

to the United States of persons alleged to have committed aircraft piracy against the laws of the United States or international law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 16376. A bill to terminate the Airlines mutual aid agreement; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.R. 16377. A bill to provide for the maintenance of a register listing the names of certain persons who have had their motor vehicle operator's licenses denied or withdrawn and to allow more efficient use of that information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 16378. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in Los Angeles County in the State of California; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. St GERMAIN (for himself, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, and Mr. STOKES):

H.R. 16379. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish national parks or national recreation areas in those States which presently do not have a national park or national recreation area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWENDEL:

H.R. 16380. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage and assist the several States in carrying out a program of animal health research; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN (for himself, Mr. KEITH, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. DANIEL

of Virginia, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. DERWIN-SKI, Mr. DU PONT, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. KING, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MCKEVITT, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MOSHER, and Mr. St GERMAIN):

H.R. 16381. A bill establishing a Council on Energy Policy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN (for himself, Mr. KEITH, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. STEELE, Mr. VEYSEY, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H.R. 16382. A bill establishing a Council on Energy Policy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.J. Res. 1286. Joint resolution to waive the requirements of section 431(b) of the General Education Provisions Act and section 495 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 in the case of rules, regulations, guidelines, instructions, and application forms for student loans under the guaranteed student loan program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Con. Res. 686. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the accounting and return of all American prisoners in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER:

H. Res. 1099. Resolution amending the rules of the House with respect to the jurisdiction of the Committee on House Administration; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SISK (for himself, Mr. BOLING, Mr. YOUNG of Texas, Mr. SMITH of California, and Mr. LATTA):

H. Res. 1100. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide for the use of electronic equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

419. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the preservation and protection of an archaeological site, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 16383. A bill for the relief of Matias J. Rubang and his wife, Ignacia C. Rubang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. Res. 1101. Resolution referring the bill H.R. 16353 entitled "A bill for the relief of the Cuban Truck & Equipment Company, its heirs and assigns" to the Chief Commissioner of the U.S. Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

271. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Kenneth R. Statler, Richmond, Va. et al., relative to clemency for Lt. William L. Calley; to the Committee on Armed Services.

272. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. E. L. Adams, Greenville, S.C. et al., relative to the agreements negotiated by the President in Moscow; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

273. Also, petition of Mrs. Charles Quick, Baltimore, Md. et al., relative to victory in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MONROE COUNTY CLERK CLOYCE MENEFEE

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would call to the attention of my colleagues Monroe County and its county clerk Cloyce Menefee of Holiday, Mo., in the Ninth District which recently received recognition in the Santa Barbara News-Press:

[From the Santa Barbara (Calif.) News-Press, July 24, 1972]

A TOWN'S TRADITION WORKS FOR MCGOVERN
(By Kevin P. Phillips)

PARIS, Mo.—Paris, France, and this small Missouri farm town are worlds apart. Here the phone booth in front of the county courthouse smells of hay and Purina chows, and Main Street looks like a Sinclair Lewis reject. No Confederate monument stands guard, but people hereabout fought with the South during the Civil War, and the drive-in movie down the road in Audrain County is named "Little Dixie."

In most ways, Paris, Mo., typifies the conservative, tradition-oriented U.S. countryside. Therefore, it may come as a shock that Paris—and Monroe County, Mo.—are almost

certain to join Bella Abzug and Jerry Rubin in casting their November votes for Sen. George McGovern.

The reason? Quite simple. Monroe is Missouri's banner Democratic County. This northeastern part of the state, known as "Little Dixie," was settled between 1810 and 1830 by Virginians, Kentuckians, and Tennesseans. Counties, towns, streets, hotels: they all seem to be named for the "Virginia dynasty" of Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and James Monroe. Pro-Confederate during the Civil War, Monroe County voted heavily Democratic thereafter. More recently, Monroe Countians have remained loyal enough that Catholic Al Smith beat Herbert Hoover 3:1 in 1928 and Adlai Stevenson whupped Dwight Eisenhower by the same ratio in 1956.

Not that local party leaders have much good to say about George McGovern. On the contrary. Even so, they shrug, "he's the Democratic nominee," and they expect to be able to carry the county for him in November. There is an important political lesson in this: that the wheels of American political realignment grind exceedingly slow. When the votes are finally counted next fall, George McGovern will undoubtedly owe a lot more of his support of plain old tradition than his young "New Politics" zealots suspect (or will admit). And similarly, the much touted "youth vote" will probably fall well short of the New Left's cohesive expectations.

Now for the converse. Any Nixon strategist driving through Monroe County—rural, con-

servative and Southern-oriented as it is—would have every reason to picture it as a snap for Richard Nixon to carry against a man like George McGovern. But the President got only 30 percent of the county vote in 1968, and local estimates credit him with just 35-40 percent in November. Under these circumstances, is the idea of a 1972 realignment valid?

I think so. Realignment in U.S. politics is mostly a matter of 7 percent in one county and 12 percent in another. To be sure, a few volatile constituencies will swing 25-50 percent on a single issue (especially the isolationist upper Farm Belt and the race-conscious Deep South). But by and large, America's major political shifts have been built on a nickel here and a dime here.

