realistic national health insurance system, one that can be acceptable to providers as well as meet the public demand for adequate health care.

The one fact that makes creation of a system of health insurance for all different from designing a major defense weapons system, is that we are dealing with people here and not simply mechanisms.

People have their own viewpoints, their own perspective on what needs to be done and how to do it. They have beliefs, traditions, lifestyles, all of which cannot be uprooted by a piece of legislation ramrodded through Congress—at least not in this country.

Therefore, the days ahead are going to be difficult ones as we try to work out these problems together. The Congress is involved because the public is demanding it. But we're laymen, we know even less about packaging and delivering and paying for health care than you do.

During the coming months we will be turning to the experts for help and advice. You have served us well in this regard in the past. Your statement on health care priorities indicate your willingness to work with us in the future.

And so I ask you, plead with you, after you return home, as you mix with your colleagues and other health professionals in your communities—be innovative, progressive, willing not only to accept change but willing to influence it.

I hope I have convinced you that there will be a change in the way health care is delivered and paid for. And these changes will be coming soon, within a year or so. As a legislator I believe we have reached the stage of debate where the Congress can come to grips with the issues sufficiently to develop a health plan.

And I believe that the upcoming 93rd Congress—the one which will lay the groundwork for the birthday of our Nation—will also be the Congress to forge the Nation's first comprehensive national health plan guaranteeing life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness through health.

What a unique birthday present that will be—born through work and sacrifice of many Americans for all America.

#### SENIOR CITIZENS

### HON. RICHARD G. SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, as a result of the sweat and toil of prior generations, this country has enjoyed unequalled progress. We owe to our senior citizens an assurance of a continued life of dignity and should utilize their ever offered experience and abilities.

Support and enactment of legislation as listed here should be our continued goal:

#### SENIOR CITIZENS

H.R. 1 Ties Social Security benefits to cost-of-living increases.

H.R. 5861 Provides a full exemption for those 65 and older from Social Security payments.

H.R. 12308 Establishes a National Institute on Aging.

H.R. 12325 Provides homemaking and consumer education assistance for the elderly.

H.R. 13128 Updates pensions for World War I veterans and widows.

H.R. 14977 Provides for voluntary employment programs for older persons.

H. Res. 124 Establishes a Select Committee on the Aging to study problems and needs of the elderly.

S. 1163 Provides increases in the field of nutrition, education, and low-cost meals for the aged.

#### FEDERAL HELP FOR CITIZENS' GROUPS

### HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 4, 1972

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, incidents of crime have increasingly marred the daily lives of all Americans. Effective measures to forestall the rate of crime must be given the fullest attention of Congress. One successful method has been the formation of citizen groups to patrol their own communities.

I have recently received a petition from New York City residents supporting H.R. 12262, the Citizen Anticrime Patrol Assistance Act which I originated and have introduced in the House. This legislation would provide Federal assistance to citizens' self-help organizations for their efforts to curb crime and restore peace to neighborhoods. Such assistance could be used for the formation of crime watch patrols and the coordination of escort services to help residents reach their homes safely. The assistance under this bill is not intended to fight crime through the use of guns and strong-arm methods. Instead, it would deter the occurrences of crime by the interested presence of organized residents. I have previously provided a detailed description of the purposes and provisions of the Citizen Anticrime Patrol Assistance Act on December 13, 1972 at pages H12391-12392 of the RECORD.

I am particularly pleased to submit for the RECORD the following petition signed by 65 residents of the 23d Congressional District which I have the honor to represent as an indication of popular support for legislation of this kind.

The petition follows:

Bronx, N.Y., March 7, 1972.

MR. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,  
Congressman 23d District,  
Bronx, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: We the citizens of the Bronx and other Boroughs heartily endorse your proposal to enact legislation to obtain "Federal Funds" to finance a "safe street" program whereby, citizens could have street protection and escort services in hallways and stairs. Especially senior citizens who are afraid to go out evenings to churches etc., and especially in high crime areas we are, also opposed to funds being used for guns or any form of weapons or transportation.

Please accept the following signatures to back-up our sentiments:

SIGNED BY 65 NEW YORK RESIDENTS.

Rev. S. A. Allen, Carolyn Allen, Geneva Walker, Rosetta Grover, V. M. Fred Albritton, David Tuckey, Jesse Tuckey, Dorothy Gray, Katie Williams, William Kitt.

Venus Price, Wayne Neals, Paul Neal, Mrs. Charlie Mae Luckey, Mrs. Audrey Williams, Annie Slate, Edith Wingate, Ethelise Williams, Mrs. Kupert F. Bowman, Samuel Scott, Mrs. Louise Kitt, Chirle Hassel, Katie Williams, Barbara Slate, Lillie Greene, Donald Smith, Wally Slater, Laurene Gruleb, Jasper Williams, Essie Bowman.

Mrs. Brenda Funnye, Mr. Buster Lee Funnye, Mr. and Mrs. S. Sussman, Sonnie Wisie, Mrs. F. Glastern, Julius Glastern, M. K. Kroniss, Hyacinth A. Davis, M.D., Carmen Ortiz, William Smith.

Carrie Bradley, R. Hedman, A. W. Madden, C. Lipschitz, Joanne Goluck, Ana Rodriguez,



S. Golafede, S. Bernstein, J. Finan, Mrs. Cera Northern,

Barnet Shafron, Julie Kaplan, M. Sylotte, Josephine Sylotte, Brenda Robinson, Juan Rivera, Millie Santos, Goofy Velez, A. Arfin, V. Brathwaite,

R. Arum, Chris Fargo, Juan Ruiz, Ruben Stewart, Seymour Clark, Mr. Morris, Luis Magdanela, J. Toben, M. Schneider,

John Argot, W. Glazer, A. Homstein, B. Glazer, Henri and Gladys Vilarie, John Henry Snow, Tassas Deelhos, W. Samborg.

#### FDA BAN OF DES TARDY AND INADEQUATE

### HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday the Food and Drug Administration announced that it has taken action to ban the use of diethylstilbestrol—DES—as a growth stimulant in animal feeds. In explaining the basis for this action, FDA Commissioner Charles C. Edwards said that new scientific data developed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture—USDA casts serious doubt on FDA's ability to set rules for the use of DES in animal feed that will assure against residues remaining in animal livers. Thus, the United States has now taken steps to join 21 other countries in banning the use of this cancer-promoting drug in the production of meat.

I am pleased that FDA has finally faced up to its responsibility for enforcing the law, but this action is long overdue. It was required many months ago when it became clearly evident that the use of DES in livestock feeding could not be controlled.

Although FDA has finally halted the manufacture of DES for feeding purposes, I find it indefensible that Commissioner Edwards is permitting the continued shipment and use of feed mixes containing DES until January 1, 1973. If the law requires FDA "to discontinue approval for use of the chemical in animal feed," as Commissioner Edwards stated in his news release, I do not know the source of his legal authority for sanctioning the continued interstate shipment of DES mixes. Both the wisdom and the legality of permitting a 5-month phaseout period for a product which can no longer be legally manufactured must be seriously questioned. There is no justification, in my opinion, for exposing the public another 5 months to a drug which is known to be a potent cancer-promoting substance and which FDA now acknowledges cannot be kept out of the liver we eat.

The Commissioner's statement that DES has been used in the feed of cattle and sheep for nearly two decades "without a single known instance of human harm" is not very reassuring. As the Commissioner surely knows, it is virtually impossible to prove in this time period that small amounts of any carcinogen, no matter how potent, have harmed humans, because cancers in man may not become apparent until decades after the

exposure has taken place. Moreover, there is no available scientific method for demonstrating that a very widely used carcinogen, such as DES in livestock feed, is or is not the causative agent for any form of cancer which develops in man.

What we do know is that DES, which has long been known to cause cancer in numerous species of experimental animals, was associated for the first time last year with human cancer. Medical scientists found that a very rare type of vaginal cancer had developed in a large number of young women whose mothers had been given DES during pregnancy to prevent miscarriage. Fortunately, the popularity of this medical treatment waned by the late 1950's, and it has been used by physicians much less frequently in recent years.

It is important to point out that leading experts in the causation of cancer agree that exposure to low levels of any carcinogen should not be permitted if the carcinogen is avoidable, since no one can say how much of a carcinogen or how long an exposure to it will produce cancer.

Until we know why more of us each year are falling prey to this dread disease, I believe we must do everything in our power to eliminate controllable carcinogens from our food supply and from the environment generally. This is the position taken by an ad hoc committee on environmental carcinogens which reported to the Surgeon General in 1970. This same position has been endorsed by officials of the National Cancer Institute and the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences and by other qualified experts whom I have questioned. Only FDA seems to be out of step in this matter.

In his news release announcing the DES ban, the FDA Commissioner stressed that the new scientific evidence just developed by the Department of Agriculture shows DES is not entirely eliminated from cattle within the 7-day withdrawal period required by FDA's tighter controls which became effective late last year. Prior to that time, FDA required only a 48-hour withdrawal period.

FDA officials have repeatedly assured the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, which I chair, of the adequacy of the 48-hour and the 7-day withdrawal periods. Now we are told there is new evidence which contradicts the data upon which FDA has relied. The subcommittee hearing record, however, reveals that FDA has never had acceptable scientific evidence establishing the adequacy of either the 48-hour or the 7-day withdrawal period for preventing DES residues. It is significant, I think, that three scientists in FDA's Bureau of Foods and a well known biometrician of the National Cancer Institute have held that the study which FDA relied upon in approving these withdrawal periods does not support the conclusion that DES is completely eliminated from cattle in 7 days.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to follow closely the effect of the Commission's decision to exempt DES implants from the ban. The Commissioner stated that:

USDA has never detected a residue when implants were used as the sole source of DES.

This statement is not only misleading but untrue.

The subcommittee hearing record of March 18, 1971, shows that in June 1970 a USDA inspector assigned to a slaughter house observed an ear implant in one animal and, because of this observation, sampled its liver. The very high amount of 60 parts per billion of DES was found in this sample. The documents relating to this incident establish that the withdrawal directions for the implant had been followed. DES residues have also been found in at least one other instance where implants have been used. Furthermore, I have been informed by USDA that implants are not included in the Department's regular sampling program for DES residues. It is not at all surprising, therefore, that residues are not being detected when USDA is not looking for them. How many residues will be found when USDA institutes a sampling program for the meat from animals receiving DES implants remains to be seen. It is my intention to ask the Secretary of Agriculture to establish such a sampling program as quickly as possible.

#### A FRESH LOOK AT RADIO LIBERTY AND RADIO FREE EUROPE

### HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I voted today to approve the interim extension of financing for Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe. I did this with some serious reservations about the wisdom of continued official American support for these stations which broadcast to the Soviet Union and to the other eastern European countries, respectively.

This reservation stems from the earlier clandestine American involvement in supporting these broadcasts, through the Central Intelligence Agency. With the exposure of that support, which was done without congressional authorization, must come a new status for these stations. Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe should either continue to receive official American support under appropriate fiscal and policy controls—in which case they probably should be incorporated into Voice of America programming—or they should be fully independent of official support and control. Giving public support without public controls is wrong; duplicating Voice of America broadcasting through Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty is wasteful; and trying to maintain the fiction that we can officially fund private attacks on other governments while trying to improve relations with those governments is foolish.

I support this interim program with the understanding that the study of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty which we authorize with that support will yield a prompt solution to the present anomalous status of these stations.

# MOST FAVOR SUBURBAN LOW-INCOME HOUSING

## HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, the respected "Minnesota Poll," as reported in the Minneapolis Star of Tuesday, August 1, has queried Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area residents about the desirability of building low-income housing in the suburbs.

The results are interesting and probably different from what most people would expect. Suburban residents thought that low-income housing should be built in the suburbs, and a majority of those suburban residents thought it would be good to have low-income housing in their own communities. The Minneapolis Star article follows:

### MOST FAVOR SUBURBAN LOW-INCOME HOUSING

Three of four metropolitan area residents questioned by The Star's Metro-Poll say Twin Cities area suburbs should do more to meet local needs for low-income housing.

More than half the people polled—both city dwellers and suburbanites—would approve of having more low-income housing in their own communities.

Two of three say there is a definite need for more low-income public housing for the poor and the elderly.

While most subsidized housing for the poor and elderly is now concentrated in Minneapolis and St. Paul, the suburban residents surveyed are only slightly less inclined than are the city residents to think the suburbs have an obligation to provide a greater share of such housing.

When Metro-Poll asked two years ago about the suburbs' role in providing low-income housing, the results were similar.

In the interim, the Metropolitan Council, which reviews municipal applications for federal funds, has given higher priority to fund requests from suburbs which demonstrate support of low and moderate income housing in their own communities.

While some local officials have objected to that policy, Metro-Poll's findings suggest most residents are not opposed to suburban low-income housing in principle.

General endorsement of the principle is not without qualifications:

"Some of the stuff they put up under the guise of low-income housing is too expensive and of too poor quality," commented a 27-year-old Richfield woman.

Another Richfield resident favored low-income housing in his community but felt "the voters in each suburb should have a referendum."

Several who see the need for more such housing added that they don't want more high-rises. Others pointed to the need for better mass transit if the suburbs are to help fill the low-income housing gap.

Six hundred voting-age residents, representing a balanced cross section of the 5-county metropolitan area population, gave their opinions on this subject last June.

In answer to the introductory question, 69 percent said they considered it "desirable to have families with a variety of income levels living in the same community" while 26 percent felt it is "better for a community to have mainly one income level." The remainder were undecided.

Again, 69 percent said "there is a need for more low-income public housing for the poor and elderly in the Twin Cities area."

The next question:

"Most subsidized low-income housing in the Twin Cities area is in Minneapolis and St. Paul. Do you think Twin Cities suburbs should or should not build low-income housing?"

[In percent]

	Should	Should not	No or other views
All respondents.....	75	19	6
Minneapolis.....	82	14	4
St. Paul.....	78	15	7
Hennepin suburbs.....	65	27	8
Other suburbs.....	75	22	3
All respondents (June 1970)...	73	20	7

"Do you think it would or would not be good to have more low-income housing in your community?"

[In percent]

	Should	Should not	No or other views
All respondents.....	56	39	5
Minneapolis.....	57	36	7
St. Paul.....	59	37	4
Hennepin suburbs.....	56	39	5
Other suburbs.....	52	43	5
All respondents (June 1970)...	60	33	7

On all of the questions asked, respondents with an annual family income of less than \$5,000 were the most in favor of more low cost housing.

## EDITORIAL ON TAX REFORM

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Calumet Index, which is well known for its sharp editorial commentaries, carried a very logical editorial commentary on the subject of tax reform. The article certainly speaks for itself, and I insert it into the Record at this point:

#### THE BURDEN OF PROOF

Advocates of "tax reform" apparently work from the assumption that most taxpayers enjoy special privileges afforded by "tax loopholes". Their idea of tax reform is to place the burden of proof on the taxpayer to show that he is not escaping his share of taxes. Such seems to be the theory behind the tax review-tax reform bill now in Congress which would repeal over a three-year period some 54 provisions of the tax code—including such provisions as percentage depletion, deductibility of taxes paid to state and local government, the capital gains tax and investment credit. Reportedly, key Congressmen oppose this sweeping so-called "reform". One Congressman has called it "preposterous".

The principle of putting the taxpayer on the defensive as proposed in the tax review-tax reform bill was pointedly criticized by one observer who suggested that, "Instead of having all exemptions expire, why not have all taxes expire in a 3-year schedule? And then add back only those that are needed and absolutely justified. That would put the burden of proof where it belongs instead of on the poor overburdened taxpayer..." Much is made of the fact that the U.S. system works because taxpayers "voluntarily" support it. The moment that lawmakers begin treating

U.S. citizens as tax escape artists, the confidence of taxpayers in the system will begin to wane. The burden of proof is now on Congress to show that political expediency is playing no part in "tax reform".

## PROFESSOR AT ROSWELL PARK TO RECEIVE POLISH HONORS

### HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, Roswell Park Memorial Institute is the oldest and one of the largest cancer institutes in the United States. It has achieved an outstanding reputation in its field, both nationally and internationally.

What makes an institute tick is its staff, and down through the years Roswell Park has been fortunate in having a highly talented and dedicated staff, now headed by Dr. Gerald P. Murphy.

A key professional at Roswell Park is Dr. Michael Laskowski, head of the department of enzymology. Recipient of a life professorship from the American Cancer Society, Dr. Laskowski had been at Roswell Park since 1966.

In recognition of his outstanding research work, Dr. Laskowski has been invited to participate in the 50th anniversary of the Polish Zootechnical Society September 19-23 as the guest of the Polish Academy of Sciences.

At the request of the Polish Academy, which will award him honorary membership, Dr. Laskowski will give a lecture on the subject "Trypsin inhibitors with colostrum of swine and cattle."

In connection with the meeting, the Polish Biochemical Society of Poznan, Poland, also will bestow an honorary membership on Dr. Laskowski.

Last spring, Dr. Laskowski was selected for honors by the Kuratorium, E. K. Frey Prize, in Munich, Germany. He was chosen for his particular scientific merits in the field of enzyme-inhibitor research.

Before coming to Roswell Park, Dr. Laskowski had a professorship at Marquette University School of Medicine and was a Fulbright American exchange professor at the University of Paris.

Hearty congratulations are in order to Dr. Laskowski upon his new recognition for his research work. The Buffalo, N.Y., area, which I represent, is proud of the outstanding medical and scientific contributions of Roswell Park Memorial Institute and its staff, with special pride at this time in the work of Dr. Laskowski.

## MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

### HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"



Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,757 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

# LACK OF ENFORCEMENT OF PUBLIC LAW 91-540

HON. JOHN JARMAN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, as former chairman of the Public Health and Environment Subcommittee, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the following statements concerning the lack of enforcement by the Department of Agriculture of the provisions of Public Law 91-540. The law originated in this subcommittee when I was its chairman and I personally know the intent of Congress was that effective regulations be expeditiously issued and enforced by the Department of Agriculture.

The statements follow:

The American Horse Protection Association was founded expressly to stop the brutal training methods inflicted on the Tennessee Walking Horse in exhibition. Although our Association's work has expanded widely to combat other abuses of horses, our battle continues to protect these gentle, beautiful animals from the constant torture and permanent crippling they suffer at the hands of callous, unscrupulous owners and trainers. The A.H.P.A. led the struggle to pass Public Law 91-540, which was signed into law December 9, 1970 and makes illegal the showing of a sored horse in interstate commerce. The final rules and regulations to administer this law were not published by the Department of Agriculture until February 1, 1972, just 65 hours after NBC-TV's "Chronolog" exposed the sub-human cruelties of the sore horse industry. Nevertheless, we were naive enough to believe that if a strong effective law were passed, it automatically would be enforced, thus eliminating a despicable practice, and prosecution of proven offenders, no matter how wealthy they might be, would naturally follow.

With the current walking horse season more than half over, the rules and regulations have not been strictly enforced and to date, *there has not been one case prosecuted!* But there is no dearth of sore walking horses in the show ring.

Public Law 91-540 specifically states: Sec. 2(a) A horse shall be considered to be sored if, for the purpose of affecting its gait—

(1) a blistering agent has been applied after the date of enactment of this Act internally or externally to any of the legs, ankles, feet, or other parts of the horse;

(2) burns, cuts, or lacerations have been inflicted after the date of enactment of this Act on the horse;

(3) a chemical agent, or tacks or nails have been used after the date of enactment of this Act on the horse; or

(4) any other cruel or inhumane method or device has been used after the date of enactment of this Act on the horse, including, but not limited to, chains or boots.

We do not interpret this, the will of Congress, to mean that the Department of Agriculture is required to excuse, protect or preserve this "billion dollar industry", which apparently cannot survive without the use of every torturous method of pain-training

the human mind can invent. Instead, it is our understanding that the law clearly intends to eliminate the sored horse in exhibition and to give honest and humane owners and trainers a fair chance to compete in the show ring.

For the last several months, our Association has been bombarded with letters and telephone calls from disgruntled, disappointed and often infuriated people, many of whom are trainers, owners and experienced horsemen, who have demanded to know why there appears to be not only more sored horses in the show ring, but more badly sored horses, now that the law is finally in effect. In each case, we have referred these inquiries to the Department of Agriculture, then we set out to see for ourselves how well indeed the law was functioning.

We chose the "world's largest mid-season horse show", otherwise known as the 21st Annual National Tennessee Walking Horse Spring Jubilee, Inc., held in Columbia, Tennessee, June 1, 2, 3, 1972. Representatives of both the American Horse Protection Association, the Humane Society of the United States and Deborah Smith, D.V.M. were present throughout the three night show which included 32 classes and approximately 600 horses from various states. In our opinion, it was one of the most gruesome sights we have ever witnessed. Outside of the annual so-called "Celebration", held in Shelbyville, Tennessee, we have never seen a larger collection of more cruelly sored horses. Almost all of the well-known owners and trainers in the industry were there to compete, and true to form, not the best, but in our opinion, the sorest horses won the ribbons every night. U.S. Department of Agriculture veterinarians were in attendance, but they inspected only a few of the winning horses in each class. Only one rider, No. 500, was excused from the ring, because his horse was said to have "an unnatural gait", squatting very low on the rear legs. The rider was forced to leave the ring, not by U.S.D.A. inspectors but by the show veterinarian. The exhibitor claimed that the mare had been examined and "passed" by a U.S.D.A. inspector at three previous shows this season, and attributed the horse's squatting "way of going" to the severe beating with a whip he had given her that morning.

Although both A.H.P.A. and H.S.U.S. representatives were asked by a U.S.D.A. inspector to stay away from the U.S.D.A. inspection tent, one of the most notorious sore-horse trainers in the business had free and easy access to the inspection area throughout the show. On several occasions we watched riders or grooms of horses about to be inspected, wipe off the legs, including the pastern area, after sometimes exchanging the boots worn by the horses in the ring for others to be weighed by U.S.D.A. inspectors. We observed horses being sored with chemical agents in the warm-up ring, less than 100 feet from the inspection tent, and we saw others being ridden with chains. None of these horses were disqualified from the show ring. In one juvenile riders' class (14 years or under) we were appalled to see that all but one of the horses were, in our opinion, severely sored; the one "clean" horse's rider was excused from the ring for a minor infraction of the National Tennessee Walking Horse Commission rules, which do not include Federal rules and regulations.

On the second and third nights of this "Jubilee", Dr. Deborah Smith was allowed into the U.S.D.A. inspection tent as an observer. A part of her report states the following:

"Almost every horse showed clinical signs of having been sored . . . some horses could barely walk at all when they first entered the warm-up ring . . . We always picked the ribbon winners as these were the sorest . . .