In this context, Monroe County does have a story to tell. First of all, local Democrats generally agree that some of George McGovern's views are quite unpopular. Privately, some will hint that a "disaster" could have occurred even in Monroe County if the South Dakotan hadn't selected Missouri's popular young Sen. Thomas Eagleton as his running mate.

Secondly, Democratic politics do expect Nixon to gain over 1968, inevitably setting a GOP presidential record in the process. More than ever before, the Republican Party is getting active—and organized—in Monroe County. If the national Democratic Party continues to move in the McGovern direction, local leaders admit, Monroe County will continue to move toward the GOP.

Third, current voter interest augurs well

for President Nixon. Monroe, like other rural Missouri counties, does not have actual voter registration. On primary day or election day, people simply go to the polls and vote. As County Clerk Cloyce Menefee says, "everybody knows everybody," and judges are on hand to prevent the occasional fraud. Elderly and incapacitated persons can ask ahead of time for absentee ballots, and Menefee says that the "one abnormal circumstance" so far in 1972 is that the bulk of the absentee requests—for the first time ever—is coming from persons known to intend a Republican vote.

It doesn't add up to any big local upheaval. But that is the genius of the American political system. Slow change acts as a damper. In France, political revolution comes overnight in the streets of Paris, but in Paris, Missouri—and in the United States as a whole—it comes 7 percent and 12 percent at a time.

EARLY INTERVENTION AND LEARNING DISABILITIES

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, Dr. George A. Williams, a pediatrician from my hometown of Idaho Falls, was one of the featured speakers at the recent Idaho Early Childhood Conference which I sponsored to focus on the needs of young children. Dr. Williams delivered a timely and informative address on the impact of early intervention in learning disabilities, and I include his speech in the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

THE IMPACT OF EARLY INTERVENTION IN LEARNING DISABILITIES (By Dr. George Williams)

This discussion is given from the basis of a psycho-educational child health therapist rather than as a pediatrician. For a more detailed outline and discussion of a child's health needs of our pediatric population, I refer you to the American Academy of Pediatrics excellent monograph entitled "Lengthening Shadows." My desire with this present discussion is to further us along the path to a better understanding of the causes, ramifications and treatment of learning disorders.

STATISTICS

If one would consider that an accurate extension of the term "Learning Disorder" would include and encompass all types of communication problems, then one would be able to appreciate the impact and meaning of our most recent statistics as follows. It is estimated that one-half of one percent of all live births yield a child who is mentally retarded. Approximately 10% of all school age children have some impediment to their learning. If this projected to the nation's population, then there are approximately 30 million people who have their learning ability compromised. Further analysis of these statistics show that 80% of these people are male and, interestingly, of the 20% who comprise the female group, psychological overlay is an important factor. The Justice Department has disclosed figures that indicate that 75% of their clients are either poor or non-readers. Previous data has shown that if the child with the learning disability is detected by age eight, the chances of amelioration of all or majority of the difficulties are about 60-40. If he goes to puberty, which is only four years later, then only approximately 20% of these children will really be helped. These are not "perpetual" statistics but these

pertain to only now, with our present day tools and our present "batting average." We can do infinitely better.

WHAT ARE OUR PROBLEMS?

1. Detection: We wait too late. 80% of all a child will learn is accomplished by the age of 6 (Bloom has estimated that 50% is learned by the age of 4). 60% of all a child will ever be able to accomplish physically has been accomplished by age 8. These physical abilities are important because they are one of our perceptual modalities and in part are a yardstick of our degree of maturation.

2. Labeling: Experience in the educational field alone has shown that we must label. We label our grades kindergarten, 1, 2, 3, 4, etc. We give grades A, B, C, D, E, etc. In fact an example of my own involvement in this was that of a student at the University of Florida Medical School. We did away with grades. We gave only passing or failing. However, it became readily apparent that there were some who were doing superior work so the grade of superior was added, and then, subsequently, the professors found that some people who were passing were only barely passing so the grade of "pass minus" was given, so we ended up with superior, pass, pass minus and fail, back to the old A, B, C, D method. But most importantly we label IQ wise. Very often a verbal test is given to ascertain the functioning IQ of a child but usually these children are non-verbal, normal children, that is, they are normal in all respects except that they score very poorly on verbal tests. The scores subsequently are low and the child is labeled as mentally retarded. With this he is injected into the educational system as a mentally retarded child and often he stays there until he is ejected out.

3. We err too often: Very often one misses a diagnosis but more tragically is the fact that no one ever, or rarely, challenges the authorities, if they do, they are considered rabble rousers. For instance, the mother who knows that her child is normal but who beleaguers the school authorities to re-evaluate the child knowing that he should be in the regular classroom. All too often these mothers are right but the manner in which the children are evaluated is really not adequate. Just as too often, the child who has a relative amount of emotional overlay, is assumed to be able to do well if "he would only try". The root problem is not seen, that is, the specific problem that is causing this child's inability to learn and faced with failure time and time again, he then develops a reactive attitude toward it and then appears to be the troublemaker.