The last class of the show (No. 32 for Five year old and over—Walking Stallions Jubilee Championship) was competition (among) the sorest horses in the show. The winner had blood running from lacerations of the horse's elbows." The winner was "Ebony's Black Market", ridden by Wink Grover and owned by Kerkeles and McIver, Nashville and Jackson, Tennessee.

After the "Jubilee" ended, various spectators "entertained" those remaining with an extra attraction, a bloody brawl, which was said to have started as a result of an argument over who had the better car, not the sorest horse. A drunken fist-fight seemed a fitting end to a disgusting spectacle where a large number of people had taken such obvious pleasure for three consecutive nights in watching and riding maimed and suffering animals, all in the name of "charity". There seems to be no limits to which a human being will not sink to pacify his sick desire for a blue ribbon and cheap silver.

Both A.H.P.A. and H.S.U.S. representatives have made vigorous protests to U.S.D.A. officials for their blatant lack of adequate enforcement of P.L. 91-540. We have since been advised that cases have been submitted for prosecution. The American Horse Protection Association looks forward to any evidence that the U.S. Department of Agriculture has initiated their promised legal action. We strongly believe that it is not only the intent of Congress, but the will of the American people that this law be enforced.

## AMERICAN HORSE PROTECTION

ASSOCIATION, INC.,

Great Falls, Va., July 18, 1972.

Dr. FRANCIS J. MULHERN,  
Administrator, Animal and Plant Health  
Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. MULHERN: Our Association is most appreciative of the time you and your staff shared with us to discuss our deep concern for the lack of enforcement of the Horse Protection Act. However, we came away from our recent meeting deeply frustrated and discouraged. It was apparent to us that the U.S. Department of Agriculture is both hesitant and uncertain of how to translate the strength of the law, P.L. 91-540, into effective action. This problem is further aggravated by a failure to devise any practical legal guidelines to force compliance. In our opinion, present U.S.D.A. inspection methods give tacit consent to soring.

By tacit consent we specify the following:

(1) To our knowledge only horse show veterinarians, not U.S.D.A. veterinarians, have ever used their influence and power to keep sored horses out of the show ring.

(2) U.S.D.A. veterinarians do not inform show committees that they are in potential violation of P.L. 91-540 when sored horses are permitted to be exhibited.

(3) The practice of inspecting only after the horses have been shown, and then only three horses in a class in which the majority are sored, is obviously absurd. The intent of the law is to stop the soring of all horses. The law clearly states that: "Any representative of the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make such inspections of any horses . . . as he deems necessary for the effective enforcement of this Act . . ." (See attached copy of a letter to Dr. Ongert from Admiral Ming reprinted in the "Walking Horse Report and Sunday Journal", dated June 28, 1972.)

(4) The facilities available to U.S.D.A. inspectors on show grounds are at the "grace and favor" of the show committee. As a result, they are often poorly lighted and there are no controls to prevent the exhibitor from changing boots or wiping off the pastern area in an attempt to destroy evidence of soring.

(5) It is clear that the walking horse industry is in no way intimidated by present methods of U.S.D.A. inspection, and it is equally clear that the honest owner or trainer has no hope of winning in the ring if he rides a non-sore or "clean" horse.

(6) It appears to us that the walking horse industry has enormous and undue influence, if not control, of present inspection methods. In brief, the sore horse industry thinks they are a joke.

We attach our statements describing what we observed at the Old Dominion Walking Horse Classic held in Chatham, Virginia, July 15, 1972. If the blatant soring of walking horses can not be stopped at a relatively small, one night horse show in Virginia, what can be expected at the so-called "Celebration" in Shelbyville, Tennessee. To promote any equitable enforcement at Shelbyville this year, we urge U.S.D.A. to replace all inspectors who live in the State of Tennessee with Federal veterinarians from other states.

The Horse Protection Act would be a strong, effective law, but only if it is strictly enforced. We believe that necessary enforcement can be achieved, but only by a realistic and vigorous legal interpretation of U.S.D.A.'s true power under the law.

Sincerely,

Mrs. PAUL M. TWYNE.

#### STATEMENT OF PEARL R. TWYNE

I, Pearl R. Twyne, President of the American Horse Protection Association, attended the First Annual Old Dominion Walking Horse Classic at Chatham, Virginia on Saturday, July 15, 1972.

I was shocked while watching the first class (Two Year Olds Walking Fillies) to see the sore action of these young animals. They all moved with the exaggerated "sore lick," i.e., crouching in the rear with excessive hock action. The second class followed the same pattern as the first.

After the third class, I went to the inspection tent to observe the method of Federal inspection of the horses. Three horses from each class were selected to be examined. In my opinion, each was a sore horse. To my knowledge, no action was taken by U.S.D.A. inspectors against the riders of these three horses. While a U.S.D.A. inspector was checking the first horse in the tent, I saw a second rider outside of the tent, out of view of U.S. inspectors, start to remove the boots. However, the show veterinarian nudged the rider and shook his head when the show veterinarian saw that I was watching.

I asked the U.S.D.A. veterinarians and Mr. Fritz Nolting, from the office of the U.S.D.A. General Counsel, if they intended to inspect the horses which had been excused from the ring for the purpose of initiating action under the Horse Protection Act. Dr. Lowry, a U.S.D.A. veterinarian, said that they were discussing this possibility, but they had not made a decision.

I witnessed the inspection of horse #152, "Devil's Delight", the winner of Class 11 (Open Walking Mares). This mare was examined by both Dr. Lowry and Mr. David Hume, U.S.D.A. investigator, of Warrenton, Virginia. The mare immediately flinched with pain when pressure was applied to its lower front legs. The owner was belligerent and denied that the mare was sore. Both Dr. Lowry and Mr. Hume were firm in stating that the mare was sore, and accompanied by Dr. Ongert, they went to the owner's trailer to discuss the mare's condition. I do not know the final disposition of this case.

I talked with Dr. Ongert and Mr. Nolting while watching walking horses come down a long path on their way into the ring. These horses were weaving back and forth, squatting deeply in the rear with extreme hock

action. I called Dr. Ongert's attention to the unnatural hock action of these horses. Dr. Ongert made no comment, and the horses were not examined for soreness unless they were prize winners. In my opinion, the exhibition of these sore horses was a clear violation of the intent of the Federal law.

I would like to make the following observations:

(1) The U.S.D.A. inspectors that I observed at Chatham, Virginia appeared to be carrying out their duties conscientiously, however, they do not seem to have any clear-cut legal guidelines to help them in the performance of their work. For instance, the show veterinarian, a "hall-fellow-well-met" with all exhibitors, did not, to my knowledge, disqualify any of the sore horses I observed in the ring. U.S.D.A. inspectors, who examined the same horses, did not, to my knowledge, encourage the show veterinarian or the show committee to disqualify any of the sore horses. Had they done so, the show would have to be closed, as the only Pleasure Walking Class appeared, in my opinion, to be sound.

(2) It would seem to me that the methods used in examining these show horses is not supporting the intent of the law. From what I observed at Chatham, and from information I have received from expert horsemen who have attended and shown horses at other walking horse shows affiliated with the National Tennessee Walking Horse Commission, all sore horses in exhibition are not examined by U.S.D.A., and no action is being taken against these exhibitors or show committees. As the law states, both the exhibitor and the show committees are held liable under PL 91-540.

(3) I feel strongly that the rules and regulations used to administer PL 91-540 are not being interpreted effectively to exercise the full power and authority vested in the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Excessive hock action is a clear indication of a sore horse, and is thus defined by the American Horse Shows Association. The show veterinarians of A.H.S.S. shows have successfully dismissed numerous sore horses from the show ring. The law clearly states "that horses which are sore compete unfairly with horses moved in commerce which are not sore."

#### STATEMENT OF JOAN R. BLUE

I, Joan R. Blue, Vice President of the American Horse Protection Association attended the First Annual Old Dominion Walking Horse Classic at Chatham, Virginia on Saturday, July 15, 1972. In my opinion, every horse that I observed in the show ring was sore to some degree. The winners of ribbons were inevitably the sorest horses in each class. To allow such a horse show to continue with a strong and effective Federal law in existence was, in my opinion, a complete abdication of Federal authority. As representatives of the Federal government, U.S.D.A. inspectors should have used all the power of their office to prohibit the flaunting of PL 91-540, which they are sworn to uphold and enforce. It is obvious to the public that U.S.D.A.'s good relations with the walking horse industry is of far more importance than the will of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn of the above allegations that the provisions of Public Law 91-540 are not being enforced. My intention, therefore, is to personally contact Congressman PAUL ROGERS, the present chairman of the Public Health and Environment Subcommittee, to discuss the possibility of holding oversight hearings on this matter. It is imperative that the provisions of this law be enforced.

#### THE CHILD DEVELOPERS

#### HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, a bill backed by women and children, preachers and teachers could not be all bad, right?

Well, it can. The bill in question is the child development, for the sake of euphemism now referred to as the Comprehensive Headstart, Child Development, and Family Assistance Act of 1972.

Family Assistance Act. The irony of that title strikes me. Many persons in the opinion-molding segments of our society believe that the American family is on the brink of disappearance, that its state of ill-health is so serious as to be perilous. I am not sure, however, that the family unit is going to disappear, because I firmly believe that that unit is synonymous with our strength and character as a civilized nation.

But, assuming for the moment that many American families are in a dangerous state of decay, it would seem to me that the best thing to do is let the family work out its own problems. Families are the private, personal affairs of their members; so, too, are children the private personal responsibility of the family. If the structure of the family is weak, it needs support—social reassurance and encouragement, reaffirmation of its importance.

The last thing the family needs to help it is the Federal Government interfering in its internal operation. That, if anything, would cause further dissipation of authority and discipline and further weaken the interpersonal loyalties. And the children of the country will only be hurt by having the Federal Government usurp the duties of their parents.

An editorial from the Dallas Times Herald of June 26, expresses my reservations lucidly. I submit the editorial for consideration by my colleagues. I would especially point out the editor's conclusion:

The Senate has blundered badly on this one. From the House, one hopes for better things.

From the House, I certainly hope for a rejection of the family-injuring Child Development Act. The editorial follows:

[From the Dallas Times Herald,  
June 26, 1972]

#### THE CHILD-DEVELOPERS

A bill backed by women and children, preachers and teachers couldn't be all bad, right?

Wrong, if the bill in question is the child development bill, still rearing its plug-ugly head in Congress despite a veto late last year by President Nixon.

True, the new bill, which glided through the Senate the other day, is cheaper than the vetoed bill (\$2.9 billion over three years vs. \$2 billion in one year). But the bill's basic objectives remain the same: To make the child, in Sen. Jacob Javits' phrase, "a care of the state."



That is why child development has drawn support from women's liberationists, child welfare advocates, liberal churchmen and educators, and so forth.

For the establishment of federal day care centers, which is one feature of the bill, some justification might conceivably be adduced. But not for the creation of vast and complex pre-school and pre-natal services, mostly aimed at the children of low-income parents. Such children (so the theory goes) get poor goals, instruction, and motivation in their homes. Ergo, the state must take a hand in the rearing process through having the children carted in daily to "child development centers," where "day care" is only a sideline.

Is there any intellectual basis for such a view? Not really. As Prof. Ernest van den Haag, the distinguished New York State University psychoanalyst, has pointed out, "The assumption that social science has as yet produced a tested theory of child rearing is sheer fantasy. Only a few variables have been detected. And they suggest that family care should be encouraged, not replaced."

In truth, child development's only achievement is likely to be the breaking down of family relationships and the fostering of psychological problems among parents and children alike. Nor is that to say anything about attendant damage to the family as a social and moral institution.

The Senate has blundered badly on this one. From the House, one hopes for better things.

#### IVORY COAST: 12TH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE

### HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, the Republic of Ivory Coast celebrates its 12th anniversary of independence on August 7. It gives me great pleasure to extend to President Felix Houphouet-Boigny and to the citizens of Ivory Coast best wishes for the future.

Ivory Coast has entered its second decade of independence on a record of consistent economic progress and political stability. Its economic growth is one of the most encouraging examples in the developing world today. Since 1960 the Ivory Coast gross domestic product has been growing at more than 11 percent annually. Per capita income has more than doubled since independence. With this phenomenal growth have come increasing opportunities for American business. The United States is now the second most important supplier to Ivory Coast of foreign goods, its second most important customer, and we are the second most important foreign investor.

Our bilateral relations with the Ivory Coast are excellent. Ivory Coast has shown itself to be a consistent friend of the West and an influential spokesman for reason in international affairs. Our good bilateral relations are based on friendship, mutual respect, cooperation and good will. It is in this spirit that we wish to congratulate President Houphouet-Boigny and the people of the Ivory Coast today.

#### INDEPENDENCE DAY—HOW IT HAPPENED

### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, for many Americans Independence Day is a day for picnics, fireworks, sports or even bargain shopping. It is, therefore, of great importance that we be reminded from time to time of the true significance of the Fourth of July in our history.

Mr. Jim McCarthy, head of the Washington Bureau of CBS-Radio, New York, did just that in his recent July 4 broadcast, entitled "Independence Day—How It Happened." It gives me great pleasure to include the text of Mr. McCarthy's broadcast in the RECORD:

#### INDEPENDENCE DAY—HOW IT HAPPENED

You know, it's interesting to note how few people really know why we celebrate the 4th of July as Independence Day . . . in fact, I've had people tell me they think it has something to do with The Flag—while others believed it has something to do with the starting or the winning of the Revolutionary War. Both are wrong . . . and, as most people know, this National holiday commemorates the formal adoption of the Declaration of Independence, not the beginning or ending of the war for Freedom.

Actually, on July 4th, 1776—the Revolution against Great Britain, which was to win freedom and democracy for Americans, was over a year old. The action that took place in Independence Hall in Philadelphia on that date was merely the formal adoption of a Sense of a Resolution for Independence that had been approved by the Continental Congress two days before. And this is how it happened: On the preceding June 7th, Richard Henry Lee, the delegate from Virginia, had moved in the Continental Congress that "the United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent states" . . . and, after lengthy debate, all action on his proposal was postponed until July 1st—so delegations could get instructions from their respective 13 Colonies on how they should vote on the Lee resolution. The voting actually began on July 1st . . . and was concluded on July the 2nd, which moved John Adams to write his wife Abigail that July 2nd ought to be "commemorated as the Day of Deliverance", and all the delegates involved finally signed the formal Declaration of Independence two days later—July 4th, 1776. The delay in voting for Independence shows how slowly and reluctantly the colonists came about to accepting the idea of freedom from British rule. In fact, the noted British historian—William Lecky—called the American Revolution "the work of an energetic minority" . . . and, as recounted by historians Charles and Mary Beard—"even after the war had been going on for a year, an advocate of Independence was regarded as a dangerous person—and likely to be greeted with angry glances in the streets of Philadelphia".

But, eventually, the Declaration of Independence was signed . . . and one must reflect on the courage of the 56 delegates from the 13 original Colonies who affixed their signatures to it, for, by their action, which was considered a treasonable act by the British, they stood to lose their liberty, their families, their personal possessions, and very likely their lives . . . which all had pledged to each other and to the new born nation in the Declaration of Independence on the 4th of July 1776. From that day on . . . the Flag,

Old Glory, has played a major role on Independence Day . . . from the original colonists who, against British decree, bravely raised a 13 star banner above their homes and businesses, to Americans today, who proudly unfurl a 50 star flag over their homes and businesses all across the United States. The meaning of the Stars and Stripes has been stated in many ways over the years . . . but probably never more memorably than by President Woodrow Wilson, who said "The lines of Red are lines of blood, nobly and unselfishly shed by men who loved the liberty of their fellow men, more than they loved their own lives and fortunes. God forbid that we should have to use the blood of America to freshen the color of the Flag. But, if it ever should be necessary, that Flag will be colored once more, and being colored . . . will be glorified and purified in Freedom and Independence" . . . or by Oliver Wendell Holmes who wrote, in "The Voyage of the Good Ship Union," "One Flag, One Land, One Heart, One Hand . . . One Nation, Evermore."

#### BAN ENVIRONMENTAL WARFARE

### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 659, asking the U.S. Government to take the lead in seeking an international agreement to ban environmental or geophysical warfare. Recent reports of rain-making and burning of forests in Indochina give grave cause for alarm. A new Pandora's box of horrors may be opening up. The possibility is no longer remote that the climate of a particular area can be changed at will and then even the levels of oceans can be altered by melting the Arctic ice cover. We must restrict environmental engineering to peaceful purposes and place it under effective international control. Nations and people may otherwise become victims of unforeseen consequences of environmental warfare in the same way that species unwittingly were decimated by DDT and unborn infants were maimed by thalidomide.

In the past we have recognized that certain actions in war are self-defeating. We have placed restraints on ourselves, and have agreed with other nations on mutual restraints, on use of nuclear bombs, biological warfare, and poison gas. We have declared certain areas such as outer space and the seabeds out of bounds for certain military operations.

We are now faced with another kind of warfare—environmental warfare—manipulation of the weather and other geophysical forces to achieve military objectives. Catastrophic floods can result from rainmaking. In a country already despoiled by bombing, defoliation, and bulldozing, soil erosion from heavy rains can be 20,000 to 40,000 times worse than erosion of farmland and woodlands.

The administration is drawing a veil of secrecy over its actions in the Indochina war. Administration witnesses, testifying on a similar resolution introduced by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL) refused, on

grounds of national security, to comment on recent reports of rainmaking over Indochina. Their evasion seems to confirm that in fact some kind of weather warfare has been employed in Southeast Asia.

The Pentagon papers have revealed cloud-seeding experiments over Laos before February 1967. The New York Times, on the basis of more than a dozen interviews with military and civilian officials, reported on July 3 that the United States had seeded clouds over North Vietnam, Laos, and South Vietnam since 1967, with the objective of suppressing enemy anti-aircraft fire and hindering enemy infiltration South.

Recent disclosure of attempts in 1966 and 1967 to burn large forest areas in Vietnam provides additional evidence of the haphazard way we have tried to tamper with the environment in Vietnam. These fires failed only because the tropical rain forest was too moist to burn. At the same time that this project was going on, the U.S. Forest Service was under contract to the U.S. Agency for International Development to help the Vietnamese build up their timber industry.

Our target in Vietnam has been the land. A scorched earth policy is nothing new, but never before in history has there been a war that has been an extensively an air war as this one. The current bombing campaign has been in response to Hanoi's April offensive. That offensive has been halted, but the bombing goes on.

Earlier this year I joined other Members of this House in introducing the Vietnam Ecological Assessment Act to assess the terrible damage done to the environment of South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia as a result of U.S. military operations. We stopped the massive herbicide program we carried on there, but not before more than a million acres in South Vietnam were destroyed in this fashion. Estimates are that the loss of vegetation through defoliation cannot be repaired for from 500 to 1,000 years. Forests that would cover the state of Massachusetts have been eliminated. Four out of five logs in Vietnam are riddled with metal and useless as timber. We have scraped bare with bulldozers an area the size of Rhode Island.

The question has been asked, "What's worse, dropping bombs or rain?" The point is that it does not matter to non-combatants whether they are starved or drowned by floods, or blown up. It does matter in terms of morality and international respect, and perhaps even in terms of survival of life on this planet, that war should be limited as much as possible to combatants. To attempt to modify climate or the physical properties of large land masses gives war a new, and if possible, an even more terrible dimension.

The Senate has voted to cut off Defense Department funds for any use of rainmaking or burning of forests as weapons of war. This is a step in the right direction. If we do not act promptly, new forms of deliberate environmental warfare will evolve. I urge you to support the environmental warfare resolu-

tion, House Concurrent Resolution 659, calling on our Government to seek agreement with other nations to outlaw all environmental or geophysical modification activities as weapons of war.

The resolution follows:

H. CON. RES. 659

Whereas rainmaking and deliberate forest fires for military objectives have been, and are being, discussed in connection with the operations of the Armed Forces of the United States in Indochina; and

Whereas there is great danger to the world ecological system if environmental and geophysical modification activities are not controlled or are used indiscriminately; and

Whereas the development of weapons-oriented environmental and geophysical modification activities will create a threat to peace and world order; and

Whereas the United States Government should seek agreement with other governments on the complete cessation of any research, experimentation, or use of any such activity as a weapon of war: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).*

SECTION 1. That this resolution may be cited as the "Environmental Warfare Resolution of 1972".

SEC. 2. That the President should seek the agreement of other governments to an international agreement which would prohibit and prevent (1) any environmental or geophysical modification activity as a weapon of war, and (2) any research or experimentation relating to the development of any such activity as a weapon of war.

#### DEBATE OVER SECOND-CLASS MAIL RATES

#### HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, there is currently a considerable controversy raging over the decision of the Postal Board of Governors and the Postal Rate Commission to raise postal rates on second-class mail, including most magazines and newspapers. I have been giving this matter a good deal of study both from the standpoint of encouraging the free flow of news and information to our citizens and from the standpoint of postal economics.

While I have not yet drawn my own conclusions about the rate increases, I do think it is important that Members of Congress and the public be exposed to arguments on both sides of this question. With this goal in mind, I am inserting into the RECORD the full text of an article by E. T. Klassen, Postmaster General, which appeared in the August 2 edition of the New York Times:

#### POSTAGE AND PROFITS

(By E. T. Klassen)

WASHINGTON.—We read a great deal today about unnamed magazines and newspapers facing what is asserted to be a catastrophic situation allegedly caused by recently authorized postal rate increases. Much of the outcry smacks of a carefully contrived campaign by corporate publishers to inject their own business interests into their editorial columns—

identical rhetoric keeps cropping up in "independent" publications across the country.

In the interest of balance—and equity—the record should be set straight by substituting facts for emotion-laden cries of disaster from our friends in the publishing industry who, like us, have had the opportunity to fully set forth their case before an impartial panel.

The July 6 increase ordered by the Postal Board of Governors was not an arbitrary action to "price ideas out of the market." Rather, the increase was in direct compliance with and required by law—the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970—under which the U.S. Postal Service must equalize its revenues and its costs and bring an end to the massive, hidden subsidies so long intertwined with postage rates.

Far from being arbitrary, these new rates were recommended by the independent and expert Postal Rate Commission after fifteen months of hearings at which the interests of 400 magazines were ably represented and thoroughly considered. The rate commission, pointing out that magazine interests were unable to substantiate with specific facts the catastrophic effects of the proposed increases, concluded that the rates it proposed "are on the lower side of the range of reasonableness."