4. What can be done? We must update constantly our screening procedures, but we must screen and we must screen early. If we waited until age 5 or 6 to screen when our children have already learned 60% of all they will ever learn and have already learned it in a wrongly and/or inadequate manner, then they start out with two strikes against them. We must have kindergarten and pre-kindergarten screening and then we must have the facilities and educational therapists to educate these children. We must stop labeling and we must evaluate and re-evaluate constantly. We must challenge ourselves and our diagnoses and we must become part of a team. There is no room for an individual appraisal of these children. Each discipline is vital if a truly comprehensive and effective program is to be provided.

I would like to give an example of how a team approached the problem of Educable Mentally Retarded children. This team was located in the Fullerton Union High School District of Fullerton, California. This team consisted of a learning specialist, a psychologist, a teacher of the educable handicapped children, school nurse, a representative of the administration and a physician. Fullerton Union High School District consists of 7 high schools of 1500 to 2200 chil-

dren per school, with an average of approximately 14,000 students to 20,000 students attending in any one given year. The special programs provided under the Department of Pupil Services are designed and administered by Mr. Walter Retzlaff. The classes for the EMR receive their students primarily from a feeder system of the elementary and junior high school districts with additional students coming in as new referrals. On an intake evaluation the child is given regular IQ testing, utilizing the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC). Why, would one ask is this specific test given? Most M.R. have a verbal disability. The WISC will comprehensively evaluate those strengths in the performance areas. Specific nonverbal tests are given. If subtests on the WISC indicate an impression of unexpected deficiency in the communicative areas, then an Illinois Test for Psycho-Linguistic Abilities (I.T.P.A.) is given. By this means we specifically designate the areas of perceptual/communicative dysfunction elucidated and then educational therapy is started. This educational therapy is specifically tailored for each child and for each specific learning problem. These children will then advance to a transitional program. This has recently been more specifically called an integrated program in which the child enters into the regular program attending regular class with regular students, but he returns back to the MER classroom for specific help in his problem areas. The result of all this is that at graduation this child graduates as a high school graduate and is awarded a diploma rather than a certificate of completion. This is *Success!* Just as important as the intelligence testing, the child has been given a full care study including developmental history and with the utilization of the full committee involvement, the objectives of education and the needs of each individual are determined. This program was started in 1969-1970 school year and has involved since then a total of 355 students.

Now I would like to ask the question, specifically, to those present. Why is there no more interest and effort on the part of the state and national governments directed to this enormously vital area of child health? Why are some areas of our nation and even our state leaps and bounds ahead of others in incorporating and putting in to use in the school programs what we already know about learning problems in children? Why is one citizen and taxpayer given up-to-date scientific educational programs (though they are a rarity) while other children still learn under the circumstances and with the tools common at the turn of the century? I do not hesitate to criticize because my criticism is a challenge. Also, I have recommendations that I frequently and freely give and I am happy to use this meeting as a platform for such.

1. My first recommendation is for a kindergarten program, state and/or federally funded as a part of the regular educational profile available to each child. This must not be an extension of the nursery school and baby sitting programs, but an integral part of the learning process. Screening for this program should begin in the 3 and 4 year olds. We must recognize the mentally gifted early as well as the disabled. At this time the child should have available to him an educational program of which he may take advantage if it is the desire of the parent just as our programs are available now. Certainly, if a child's problem is detected early and if the parents are motivated, they will take advantage of the educational programs available to benefit their children whether it is an advanced or accelerated program for the mentally gifted or if it is a program tailor made to remediate the learning problems of the child that had been detected. Re-evaluations yearly until the child has entered into the educational

experience should greatly limit the number of children who will end up as educationally handicapped youngsters in their preteens.

2. When the child has begun his educational experience, he should not be labeled and hampered by artificial categories, e.g., MR, kindergarten, first grade, mentally gifted, etc., but he should have a *fluid* program through which he may move at the pace that he can best achieve his maximum. Grades only tantalize and punish the exceptional student and in the "regular" student grades indoctrinate them to score high, not necessarily learn.

3. I recommend a living wage for teachers commensurate with the responsibility not their worth. We pay them less than any other professional and most of our laborers. We must encourage excellence in our teachers and we must assist them in updating their techniques. As we motivate our children so must we motivate our teachers. We must have more and more educational therapists to deal with the exceptional student.

4. I recommend state workshops, district workshops, national workshops. We must disseminate what we know to the rest of our colleagues. We must constantly update ourselves. Less important is the huge umbrella of federal investigation into problems of children, if it is only going to stay in Washington. These people who investigate problems of children interpret the needs of the individual, provide programs and then delegate responsibility should be out in the fields, seeing what the problems really are. We must have local representatives in Washington telling our academicians what their problems are in their local communities. We must have these local people, teachers, therapists, physicians, not only available, but involved in the process of providing programs.

5. To challenge our programs there must be ongoing research just as in cancer or heart disease. We must look for the etiology of our disabilities as well as for their specific therapy.

COAST GUARD WEEK

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, a proclamation by Alaska State Governor William A. Egan emphasizes the close and effective relationship between the U.S. Coast Guard and the State of Alaska. August 4, 1790 marked the creation of the Coast Guard, and August 12, 1967, was the date that the town of Sitka welcomed the Alaska Patrol. Since the occasions fall so closely together, the week of July 31 through August 5, 1972, has been proclaimed as Coast Guard Week in Alaska.