It is understandable that figures such as 127 per cent used by various spokesmen for the publishing industry may appear at first glance to be quite unreasonable. But it is just as unreasonable for these spokesmen to omit entirely any reference to just how much—or how little—it actually costs to mail a magazine. As recently as 1970, the average postage paid per copy of Time was 1.7 per cent; per copy of Life, it was 2.2 per cent.

Now, it should be obvious that an increase of 127 per cent of a small amount will result in another small amount. For example, in the case of a typical half-pound magazine, the July 6 increase brought the per-copy mailing costs to about 3.2 cents. After the full phase-in of the increase over five years, the average mailing cost for this half-pound magazine will be 5.8 cents compared with 8 cents an ounce for letters and 13 cents for half-pound advertising circulars that is being paid by mailers right now.

Admittedly, any increases are a problem for publications, just as rising costs are a problem for the Postal Service, whose labor costs are now about 10 cents per minute per employee and rising. There are clear signs, however, that many publishers may be crying wolf too loudly. For example, both the U.S. Department of Commerce and a major investment firm report that the magazine industry has a bright financial future. From information revealed this spring before the Postal Rate Commission, these predictions seem entirely accurate. Time, Inc., one of the loudest of the recent "wolf" criers, increased profits from its magazines from \$11 million in 1970 to \$17 million in 1971. And 1972 looks even better. Such increases far out-distance any postage increases the magazines would be forced to absorb if they could not convince readers that their publications were worth several cents more.

The number of newly introduced magazines has been three to five times the number of discontinued magazines for each of the past several years—hardly a sign of imminent disaster.

Second-class mail constitutes 25 per cent of the total weight of all the mail we must deliver. Even at the conclusion of the five-year phase-in period for this rate increase, the new rates will produce less than 5 per cent of postal revenues. In addition, the average second-class piece will contribute less to the general overhead expense of the Postal Service than the average piece of any class except airmail.



## RADIO FREE EUROPE

## HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, today I voted against the authorization of \$38.5 million for Radio Free Europe.

I am opposed to the concept of Radio Free Europe—in that it perpetuates a cold war philosophy which is now obsolete. President Nixon's visits to Russia and China have demonstrated the growing awareness of the Nation that that period of our history is coming to a close. The committee report states that the "free flow of information and ideas among nations is indispensable to more normal relations between East and West—." I could not agree more. However, is it really a free flow of information when our propaganda is broadcast exclusively over these radio networks. Do these networks give the other side of the coin. Is it indeed a "free flow" or does it not reflect a very heavy-handed attempt to proselytize our version of what is best for everyone. Certainly, I cannot commend those governments which refuse to let their citizens know what is going on in the outside world. I cannot commend government censorship of music and news. But I cannot commend our Government's provincial attitude that such broadcasts are necessary and proper for the salvation of those oppressed by "monolithic, atheistic communism."

In the past the authorization for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty were funded through the budget of the Central Intelligence Agency—a clear indication of the light in which these media were considered. In 1971 both the House and Senate agreed that a Commission should be established to review and evaluate the activities of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty to determine both the content of their broadcasts and the best mechanism of funding for the future.

It seems to me to be contrary to the best interest of these media and to the intent of Congress to authorize continuation of funding before such a Commission has reported. For the first time the Congress will have the opportunity to know what Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty really are doing, and I cannot support their continued operation until their policies are evaluated and the necessary changes implemented.

Mr. Speaker, this month \$6.5 million was released in EDA funds for the northeast region of the Nation. This means that Massachusetts will receive approximately \$500,000 to \$1 million in these essential funds—for water and sewer treatment, urban problems, and many other needs. Yet more than \$5 million worth of critically needed funding applications have been submitted. Few of them, obviously, will be funded. The \$38.5 million we are spending today could be much more wisely spent on the

very urgent domestic priorities facing us now. That money could fund all of the worthwhile EDA applications in New England.

I think that it is budgetary items such as these—the small, unnoticed millions—which should be looked at much more closely. We should not go along with such expenditures—particularly expenditures such as these—simply because they are too small to fight. We should cut out unnecessary and wasteful expenditures and put the money to use where it is critically needed here.

## HOW THE FEDS BOUGHT MISSISSIPPI

## HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago I asked for a special order to address the House about the alarming situation that has developed as a result of open-ended Federal matching of State expenditures for social services to former, current, and potential welfare recipients.

At that time I advised my colleagues of current State projections indicating a possible \$4.8 billion spending level for this out-of-control program—almost 10 times the amount spent in fiscal 1970.

We were just getting ready to go to conference with the Senate on the Labor-HEW appropriations bill, and I also predicted that, much as I hoped otherwise, the conference agreement would not include the \$2.5 billion limitation placed on these expenditures by the Senate.

The conference report has been filed, of course, and the limitation was dropped, so this back door to the Federal treasury is still wide open. This, plus the fact that the line-item dollar amounts agreed to by the conferees are \$1.8 billion over the President's budget recommendations, practically assure a veto of the Labor-HEW appropriations bill.

The Washington Post this morning carried an article by Jodie Allen analyzing the social services funding issue, and I urge my colleagues to read it.

The article follows:

HOW THE FEDS BOUGHT MISSISSIPPI—BACK DOOR REVENUE SHARING—AND ON A BIG SCALE

(By Jodie Allen)

While debate rages in the halls of the Congress and the administration over revenue sharing and welfare relief for hard-pressed states and localities, a multi-billion dollar program of fiscal relief for states is quietly being implemented under a little noticed provision of the Federal welfare law which provides federal matching for state expenditures on "social services" for needy persons. A recent action by the Senate-House conferees on the 1973 HEW appropriation bill on August 2 seems to assure that almost \$4 billion for "social services" will be added to the President's budget with little debate and with virtually no public attention.

Program increases of this magnitude are

usually front page news, particularly in an administration highly concerned over the prospect of a record-breaking budget deficit. The reason for this strange turn of events lies in the peculiar history and characteristics of the social service program.

There are three features of the social service authority which explain its unique potential for breaking the federal bank. The first is that the language of the social service provisions, as modified by a series of liberalizing amendments during the 1960s, is remarkably broad. The services covered include any "services to a family or any member thereof for the purpose of preserving, rehabilitating, reuniting or strengthening the family, and such other services as will assist members of a family to attain or retain capability for the maximum self-support and personal independence." Furthermore such services may be provided not only to current welfare recipients but, since 1965 to former or potential recipients as well.

Without even stretching the imagination it would seem that practically the entire gamut of services provided by state and localities for their citizens—including vocational rehabilitation, job training and counseling, child care, foster care, family planning, family counseling and referral, protective services for dependent persons, mental health and mental retardation services, community health services, homemaker services, non-formal or compensatory education, and information and referral services of all sorts—might easily be justified at least in part as deserving of federal support under the amendments. In fact the only services specifically excluded from support are public school education and institutional care and the only additional limitation appears to be a vaguely worded caveat in a HEW memorandum to the states that they must "significantly expand" not merely re-fund existing services. And to make it all easier, since 1967 the law has allowed the states not only to provide such services themselves but to purchase such services from other public and private agencies with federal support.

The second striking feature is that the terms of the federal support are extremely attractive. For every \$25 the states or localities proffer for these services the Fed will supply another \$75. The Talmadge amendments of 1971 went this one better and allowed 90 federal dollars for every 10 state or local dollars if the services provided were such as to enhance the employability of current, former or potential welfare recipients. (This largesse should be compared to the relatively miserly 50 per cent matching which is all most large states can receive on actual cash grants to recipients.)

Last and best there is the "open-end" financing provision—which means exactly what it sounds like. Unlike most federal authorizations for which a fixed amount is appropriated by Congress each year, the social service fund is essentially a bottomless pit. As is the case for public assistance cash payments, whatever amount of money states and localities express willingness and ability to spend for social services in a given year, the federal government must stand ready to match at \$3 or more for 1.

Given these generous provisions, the only thing that is hard to understand about the social service program is why it is not already the largest domestic program in the federal budget. In fact most states were slow to recognize the potential of the social service program. In 1964 only \$75 million in federal dollars went to social services. By 1968 the federal cost had risen to the still modest level of \$230 million and by 1969, even after a one year increase of 59 per cent the federal share was still only \$366 million. A few sharp state officials however were beginning

to catch on. One state, California, had by 1970, managed to corner almost 40 per cent of the total social service budget of \$500 million for that year largely through the cleverness of a consultant at the California State Assembly, Tom Joe. In a fascinating article in the June 17, 1972, issue of the "National Journal," John Iglehart has traced the subsequent involvement of the ingenious Mr. Joe who, as part of the entourage accompanying former HEW Secretary Finch to Washington from California, has subsequently stayed on at HEW. There, in an informal capacity, he has spread the glad tidings of largesse to other less favored states—to the ultimate discomfort of the administration.

For discomforted indeed are HEW budget managers. From a sleepy little sub-billion dollar program, social services has in the last several months skyrocketed with a multi-billion dollar flare likely to eclipse in importance both the much heralded revenue sharing proposals now being debated in the Senate Finance Committee and the now beleaguered welfare reform package with its promise of some \$2 billion in state welfare savings.

Picking up the thread of our chronology we find that by fiscal year 1971 the federal share of social service expenditures had climbed to almost \$700 million with the Congress ignoring a request by the administration in its budget for that year to impose a 10 per cent ceiling on expenditure increases over the previous year (a request repeated and again denied in the administration FY 72 budget). In FY 72 social services again surprised everyone by outstripping the original administration estimate of \$838 million by at least another \$450 million and, by some estimates by perhaps, as much as \$750 million. In either case the federal government is thus already spending at the rate of over \$1.3 billion a year on social services—an amount almost twice that expended in the previous year and already larger than the administration's \$1.2 billion request for the upcoming fiscal year, 1973.

But that discrepancy must be counted as minor. For while the Congress has been considering the HEW request, the states have quietly been revising drastically their estimates of federal dollars required in FY 73. In May to the consternation of HEW officials a new estimate of \$2.2 billion, almost twice the administration's 1973 budget request of \$1.2 billion, was computed. The Senate Appropriations Committee, alerted to the danger added to the HEW appropriation bill a ceiling of \$2.5 billion on social service expenditures. But pressure from governors and state officials anxious to cash in on the bounty proved too strong and, with virtually no public attention, the limitation was dropped in the Conference Committee despite assertions in the conference report issued on August 2 that the conferees "agreed with the basic premises of the Senate amendment: (1) to insure fiscal control over a program which is presently increasing at an alarming rate and (2) to insure that funds are disbursed prudently and effectively."

But the conferees literally didn't know the half of the matter. For by the end of June the states had set their sights far higher than a mere \$2.2 billion—in fact having doubled the estimate once, they decided to do it again this time submitting a total FY 73 request of almost \$5 billion, a quadrupling in expenditures over the previous year to an amount equal to the much publicized revenue sharing program. And there is unanimous agreement on the Hill and in HEW that that estimate is probably too low.

Fortunately it is not necessary to question the efficacy or relative utility of social services in order to question the desirability of this turn of events. It is fortunate in that no one seems to have any clear idea of what the money is being spent on.

But apart from the merits of social services per se three things are abundantly clear:

1. A huge sum of taxpayer money is being distributed among states in a quixotic fashion unrelated either to relative need or to the ability and willingness of states to use the money constructively.

2. It is not possible for states and local governments to achieve a four-fold expansion in services of any kind in one year (on top of a doubling the previous year) and particularly not in services of a type for which no clearly successful record of performance has yet been demonstrated, even on a modest scale.

3. Even if the money is in fact expended for the purposes intended, serious imbalances are occurring within state expenditures patterns between social service activities for low income populations and other forms of assistance and service both to this population and to other groups in the population.

To illustrate these points one need only look at a few states. In 1971 Mississippi spent about \$950,000 on social services. Its estimated expenditures for 1972 increased by 88 per cent to \$1.8 million. In 1973 Mississippi now estimates it will spend some \$460 million on social services, over 250 times the amount it spent the previous year.

Two other comparisons are equally interesting. If Mississippi's social service benefits were spent entirely on welfare recipients, it would turn out that Mississippi would be spending some \$1,625 per welfare recipient on social services, or about \$6,500 per year on a family of four (a number familiar to the National Welfare Rights Organization). Apart from the striking generosity of this allotment it is interesting to compare this expenditure with the maximum welfare cash grant which such a family if it had no other income could receive in Mississippi. That amount is \$720. And lastly it is interesting to observe that if, as is likely, most of the \$460 million in federal dollars is used simply to support existing state and local services in Mississippi, this amount alone will account for over half of the current total Mississippi state budget.

Other examples abound. Maryland's estimated expenditures will grow from a 1971 level of \$15 million to an estimated level of almost \$420 million in 1973. At this point Maryland will be spending some \$1,650 per welfare recipient or about \$6,000 for a family of four. Georgia plans to expand its program from a 1971 level of \$12 million to a 1973 level of over \$220 million. New York will expand from \$67 million 1971 to \$850 million, Illinois from \$24 million to over \$180 million. Faced with an unplanned increase in the President's budget of at least \$3.6 billion and the frightening potential of even more staggering increases to come (the estimates are from \$6 to 8 billion in the next fiscal year) there appears to be little that the administration can or, perhaps, wants to do to stem the flowing tide. To "close the end" on social services would require legislative action and, as has already been demonstrated by the recent action of the appropriation conferees, such action is unlikely to be forthcoming, particularly in an election year, given the opposition to such a change that would be generated by enthusiastic state and local officials who have suddenly discovered that there is indeed a pot of gold at the end of the federal rainbow.

There is also the difficult problem of devising a formula which, at once, distributes the fund among the states in at least some vague relationship to need and current fiscal effort; maintains each of the states at least at their current level of expenditures and probably allows some increase (a practical necessity to ensure acceptance of any formula); and, at the same time sets a reasonable dollar limit on the total budget.

Despite the practical and potential difficulties involved, however, it is clear that something constructive must be done, not simply

to control a runaway program, but to insure that the monies are distributed equitably among states and that real and needed public services are produced in the process. Surely some more rational basis must exist for distributing several billion dollars of taxpayer money than one depending upon the relative ambition and ingenuity of a few state and federal officials.

## THE NEW POLITICS: IS IT OUT OF STEP?

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal being said about what the workers in the country are thinking about the coming campaign. An article in the Chicago Tribune of Sunday, August 6, 1972, titled "The 'New Politics' Is Out of Step" by Mike LaVelle of Cicero, Ill., covers this aspect of the coming campaign very clearly. Mike LaVelle is a laborer in a pipebending shop and a free lance writer. What does labor's rank and file think about these labor leaders and their decisions—meaning George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO and I. W. Abel, head of the United Steelworkers—when they said they would not endorse GEORGE MCGOVERN? How does the blue-collar man view GEORGE MCGOVERN and his proposals? This is an interesting and well-written article by a blue-collar worker who seems to understand what the issues of his time are. I know my colleagues will enjoy reading it:

### THE "NEW POLITICS" IS OUT OF STEP (By Mike LaVelle)

They drove out Johnson, defeated Humphrey, booted Daley, and now the "kids" have their very own candidate for the Presidency of these United States of America. We thought they had their noses buried in an underground newspaper and all the time it was a delegate tally sheet. The kids are working within the system—"whoopie" and "baloney."

They have never been out of the system, they are of it and in it, in the quality and quantity of their lives, up to their eyebrows, and always have been.

When a contemporary liberal affectionately, always, affectionately uses the word "kids," I know who and what he means—the affluent and pampered children of the white-collar Left. The blue-collar Hells Angels are hoodlums; the upper class Weathermen et al are idealistic "kids," who are never idealistic enough to demonstrate on campus for mine safety after the live burials of their lesser peers in cave-ins.

### NO CAREFREE SUMMERTIME

There are no formal sabbaticals or carefree summertimes for blue-collar youth to flood the streets of America working for this or that political candidate or cause. Instead they are in factories, steel mills, mines, or Viet Nam in the noncampus, nonelite system as it is. They were definitely not in evidence among the McGovern delegates at Miami.

Life magazine called the Oregon delegation to the Democratic convention "nearly perfect" according to the McGovern reform rules. Using Oregon as representative of all the McGovern delegates at Miami, let's look at its 34 delegates. There were six students,



five teachers, four business people, four lawyers, three writers, two bureaucrats, two editors, two politicians, two homemakers, one social worker, one newspaper indexer, one retired Army officer, and one secretary. The delegation included the correct amount of women, blacks, and youth which all sounds very democratic on the surface but which deceptively is not so.

McGovern claims a blue-collar electoral response to his primaries. Yet not a one of the Oregon delegates, black or white, sweats on a production line. So how could they effectively represent me or my peers who do, even if they wanted to. My gut feeling is that they do not want to represent me.

Of all the delegates at Miami, 39 per cent had postgraduate degrees, 31 per cent had family incomes over \$25,000 a year, and the average income was \$20,000 a year. I do not know the national average, but mine with a nonworking wife and two children is roughly \$7,800 a year.

So much for the much ballyhooed "New Politics" McGovern convention.

Whatever Meany, Woodcock, Abel, et al do concerning McGovern is more a matter of whether they give or withhold vast financial and organizational support than direct votes from rank and file. The primary votes of Michigan for George Wallace prove how grandiose the myth and pittance of the power of labor leaders to deliver the so-called labor vote.

In the past, the deliverance was merely a pro forma statement on de facto votes—essentially when Republicans were the reactionary bad guys and there was nowhere else for a worker to go except to the Democrats. Those days are over.

Now the Republicans are the moderates and the Democrats seem to be embracing the Left crazies or allowing themselves to be embraced. Pragmatism seems to have become a dirty word to the moral purists who have taken over the Democratic Party. As a consequence they have given President Nixon a bigger ball park, and he is Mister Pragmatism himself.

One suspects that McGovern's "Kamikaze economic advisers" have unconsciously already structured their utopia and tipped their game-plan prematurely by abolishing money—if not as a medium of exchange than as sensible campaign oratory, barring the other and more probable extreme that they are printing their own.

How else can you explain proposals, such as a \$30-billion cut in defense spending simultaneous with "Jobs for everyone," massive social legislation, simultaneous with a relief of tax burdens and a thousand dollars mad money for each citizen—a cynic might be tempted to say each voter."

#### THE ENEMY OF FANCY

Facts are ever the enemy of fancy, and what glazes the dreamer's eye often distorts his vision—assuming that the McGovernite economists fault on the side of the angels or the purities of some bizarre ideology. Or is it possible that the under-30 rhetoric and mystique have dropped to under 10? And if one were to interrupt the cream of the cerebral McGovernites in a planning conference would he find them, in serious mien, hovering and jabbering over Monopoly, play money and all?

If there is a sweetish odor in the air then one can safely assume that Harvard's economists are drafting another zinger for McGovern. I'd strongly suggest that McGovern give these people a mythical candidate to play with and leave the real one alone.

"In San Diego, I was campaigning at an aerospace plant, walking alongside a wire fence and shaking hands with some of the workers, and the reception I was getting wasn't very enthusiastic. And I wasn't feeling very good about what was happening either. Then a man stuck out his hand and

said, "I need my job, but I need my country more. I'm for you. In California military spending was an important issue, and I was heartened, that a worker would put love of country above his own job." From George McGovern's "How I won the Nomination" in Newsday.

That is twisting "love it or leave it" to "love it and leave your job." Or defense spending one has to give McGovern an "A-plus for honesty" as was given to Barry Goldwater on other issues. Unfortunately for politicians the kin of candor is too often defeat. It is not hard to envision McGovern's old politics advisers thru clenched teeth telling him, A minister's son is good imagery, George, but this is an election, not an appointment."

To tell a man with a wife, two children, and no job that he has just struck a mighty blow against the military-industrial complex—"F.D.R.'s Arsenal of Democracy" remember?—is poor politics indeed and dangerous when there is a Luddite Left in America which yearns for the good old days of horsedrawn unhomogenized milk wagons and nonunionized laborers who were kept in their place by men of style and substance.

It does little to enhance McGovern's populist image that one of his fat cats is Stewart Mott, one of the owners of General Motors, who admits to paying zero taxes while the workers on a G.M. assembly line voice an unfair tax burden as one of their major complaints.

#### EMERGING ELITE SCORN

The anti-Polish jokes of Henry Kimelman [as reported by Nicholas von Hoffman], another McGovern fat cat, lends credence to suspicions of an emerging elite liberal scorn for the nonblack, nonbrown, non-Jewish, and non-WASP ethnic groups in America who make up a large part of blue-collar voters that gives another reason to retaliate in November.

Unless McGovern disavows some of his snobbish friends, they may, in tandem with frenetic Yippies, rupture whatever liaisons McGovern might have to middle America.

Politicians who stray from the vast, if safe middle are generally ambushed not by adversaries, but by zealous advocates who attempt to move them farther Left or Right than they wish to go. I'm sure that the S.D.S. and the giggle Left will do to George McGovern what the John Birch Society and the Ku Klux Klan did for Barry Goldwater.

The Klan took Goldwater's sincere questioning of civil rights legislation as a commandment for its repeal, the Birchers took his plan for military field decisions as a "yup" for Armageddon. Nightmares that must haunt McGovern might well be those of a "now" child planting some pot on him, a leftist crazy pinning a Mao Tse-tung button on him, a gay lib transvestite embracing him on national television, or being presented with an aborted fetus.

Not to be overlooked is that in November we will be well into the school year, and bus-ing will be a hotter issue for the Democrats than the Republicans, providing that the Republican platform is against it or vague enough not to be blatantly for it as the McGovern position appears to be.

The Left-Right, war-peace zeitgeist has so completely swung around in the last 35 years that the isolationist America Firsters from the 1930s must be spinning in their graves. And those still living feel a bittersweet nostalgia at seeing the interventionist and global warriors of yesterday rallying around the slogan "Come Home America."

Has anyone ever asked ex-bomber pilot George McGovern ["Jan. 31, 1945: Hit Moose-bierbaum, Austria—bombed thru overcast—very light flak." From "McGovern" by Robert Sam Anson.] how many women and children he killed in his bombing runs during World War II?

Give us a rough estimate, George.

#### TRAINS STILL RUN ON TIME

Even the trains that used to run on time in Mussolini's Fascist Italy are now running on time in Peking with the now familiar sophistries that its dictators are in charge and representative of the ever abused "people." Such moral garbage that comes from the Left today used to come from the Right. Which proves, at least, that human rights carries no other label, but an ideological one.

A potential freedom fighter in Athens or Havana waits hopelessly for someone divorced from the ideological struggles that forge new chains as they break the old ones to say no to unfolding history and yes to Thomas Jefferson's "eternal hostility to all tyrannies over the minds of man." The above is a true liberal banner that now lies crushed and silent as the boot-loving current banner waivers shriek their admiration for diverse dictators.