The proclamation follows:

PROCLAMATION—COAST GUARD WEEK

One hundred and eighty-two years ago, on August 4, 1790, President George Washington signed into law a bill creating the young Nation's first sea-going military force. The act called for the establishment and support of ten cutters for the purpose of enforcing customs laws. Called the Revenue Cutter Service, the agency grew with the years, joining together with the Lifesaving Service, Lighthouse Service, and the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation. Today this multi-missioned service is known as the United States Coast Guard.

Seventy-seven years after President Washington signed that bill, on August 12, 1867, the remote and rugged town of Sitka, located in the brand-new Alaska Purchase,

welcomed the first in a long series of distinguished visitors. The Revenue Cutter Lincoln had arrived to establish a service that continues to this day—the Alaska Patrol.

These two anniversaries, falling as closely together as they do, emphasize the close and effective relationship that has always existed between the Coast Guard and the State of Alaska. From Barrow to Ketchikan, Coast Guardsmen of the Seventeenth District provide the search and rescue, law enforcement, marine safety, environmental protection, and aids to navigation services so essential to a state nearly surrounded by the sea.

With a new base at Kodiak, new helicopters at Kodiak and Annette, and new challenges from the Arctic Circle to Valdez, the Coast Guard in Alaska is entering a period of growth and development that matches perfectly the vigor and spirit of the Fortyninth State.

Therefore, I, William A. Egan, Governor of Alaska, proclaim the week of July 31 through August 5, 1972, as Coast Guard Week in Alaska. It has been 182 years since the establishment of this proud service, and few realize as well as Alaskans how well it has lived up to its motto: "Semper Paratus"—Always Ready.

Dated this 28th day of July, 1972.

PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1972

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, on August 7 the Committee on Public Works reported favorably H.R. 16071, containing amendments to the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. Subject to a rule being granted on H.R. 16071, this bill is scheduled for floor action on Wednesday of this week.

The continuing problem of high unemployment in the Nation, with almost 5 million of our citizens without jobs, makes H.R. 16071 of utmost importance at this time. The bill contains a number of very important provisions aimed at immediately reducing unemployment and at fostering long-term economic growth.

Included among these provisions is extension for an additional year, through fiscal 1974, of the existing economic development program, which is designed to assist in the long-term economic growth of depressed areas and regions of the Nation.

Also included in the bill is expansion of the highly successful program of public works acceleration enacted into law last year to help in providing immediate employment for the jobless through construction of badly needed public works projects.

H.R. 16071 also addresses several important areas of concern through new provisions designed to assist businesses threatened with shutdown and individuals who become unemployed because of standards and orders issued to improve the quality of our Nation's environment.

With permission, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point a complete analysis of H.R. 16071 for Members to examine before the bill comes to the floor this week. The analysis is as follows:

H.R. 16071: SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS, PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1972

	Section of bill	Amends act section
Amends statement of purpose.	2.....	2.....
Would add 2 new sentences to the purpose clause to recognize that economic distress has brought about substantial migration which is frustrating orderly national growth and aggravating economic and social conditions in both rural areas and central cities, and that orderly growth should recognize economic disorders.	2.....	2.....
Amends title I (Public facility grants and supplementary grants).	3.....	3.....
Technical amendment to correct reference to identify new section number for Public Works impact program criteria.	3(1).....	101(a)(1)(D).
Reduces the required minimum non-Federal share of aggregate cost of a project from 20 percent to 10 percent.	3(2).....	101(c).
Technical amendment to correct reference to identify new section number for areas designated under the public works impact program.	3(3).....	101(c)
Deletes the sentence that requires that supplemental grant funds be for the sole purpose of increasing the Federal contribution above the fixed maximum portion of the cost of a project otherwise authorized by the applicable law.	3(4).....	101(c)
Deletes the language that requires the Secretary, in determining the amount of the supplemental grant, to take into consideration the amount of user charges or other revenues a project may reasonably be expected to generate over and above costs for operation and maintenance.	3(5).....	101(c)
Technical amendments to strike the phrase, "In addition to the assistance otherwise authorized" to eliminate possible inference that other assistance is authorized for the areas designated under this section.	3(6).....	102(a)
Technical amendments to retain Appalachian assistance restrictions on projects approved under this title other than public works impact programs.	3(7).....	104
Extends the annual authorization of \$800,000,000 through fiscal year 1974 for projects under this title other than public works impact projects.	3(8).....	105
Adds new sec. 107 to set out criteria for designation of "public works impact areas" and to authorize appropriations for public works impact program. Authorizes an annual appropriation up to \$500,000,000 for fiscal years 1973 and 1974.	3(9).....
Amends title II (Public Facility Loans and Financial Assistance for Business Development).	4.....
Extends annual authorization of \$170,000,000 for assistance under this title for fiscal year 1974.	4(1).....	201(c).
Amends catchline for business loan program to be "Financial Assistance for Business Development."	4(2).....	202.
Rewrites subsection to include, in addition to what already is authorized in this section, new tools for guaranteeing loans and leases to private borrowers up to 90 percent of the outstanding balance of a loan and up to 90 percent of the remaining rental payments under a lease.	4(3).....	202(a).
Includes guarantees under restrictions on financial assistance.	4(4).....	202(b)(6).
Extends 25-year time limit on term of loans to include guarantees.	4(5).....	202(b)(7)
Increases maximum Federal loan assistance participation under this section from 65 percent to 75 percent.	4(6).....	202(b)(9)
Amends title III (Technical Assistance Research and Information).	5.....