We Americans will not say yet, and yet we can. What we have become is a tragedy of retreat and default.

Whoever wins the Presidential election, at least with McGovern and Nixon running, it is definitely not a beauty contest. What did he say? Who's listening [sigh]?

The roster of some of the names around the McGovern in the background reads like a Quixotic platoon of the New Frontier warriors who were fractured on the shores of Viet Nam. Some who were mesmerized by his charisma would have crossed the River Styx for J.F.K., but not L.B.J. And others saw blood dripping from the robes of Camelot.

It is difficult to guess just who thought that Harvard [with a Boston accent] could do no wrong and "My fellow Americans" [L.B.J.] could do no right.

#### HARVARD AND L. B. J.

One hates to even imagine that the destiny of America might have—and still could—hinged on a slipped syntax or a Hollywood profile.

And there McGovern gets a plus. The man is plain looking to the horror of the Beautiful People who never tire of running a John Barrymore for President. "When McGovern crossed his legs, a vast expanse of white shin was exposed to the cameras. Gloria Steinem solved that problem and set McGovern on the road to recovery by dashing to a local mens' store and bringing back a pair of over-the-calf socks." From "McGovern."

Gloria, please get your cosmetician hands off our Populist, he's got enough problems with "friends" trying to help him.

#### ASIAN DRUG INFLOW FOUND "GREATER THAN REALIZED"

#### HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, recently the New York Times printed an article under the headline, "Asian Drug Inflow Found 'Greater Than Realized'." In the course of the article, which was a lengthy one—about 42 inches of copy—it developed that the Bureau of Narcotics had concluded that the amount of high-quality heroin being smuggled into this country from Southeast Asia is "greater than previously realized."

I must say, Mr. Speaker, this announcement comes as no revelation to a thinking person, except, perhaps, to the Bureau of Narcotics. I, for one, have always maintained that the drug flow from

Red China, euphemistically referred to nowadays as "mainland China," was greater than publicly acknowledged.

I also have a very brief, one-paragraph news note from the Washington Post of August 2, mentioning a \$1 million haul of heroin in New York. Origin of the heroin? "Mainland China." The investigation leading to these arrests had been in progress for 3 months; no doubt there are similar ones still going on. I will not be surprised to hear in the next few months of similar drug traffic exposés, with a similar point of origin for the contraband.

It is unrealistic to place most of the blame on Turkey and France for the tremendous influx of drugs into our country. After all, what interest has Turkey in undermining the character of America's citizens? Surely not the same interest that Red China, given her ideological convictions, has in weakening America. Red China is trying very hard, and so far, with great success, to utilize this most recent weapon in the "continuous revolution" between the Communist world and the non-Communist world.

It is no accident that the young men who go at their country's calling to fight a war in Southeast Asia are the ones most vulnerable to the drug-plague and the ones hardest hit by it. It is no accident, either, that our Government policy has low-keyed the Chinese role in the drug traffic—political and diplomatic expediences play their parts in the attempt to cast the blame on France and Turkey.

I am encouraged that my first point has been acknowledged; how long will it be until the second one is recognized?

Mr. Speaker, I insert two newspaper articles in the RECORD at this point:

[From the New York Times, July 28, 1972]  
ASIAN DRUG INFLOW FOUND "GREATER THAN REALIZED"

(By Seymour M. Hersh)

WASHINGTON, July 27.—A secret analysis by the Government's top narcotics enforcement agency has concluded that the amount of high-quality heroin being smuggled into the United States from Southeast Asia "is greater than previously realized."

The new Government report, compiled last month by the Strategic Intelligence Office of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, further showed that narcotics-control personnel was beginning to accumulate evidence linking organized crime to the Southeast Asian drug market.

Another Government study, reported on in The New York Times on Monday, concluded that there was "no prospect" of halting the drug flow from Southeast Asia into the United States. This Cabinet-level study was later discounted by the man who commissioned it—Egil M. Krogh Jr., a special White House aide for narcotics matters.

Mr. Krogh said "there has been substantial progress" in reducing the influx of drugs from Southeast Asia.

The Narcotics Bureau report stated that "the traffic at present relatively unorganized, but has definite potential for expansion as a replacement for Turkish-French heroin."

Officials from the Central Intelligence Agency, State Department, Narcotics Bureau and Defense Department "are presently reviewing the international trade," the report added, "with particular focus on Southeast Asia as an alternate to the Middle East as a source of supply."

#### WHITE HOUSE THINKS OTHERWISE

Nixon Administration spokesmen have repeatedly maintained publicly, in opposition to statements of critics, that heroin smuggled from Southeast Asia makes up only a small fraction of the total United States annual supply.

Last month Nelson G. Gross, the State Department's senior adviser for international narcotics matters, told a Congressional hearing that "the overwhelming majority of the heroin coming to the United States originates in the Middle East and is processed in European laboratories before being smuggled into our country. We estimate that probably 5 per cent and certainly no more than 10 per cent of the heroin presently flowing into the United States originates in Southeast Asia."

The Cabinet-level study, while completed last February, was at odds with Administration thinking in its conclusions that there was "no prospect under any conditions that can realistically be projected, of stopping the drug flow from Southeast Asia. It was immediately assailed by Mr. Krogh."

Asked in an interview today about the Narcotics Bureau's analysis, Mr. Krogh acknowledged that "from what I've learned so far, there has to be a strong likelihood" that organized crime is involved in the flow of heroin from Southeast Asia, but he added that the evidence was not yet conclusive.

#### "STATISTICS ARE FLUID"

He emphasized that the Administration set up its international narcotics program only 18 months ago. Because of this, he said, it would be "impossible" to estimate accurately which area in the world was responsible for which percentage of the heroin reaching the United States. "Statistics at this time are so fluid," he said.

Other officials said that content of the bureau's analysis had been approved by that agency's over-all intelligence board before its dissemination inside the Government.

The Narcotics Bureau, a Justice Department agency, indicated in its study, made available today, that much of the growing amount of heroin from Southeast Asia was being smuggled into the United States by "essentially political Chinese entrepreneurs operating out of Laos, Thailand and Hong Kong. The heroin is sold to ethnic Chinese seamen, many of whom may be organized, who jump ship once their vessels dock in the United States."

Further intelligence may "reveal more precisely the role of Far East heroin in the United States," the document said, "and may reveal the substance of long-standing hitherto unverifiable reports of a 'Chinese-Corsican' connection between morphine base from the Orient and the chemical expertise of the Marseille area. Perhaps this preliminary report will stimulate interest in acquiring more data on the 'Chinese connection.'" Morphine is another product of opium, which is extracted from poppy seeds.

Intelligence reports "over the past year indicate an increase in the number of ethnic Chinese who illegally enter the United States and Canada," the document said, adding that the volume and the pattern of techniques used in the delivery of narcotics were not sufficiently known.

"However," the report said, the bureau "views the amount as a serious and increasing threat."

#### EIGHT CHINESE ARRESTED

Government intelligence agencies recently set up a joint effort, known as Project Sea Wall, to stem the growing smuggling through United States and Canadian dock areas. Within a month of the program's initiation on April 7, the report said, eight ethnic Chinese were arrested, most of them carrying one to four pounds of high-quality heroin strapped to their bodies.

One seizure, on April 11, resulted in the arrest of seven Chinese seamen carrying a total of 11 pounds of heroin, the bureau's report said. It added that "further information developed that this 11 pounds was part of a 100-pound shipment which originated in Bangkok and was evidently delivered by a European diplomat assigned to Thailand. Sensitive sources have revealed that more shipments, sponsored by other groups, are on the way; arrests are anticipated in the near future."

Significantly, the report noted that "the smuggling activities of Chinese seamen imply a loose but rather extensive arrangement between the seamen and their United States contacts to carry out the movement of narcotics from Southeast Asia on a continuing basis. These arrangements appear to involve some degree of organization at the receiving end and possibly at the sending end."

The report listed docks in San Francisco, New York, Miami and Vancouver as areas with some degree of organized smuggling, but also said that high-quality Southeast Asian heroin had entered the United States through other ports—among them Seattle, Portland, New Orleans, Baltimore and Philadelphia.

The report contained a number of clues indicating that the amount of organized smuggling could be far higher than even now suspected.

It cited the arrest of a Philippine diplomat late last year in New York City with about 37 pounds of a brand of highly refined heroin known as "double uoglobe." It was the diplomat's third trip to the United States, the report said. "At least one previous time he was accompanied by a known Chinese heroin dealer in Bangkok."

The "double uoglobe" heroin, manufactured in Laos, was widely sold to United States servicemen in South Vietnam in 1970 and 1971.

#### MARKETING BUILDUP SIFTED

At another point, the bureau's analysis said that "sensitive sources also reveal frequent communications between Chinese heroin traffickers in New York, Seattle, San Francisco, Portland and Vancouver, suggesting that an extensive wholesale marketing mechanism exists or is being established."

In recent years, United States narcotics officials have repeatedly said that 80 per cent of all heroin known to be consumed in the United States comes via Marseilles refineries from Turkey's opium-growing areas. Ten to 15 per cent was said to come from Mexico.

The bureau's report tended to support the position of the opium-growing in Turkey and other areas a prime goal of its antinarcotics drive. Officials now expect the opium production in Turkey to end this year.

The Nixon Administration's leading critics of the Administration's narcotics drive—Representative Robert H. Steele, Republican of Connecticut, and Alvin W. McCoy, a Yale graduate student who has written an exposé of the heroin traffic in Southeast Asia.

When told of the bureau's report, Mr. Steele commented: "Vietnam is truly coming home to haunt us. No matter what they say, this means that the first wave of this material is already on its way to our children in high school."

Mr. Steele, a first-term Representative who last year helped reveal the extent of heroin addiction among G.I.'s in Vietnam, asserted that Narcotics Bureau attempts to stop smugglers from jumping ship or otherwise getting into the United States were misguided.

"Instead of trying to put up this barrier," Mr. Steele said, "it would be much more economical if we just went to our allies in Southeast Asia—to Thailand, where most of this stuff comes from—and stopped the traffic there."



He specifically cited what he termed the Administration's inability to interfere with the known large-scale smuggling of opium via trawler from northern Thailand to refineries to Hong Kong and Malaysia.

During testimony June 2 before a Senate subcommittee, Mr. McCoy, a Ph. D. candidate in Southeast Asian history, testified that beginning in 1965 "members of the Florida-based Trafficante family of American organized crime began appearing in Southeast Asia."

Mr. McCoy specifically named Santo Trafficante Jr., whom he described as the heir to the international criminal syndicate established by Lucky Luciano and Meyer Lansky, as having traveled to Hong Kong and Saigon in 1968.

"In 1967-68 there was evidence of increased activity on the part of Indochina's Corsican gangsters," he also stated. "United States agents observed Corsican heroin traffickers commuting between Saigon and Marseilles, where the Corsicans control the clandestine heroin laboratories."

Mr. McCoy then told the subcommittee that a former high-ranking C.I.A. agent in Saigon—subsequently identified as retired Lieut. Col. Lucien Conein, who played a major role in South Vietnam for more than 10 years—"told me in an interview that in 1969 there was a summit meeting of Corsican criminals from Marseilles, Vientiane, and Phompenh at Saigon's Continental hotel.