	Section of bill	Amends act section		Section of bill	Amends act section		Section of bill	Amends act section
Adds language to permit the Secretary to assist applicants in applying for assistance where the applicant does not possess the expertise or the ability to obtain the expertise necessary to perform the technical aspects of application.	5(1)-----	301(a)	Adds a new subsec. (f) to require commissions to provide for public participation in their planning process.	7(a)(2)-----	503.	New title VIII—Environmental effects: Adds new sec. 801 authorizing \$100,000,000 for the Secretary to provide to each individual certified as being unemployed as a result of an environmental standard or order assistance in the following manner:	9-----	
Permits the Secretary to defray up to 100 percent of the economic development planning expenses of an Indian tribe.	5(2)-----	301(b)	Adds the payment of administrative expenses to the commissions' existing authority for technical and planning assistance.	7(a)(3)-----	505(a)(2).	(1) Unemployment compensation equal to at least 60 percent of the individual's former weekly wage to be paid as long as he is unemployed or until he retires from the labor force but in no event more than 78 weeks;		
Inserts a more accurate reference to planning and research grants authorized under the Federal highway laws.	5(3)-----	301(b)	Rewrites subsection to permit the Secretary to deduct such sums as are necessary for technical assistance provided by the Secretary to the Commissions, for expenses of the Federal cochairmen and staff, and for the Federal share of Commission expenses out of the appropriations to each regional commission but not to exceed 10 percent of such appropriation.	7(a)(4)-----	505(c).	(2) Mortgage and rental payments up to 1 year for those individuals who have received notice of foreclosure on mortgage or eviction from principal place of residence;		
Adds two new subsections: subsec. (g) is added to authorize assistance to States to: (1) prepare State OEDP's (2) provide State assistance to economic development districts; and (3) review district OEDP's in order to better coordinate planning on State and district levels.	5(4)-----	301	Rewrites sec. 509(d) as 509(d)(1) to provide for the addition of a new subsec. (d)(2).	7(a)(5)-----	505(d).	(3) Reemployment assistance authorized under other laws;		
Subsec. (h) is added to authorize the Secretary to provide assistance to economic development districts to better coordinate planning between districts and local government and to provide financial assistance to districts that have the responsibility of Federal review process.			Changes a 2-fiscal-year authorization for fiscal years 1972 and 1973 of \$305,000,000 to a 1-fiscal-year authorization for fiscal year 1972 of \$152,500,000.	7(a)(6)-----	509(d).	(4) moving expenses for family and effects when unable to find employment at a reasonable distance but does find employment beyond such distance.		
Would redesignate sec. 302 as sec. 303. New 302 would authorize grants for the operation of vocational training facilities constructed with grants from title I of this act. Such grants may be made up to 75 percent of operation costs within any 2-year period during 5-year period beginning with the date of enactment of this amendment. Not more than \$15,000,000 per year would be made available for this purpose.	5(5)-----	302	Technical amendment changing word "authorization" to "paragraph" to reflect new authorization paragraph" (2).	7(a)(7)-----	509(d)	Adds new sec. 802 to preserve jobs that otherwise would be lost as a result of the enforcement of environmental control legislation by providing long-term low-interest (30-year, 3 percent) loans to business enterprises for pollution control. Would authorize \$100,000,000 annually for fiscal years 1973 and 1974 for this purpose.		
Extends authorization of \$50,000,000 per fiscal year to carry out this title for fiscal year 1974.	5(6)	303	Adds a new para. (2) to authorize for fiscal years 1973 and 1974 \$100,000,000 annually for each regional commission with an economic plan approved by the Secretary and up to \$20,000,000 annually for each regional commission without an approved economic plan.	7(a)(8)-----	509(d).	Amends sec. 2 of the act of July 6, 1970 (Public Law 91-304) as amended, to extend the moratorium on redevelopment area de-designation to June 1, 1974.	10-----	
Amends title IV (Area and District Eligibility)	6		Rewrites sec. 511 as new subsec. 511(a) to add technical assistance grants to the activities that the Secretary and each Federal cochairman must coordinate.	7(a)(9)-----	511.	Amends act to rename "economic development center" or "economic development centers" as "economic growth center" or "economic growth centers".	11-----	
Redefines special impact areas as both urban and rural communities suffering from low income, substantial unemployment, or threatened abrupt rise in unemployment.	6(1)	401 (a) (6)	New subsec. 511(b) adds the requirement that each regional commission coordinate with districts within the region in preparing long-range regional overall economic development programs under sec. 503(a)(2) and in developing continuing comprehensive plans and programs and in establishing priorities as required under sec. 503(a)(7).					
Reduces economic development district requirement of two redevelopment areas to 1 redevelopment area.	6(2)	403(a)(1)(B)	A freestanding amendment which refers to sec. 7(a)(2) of the bill which declares that this section is not to be construed as affecting any plan or program developed or revised prior to the date of enactment of this legislation.	7(b)-----				
Rewrites subparagraph to expand district criteria to require that each State approve district plans as being consistent with State plans and to require that approved district plans be furnished to the appropriate Regional Commission.	6(3)	403 (a) (1) (D)	Amends title VII (Powers of Secretary).	8				
Amends subpar. which presently limits "economic development centers" to areas with a population up to 250,000 to areas with a population up to 500,000.	6(4)	403(a) (2) (C)	Includes in this paragraph guarantees made by the Secretary to authorize the Secretary to dispose of property and collect, compromise, or dispose of obligations held in connection with guarantees made by him.	8(1)	701(4)			
Combines existing definition subsecs. (d) (e) and (f) into new subsection (d).	6(5)	403(d) (e) (f)	Includes in this paragraph guarantees made by the Secretary to authorize the Secretary to extend the terms of guarantees for an additional period of not more than 10 years to aid in orderly liquidation.	8(2)	701(5)			
New subsection (e) permits assistance to nonredevelopment areas within a district when such assistance would be of significant direct benefit to a redevelopment area in such district.			Includes in this paragraph guarantees made by the Secretary to authorize the Secretary to deal with, alter, or sell real or personal property acquired by him in connection with guarantees made.	8(3)	701(6)			
New subsec. (f) assures a minimum of 5 years of administrative and planning grants up to 75 percent and 100 percent respectively, and provides a separate authorization of \$20,000,000 per fiscal year for fiscal years 1973 and 1974 for such district funding.			Includes in this paragraph guarantees made by the Secretary to authorize the Secretary to pursue to final collection claims against 3d parties in connection with guarantees made under the act.	8(4)	701(7)			
Extends existing annual authorization of \$50,000,000 for assistance to economical development centers and bonuses to redevelopment areas within districts through fiscal year 1974.	6(6)-----	403(g).	Includes in this paragraph guarantees made by the Secretary to authorize the Secretary to take all actions desirable in administratively dealing with or realizing on guarantees made.	8(5)-----	701(9).			
Amends title V (Regional Action Planning Commissions) Adds to the functions of the commission the requirement that commissions consider district plans be considered in developing comprehensive and coordinated plans and programs, and in establishing priorities in the region.	7(a)----- 7(a)(1)-----	503(a)(7).						

MASSACRE IN BINHDINH

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I include the following editorial from the Evening Star, published August 14, 1972:

AN EDITORIAL—MASSACRE IN BINHDINH

It is a fervently held article of liberal faith that if the United States will just get out of Indochina, all will be sweetness and light among the Vietnamese people, North and South, Communist and non-Communist. Those who chant this doxology ignore the execution of thousands of Vietnamese and flight of tens of thousands more when the Communists took over in the North in 1954. They ignore the mass graves containing the bodies of more than 2,600 South Vietnamese civilians murdered at Hue during the 1968 Tet offensive. So they should have no difficulty whatsoever in glossing over the less numerous casualties of the more calculated reign of terror which has taken place at Binh Dinh province on the central coast of South Vietnam the past three months.

Binh Dinh fell quickly to the North Vietnamese in early April and it was not until July that Saigon's forces launched a serious effort to retake it. So the Communists had plenty of time. There was no need to hurry, as there was in Hue in 1968, when American and South Vietnamese forces counterattacked within days of the city's fall.

According to intelligence reports and on-the-spot interviews with survivors, the Communists were extremely methodical. They rounded up hamlet and village chiefs, pacification workers, policemen, militiamen, teachers, doctors, nurses, clerical workers, literally anyone who had had any connection with the Saigon government. "People's courts" executed several hundred (perhaps as many as 500) and shipped an estimated 6,000 others off to "people's prisons" in remote areas of the Communist-held An Lao valley. Most of those killed apparently were executed by rifle fire but others were buried alive, beheaded or hacked to pieces.

None of this represents any new departure in tactics on Hanoi's part. Aside from the general massacres in the North in 1954 and in the South during the 1968 Tet offensive, the murder and kidnapping of South Vietnamese officials has been part and parcel of Communist "liberation" since the war began. In the past four and a half years, nearly 25,000 South Vietnamese civilians and officials have been executed by the North Vietnamese Communists and the Viet Cong.

There have, of course, been atrocities on the Allied side. But anyone who is still prepared to maintain that a Communist takeover in South Vietnam would not lead to a bloodbath of major dimensions is simply ignoring the evidence at hand. A politician like Senator McGovern, who advocates a quick and unilateral American withdrawal from Southeast Asia, need look no farther than the shallow graves of Binh Dinh province to see where the policies he advocates would lead those who have placed their trust in the United States.