Intelligence sources acknowledged in subsequent interviews that the Government began studying the Southeast Asian narcotics trade less than two years ago, primarily in response to the rapid increase of G.I. addiction. In early 1971, the White House reportedly ordered the C.I.A. to coordinate intelligence efforts in the area.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 2, 1972]

#### HEROIN SEIZURE

NEW YORK.—Three Chinese pleaded innocent in federal court yesterday to charges arising from the seizure of nearly \$1 million worth of heroin from mainland China.

Judge Marvin E. Frankel continued bail at \$50,000 for Mrs. Tam Chun, 41; \$5,000 for her husband, Henry Chan Chun, and \$20,000 for yee-Tom Choy.

The case was assigned to Judge Constance Baker Motley, with no date set for trial. The three were arrested July 21 after a three-month investigation.

#### GOOD NEIGHBOR FOUNDATION

#### HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in commemoration of National Friendship Day, August 7, I wish to call attention to the existence and accomplishments of the Good Neighbor Foundation. The foundation was founded by Mrs. Marguerite Timper Wilcox on August 7, 1920. Its members are senior citizens dedicated to service to handicapped veterans and civilians. Mrs. Wilcox, a resident of my congressional district, is handicapped herself and since the founding of the organization has been active in service to the community and an inspiration to other handicapped persons in the Milwaukee area and through her worldwide correspondence.

The poem written by Mrs. Wilcox on

the occasion of the 48th anniversary of the founding of the Good Neighbor Foundation expresses best the spirit and the purpose of the organization and I am pleased to place it in the RECORD and commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

WHEN?—HOW?—WHY?

(By Marguerite Timper Wilcox)

We are to celebrate here  
Our wonderful—48th year  
Of The Good Neighbor Foundation  
With members throughout the nation.  
Founded—August 7, 1920  
When Marguerite thought she was ready  
Even though she was very ill  
Through complete—Faith and Will  
She prayed, prayed and prayed  
When over 2 years in bed she laid  
And only 69 pounds she weighed  
In 24 hours the Dr's to her parents said  
Marguerite Timper would be dead  
Completely unconscious—she was they  
thought

But every single word she caught  
Doctor told the Mother to  
Prepare a bit of chicken stew  
But that very night  
Marguerite—ate not a—bite  
But had her nurse—Ruth Ward  
Send the first shut-in-card  
To lovely Irving Berl is wife  
Who also was fighting for her life  
Later many phone calls she made  
As more—strength she gained  
Then to add to peoples fun  
Various parties she did run  
For the lonely, Handicapped, and Aged  
Into Volunteer services she waded  
All this time our member—Nelle  
Helped—Marguerite—to get well  
When Helen Puschnig—again came  
She added her wisdom to the game  
Of bringing various joy to all  
For entertainment in-the-hall  
Some other old members are here  
And of course are very dear  
But I love you—all, so don't you fear  
You are marvelous to one another  
Treating each as a dear Sister or Brother  
With your—Christian attitude  
Bringing out one anothers good.  
Dr. Wilkinson, Nurse Ward and Druggist  
Meiner

They could not have been finer.  
Many in this world no longer roam  
For they have been called home  
Some wonderful marriages we have had  
And to that we can add  
Many marvelous romances  
Who still enjoy their companions dances  
Al, Bess and Tillie and Gus  
Delores, Charles, Ida and Camilus  
Marie, Otto, Leta and Bill  
Say life without one another  
Would be nill  
Oh, yes of elopments we know this  
They too are enjoying married bliss  
Thousands of letters Marguerite does write  
At her desk—day and night  
All these—and many more  
Love to you—she does pour  
Yes, and talents she scouts of all ages  
All this for 48 years—without wages  
And since 1920 many serious illnesses she has  
had  
But it has not left her sad  
For life to her means to make you glad  
And hopes to show you visions of love  
By belief in God and blessings from above.

Yes, I am glad that I am handicapped for  
thereby I found God, I found myself, and I  
found you.

And I hereby now rededicate myself again  
for another year.

Thank you—and may The Lord richly Bless  
You

CAN WE AFFORD TO BE  
SECOND BEST?

#### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the debate continues to rage in this Congress and on the public platform, in an attempt to define and project America's defense priorities for the immediate future. Many observers have termed the coming Presidential election a crucial one, in terms of a decision by the American people between widely diverse views of this Nation's role in the spectrum of world events.

For the further general edification of my colleagues, I would like at this time to include in the RECORD the text of a recent statement on the subject by Mr. Geoffrey R. Simmonds, president of Simmonds Precision:

CAN WE AFFORD TO BE SECOND BEST?

(By Geoffrey R. Simmonds)

Since the end of the Korean War, the United States has followed a "balance of power" strategy in an effort to maintain world peace. The philosophy behind this strategy is that we can avoid a confrontation of world powers only if we maintain a constant military posture equal to, or stronger than our potential enemies. This strategy is expensive. It is supported by heavy expenditures in research and development and a strong financial commitment to advance military technology.

The War in Southeast Asia has had an effect on this balance of power that has gone largely unobserved by the American public. We have spent more than \$150 billion of our national wealth in the day-to-day costs of maintaining the Vietnam War. As a result our financial resources have been strained and we have curtailed during this period, our research and development of new weapon systems and advanced military hardware.

In contrast, the Russians, since the Vietnam War have taken advantage of our slowdown to embark on an airport technological development program aimed at global military supremacy. We can no longer rely on the "sour grapes" rationalization that our technological quality is better than the Russians' quantity. The bare assumption of U.S. technical superiority is no longer valid. Let me give you an example from the aircraft industry. The U.S. Air Force is developing an advanced variable-geometry strategic bomber, the B-1, which is scheduled to fly three years from now. The Russian equivalent of the B-1 is the "Backfire" strategic bomber. Three of them are flying now . . . and there are more on the way.

Another example is the new Russian MIG-23 "Foxbat" twin-jet, all weather fighter. This is a Mach 3 aircraft that out-performs in speed and altitude anything we now have in service or on the drawing boards. The Grumman F-14 Navy variable wing fighter aircraft is scheduled to be operational with the fleet in 1973, and the McDonnell Douglas F-15 is scheduled for service with the Air Force in the mid-70s. Both are rated at Mach 2+. The Russians now have 50% more first line aircraft than the U.S. And more than half of our air fleet is over 10 years old.

The same problem exists on the high seas. The U.S. and Russia have roughly the same number of naval vessels in commission. Less than 10% of the Russian ships are more than 25 years old. In contrast, 75% of our fleet is that age.

It is clear that Russia is making a determined effort to be the No. 1 military power in the world in order to expand its international political and economic influence.

There can be little doubt that the ball is in our court. We are under enormous pressures at home to pour more of our national wealth into the resolution of social and environmental problems. Simultaneously, we must decide whether world peace and U.S. political and economic interests across the globe can be served by our becoming the second best military power in the world. Ultimately, the decision rests with the American people. The debate will probably be side-stepped in the 1972 elections, but it is likely to be a major issue in 1974 and 1976.

As we reconsider our technical-military role, we would do well to take a long, hard look at our industrial posture in today's changing world. At the end of World War II, the U.S. had the most modern and efficient industrial complex in the world. A large investment in plant and equipment permitted high wages, provided high productivity, and gave us the assurance that we could sell our products competitively anywhere in the world.

Now, times have changed. Both our friends and our former enemies—partly with American taxpayers' money—have completely rebuilt their war-torn industries. They control industrial plants that are, relatively speaking, more modern and productive than ours.

It is interesting to compare the productivity of \$100 in 1970 wages in a few selected countries. A Japanese company gets more than 100 hours of work for each \$100 of wages. Compared with that, a French, German or British company will get about 50 hours of work. For the same wages, an American company gets only 25 hours of work. It is obvious that we must be four times as efficient to compete with the Japanese. And we have seen the results: imported products at prices well below domestic levels.

In one of our main markets, aerospace, the European governments together have committed \$4 billion in taxpayers' money to the

development by private companies of commercial aircraft. In this way, four different commercial aircraft will be developed. The governments and the companies intend to capture the lion's share of a \$30 billion market.

It is against the traditions of the U.S. free enterprise system to use public money for commercial development. European governments, on the other hand, have already come to grips with the fact that private industry simply cannot finance the sky-rocketing costs of advanced technology. They consider the "national interest" to include healthy technological development of industries such as aerospace computers, atomic energy and electronics, and they have decided to use public money for these purposes. Over the next few years, we in the U.S. will be faced with the same decision.

The 25-year honeymoon—when we were supreme in both the competitive military and industrial worlds—is over. The government must establish new national priorities, not only of a social nature but also of a scientific and technological nature. We must decide which industries can compete in world markets over the next 25 years, despite our high wage costs. These industries should be nurtured, encouraged, and supported when necessary.

We must modify our tax system so that over the next five to ten years our plant and equipment is once again the most modern and efficient in the world. Labor and management are both going to have to work harder. Interdependence, rather than independence, will have to be developed to a much greater degree. Featherbedding and make-work projects will have to go because our economic system can no longer support them.

We are about to live through one of the most challenging periods of our history. The question is whether or not we shall rise to the challenge and energy and purpose if we do, we shall retain and strengthen our world position, our self-respect and the respect of others, if we do not, we shall become a second rate power.

## YOUNG ADULTS

### HON. RICHARD G. SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1972

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, a number of my constituents have expressed their concern for the attitude in Congress toward young adults. I have assured them that I, along with a great number of my colleagues, believe that young adults must be represented as individuals and must share equally as citizens the privileges and responsibilities of our society. The future of our country lies in creating job opportunities for our youth, and that all youth should have the chance to better themselves through vo-tech or college training.

I feel the following list of bills is of the type we have and should continue to act on:

H.R. 6531. Provided incentives for building a volunteer Army thereby eliminating need for draft.

H.R. Res. 223. Amended U.S. Constitution to lower voting age to 18 years.

H.R. 12596. Coordinates all of the Federal agencies connected with the drug abuse problem into a Special Office for Prevention of Drug Abuse.

H. Res. 739. Expanded Federal Student Intern Program to interns for employment during the summer months.

H.R. 7352. Establishes an Institute for collecting information on and training officials for the treatment and control of juvenile offenders.

H.R. 11112. Provides individual income tax deductions for Vo-Tech and other higher education cost.

H.R. 14552. Allows single individuals same tax benefits as married persons.

## SENATE—Tuesday, August 8, 1972

The Senate met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, we thank Thee for every day Thou dost give us. Especially do we thank Thee for the occasional flashes of pure beauty, pure goodness, pure love which show us Thy nature and our possibilities—and throws into vivid contrast the littleness of man, the ugliness of the human scene, the cruelty, greed, oppression and hatred exposed by sin. Spare us from cozy acquiescence with things as they are, from turning away from man's failures when Thou hast promised grace and wisdom to those who call upon Thee.

We lift our hearts to Thee for strength to live by the moral and spiritual imperatives which lift and help and heal. Here at this place of daily prayer and hourly toil help us to empty ourselves of everything which excludes Thy spirit and help us to live the life of active collaboration with the divine in all that is human. Accept us as we say in the depths of our being "Here am I, Lord, use me."

For Thy name's sake. Amen.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 3645) to further amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15641) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. FISHER, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. LENNON, Mr. HAGAN, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. BRAY, Mr. PIRNIE, Mr. CLANCY, and Mr. POWELL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, August 7, 1972, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Environment of the Committee on Commerce; the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary; the Committee on Government Operations; the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs; the Committee on Armed Services; the Committee on Foreign Relations; the Committee on Public Works; the Committee on Finance; and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider a nomination on the Executive Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.