"THE NEW FRONTIER"

HON. JOHN W. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention and to the attention of all the Members of Congress a poem entitled "The New Frontier." This fine poem was written by Ronnie Ted Shiflett, a good friend and constituent from Rome, Ga. I am sure that we are all grateful to Ronnie Shiflett for his moving poem, dedicated to the memory of our late President John F. Kennedy, and I commend it for the edification and enjoyment of all as follows:

DEDICATED TO THE MEMORY OF OUR LATE
PRESIDENT, JOHN F. KENNEDY

(By Ronnie Ted Shiflett)

The tides of time are drifting high
Above the earth to wash the sky
And one by one, each surging wave
Shall flow into a twilight bay

The tides of time are drifting high
Above the rocks along the shore
And one by one, each sweeping wave
Shall cleanse the sand forevermore

The tides of time are drifting high
Beyond this world of darkening sod
To send its spray on yonder shore
And wash the face of God

The tides of time are drifting high
Beyond the old for a new frontier
And every wave shall wash away
Every dark and troublesome fear
From every weary heart that hears,
The tides of time are drifting high—

STAMPS THAT HONOR ILLINOIS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Illinois, the eighth State to be admitted to the Union after the Original Thirteen, has played an important role in the history of our Republic. One of her sons was the civilian who led the Nation through the terrible conflict that threatened to permanently divide it, while another was the military leader who was in the forefront of the fight against the forces of disunion. Many other Illinoisans have had an influence that extended far beyond the borders of the State.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I naturally maintain an interest in both the history and the new developments in the Postal Service, and I am pleased to direct the attention of the Members to a historic review of stamps issued which properly commemorates achievements relating to my home State of Illinois and its outstanding citizens.

The Post Office has, from time to time, beginning in 1866, issued stamps that pertain to Illinois individuals, organizations, and events. Knowing that philatelists and students of history are interested in such data, I am inserting a list of these issues in the Record.

The list follows:

The following stamps have honored Abraham Lincoln:

In 1866, 15 cents, black; 1869, 90 cents, carmine and black; 1870, 6 cents, carmine; 1890, 4 cents, dark brown; 1894, 4 cents, dark brown; 1902, 5 cents, blue; 1909, 2 cents, carmine; 1922, 3 cents, violet; 1938, 16 cents, black.

October 20, 1940; 3 cents, deep violet with "Emancipation," a statue of Lincoln and a slave, commemorates the 75th anniversary of the 13th amendment to the Constitution.

July 7, 1942; 5 cents, bright blue with Lincoln, Sun Yat-sen, and map of China, commemorates 5 years' resistance of the Chinese people to Japanese aggression.

November 19, 1948; 3 cents, bright blue with Lincoln and a quotation from his Gettysburg Address, commemorates the 85th anniversary of the address.

In 1954, 4 cents red violet.

August 27, 1958; 4 cents sepia with Lincoln and Stephen Arnold Douglas, another Illinoisan, debating, commemorates the centenary of the Lincoln-Douglas debates.

February 12, 1959, 1 cent green; February 27, 1959, 3 cents purple; and, May 30, 1959, 4 cents dark blue, commemorate the sesquicentennial of Lincoln's birth.

November 19, 1960; 4 cents magenta and green, contains a Lincoln quotation. In 1960, 25 cents black and maroon air-mail.

August 16, 1963; 5 cents dark blue, black, and red, commemorates the centenary of Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation and contains a Lincoln quotation.

April 9, 1965; 5 cents Prussian blue and black, which contains a Lincoln quotation, commemorates the centenary of Gen. Robert E. Lee's surrender to Gen. Ulysses S. Grant at Appomattox Court-house.

November 19, 1965; 4 cents black.

Besides the Lincoln stamp that was issued on April 9, 1965, the following postage stamps have honored Grant: 1890, 5 cents chocolate; 1894, 5 cents chocolate; 1903, 4 cents brown; 1923, 8 cents olive green; 1937, 3 cents purple with Gens. William T. Sherman and Philip H. Sheridan; 1938, 18 cents brown carmine.

The following stamps commemorate the World's Columbian Exposition that was held in Chicago from May 1 to October 30, 1893, in observance of the quadricentennial of the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus on October 12, 1492:

Columbus in sight of land, 1 cent deep blue; landing of Columbus, 2 cents violet; flagship of Columbus, 3 cents green; fleet of Columbus, 4 cents ultramarine; Columbus soliciting aid from Isabella, 5 cents chocolate; Columbus welcomed at Barcelona, 6 cents purple; Columbus restored to favor, 8 cents magenta; Columbus presenting natives, 10 cents black brown; Columbus announcing his discovery, 15 cents dark green; Columbus at La Rabida, 30 cents orange brown; recall of Columbus, 50 cents slate blue; Isabella pledging her jewels, \$1 salmon; Columbus in chains, \$2 brown red; Columbus describing his third voyage, \$3 yellow green; Isabella and Columbus, \$4 crimson lake; Columbus, \$5 black.

Among the stamps that commemorate the Trans-Mississippi Exposition that was held in Omaha, Nebr., from June 1 to November 1, 1898, was the \$2 orange brown which was issued June 17, 1898. Appearing on this stamp is the bridge across the Mississippi River that connected East St. Louis, Ill., and St. Louis, Mo.

The following stamps commemorate the Century of Progress International Exhibition that was held in Chicago during 1933, the centenary of the incorporation of Chicago as a city: May 25, 1933, 1 cent yellow green; restoration of Fort Dearborn, 3 cents violet; Federal building, Chicago, October 2, 1933, 50 cents green airmail issued in connection with the flight of the "Graf Zeppelin" in October 1933, to Miami, Akron, and Chicago, and from Chicago to Europe.

Other stamps of significance to Chicagoans and other Illinoisans include the following:

In 1940; 10 cents dark brown honors Jane Addams, social worker; 3 cents bright red violet honors Cyrus Hall McCormick, inventor; 5 cents ultramarine honors Frances Elizabeth Caroline Willard, who was president of Evanston College for Ladies until it merged with Northwestern University, when she became dean of that institution's woman's college.

February 23, 1955; 8-cent deep blue commemorates the 50th anniversary of the founding of Rotary International; a Chicagoan organized the first Rotary

Club in 1905 and the organization's headquarters are in Evanston, Ill.

August 27, 1959: 10-cent violet blue and bright red airmail commemorates the third Pan American Games, which were held in Chicago from August 27 to September 7, 1959.

September 14, 1959: 4-cent green commemorates the centenary of the American Dental Association, which has its headquarters in Chicago.

October 23, 1965: 5-cent pale blue, black, carmine, and violet blue honors Adlai Ewing Stevenson, who was Governor of Illinois from 1949 to 1953 and the Democratic candidate for President of the United States in 1952 and 1956.

June 8, 1966: 2-cent dark blue and gray honors Frank Lloyd Wright, Chicago architect who became internationally famous.

July 5, 1967: 5-cent blue, red, and black publicizes the search for peace, which was the theme of an essay contest for young men and women sponsored by Lions International on its 50th anniversary; the organization was founded June 7, 1917, in Chicago, where it has its headquarters.

February 12, 1968: 6-cent blue, gold, and pink commemorates the sesquicentennial of Illinois' admission to the Union.

The support-our-youth 6-cent red and blue stamp, which was issued during "National Youth Week" in 1968, was sponsored by the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks as part of the lodge's centennial observance; its headquarters are in Chicago.

August 22, 1970: 6-cent black and olive bister honors Edgar Lee Masters, Chicago lawyer, who was famous for his poetic tribute to Ann Rutledge.

DIKE BOMBING AND JANE FONDA

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, the press has recently given a great deal of time and attention to actress Jane Fonda's activities as a guest of the Hanoi Government. I am shocked and outraged by Miss Fonda's denunciation of her country, and her defense of our foes, and I see no difference between her actions and those of the World War II propagandists Axis Sally and Tokyo Rose.

Mr. Bertram Kalisch, of Brandywine, Md., agrees with me. The Washington Star-News printed his letter to the editor on July 31, 1972. For the information of my colleagues, I insert that letter into the Record.

The letter follows:

DIKE BOMBING AND JANE FONDA

Sir: By headlines such as "Dikes Bombed, Cleric Says" and "Reds Quote Jane Fonda" it is easy to see where the enemy gets its "aid and comfort" these days.

Apparently, Dr. Eugene Carson Blake of the World Council of Churches and Jane Fonda, Oscar winner and international babe

in the woods, have joined the Anti Decatur Club with the perverted motto: "My country, always wrong!"

Blake, pontifically wrapped in his World Churches' mantle, quotes Hanoi news sources to declare that American explanations that "no bombing has occurred . . . must be . . . untrue."

While Miss Jane from Hanoi, says she saw bombed ruins "with my own eyes . . . and there are no military targets."

With such "prophetic" and "military" geniuses to advise us, all the President need do is call them to find out what's what. Of course, he may have to wait until these self-appointed know-it-alls call the Hanoi party line; but what are the facts to these fantasy fanatics?

Where were they when the Viet Cong were committing genocide in South Vietnam? Or when the "popular Red offensive" shelled cities for "terror effect" and caused thousands to flee south to avoid the Red shells and rockets?

Some day, may the cleric playing politics and the actress turned instant military expert meet in the Vietnam jungle and return to the primitive life of "Me Gene—you Jane" swinging from tree to tree.

They've already made monkeys of themselves, dancing to the tune of the Hanoi organ grinders.

Brandywine, Md.

BERTRAM KALISCH.

TEAMSTERS PENSION FUND AND ORGANIZED CRIME

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the first part of the article entitled "Central States Pension Fund" appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, today I would like to call your attention to the second part of the article: "Central States Pension Fund Loans in Michigan".

CENTRAL STATES PENSION FUND LOANS IN MICHIGAN

TALES OF FRAUD, KICKBACKS, AND THE MAFIA

Central States Pension Fund loans to businesses in Michigan do not involve the largest amounts loaned by the Fund, nor are they the most spectacular in any other way. In fact, what one could say with a great deal of certainty is that they are typical of the loans granted by the Pension Fund. In this respect, however, a "typical" loan by the Fund has come to include, in many cases, bankruptcy, fraud, kickbacks and the Mafia.

As near as can be determined, the first Pension Fund loan in Michigan was made in June, 1959 to the Park Plaza Motor Hotel in Birmingham, Michigan. The amount borrowed was \$500,000. As of April, 1972—just about 13 years later—the balance was \$202,335. Had that money been put in a savings account which paid 6% interest, the Fund would now have the original \$500,000, plus \$390,000 in interest.

A lengthy investigation by OVERDRIVE has discovered that there have been 27 Pension Fund loans made in Michigan, totaling over \$32 million. As of April this year, the outstanding balance on these loans came to approximately \$28 million. Among those who got money commitments from the central states pension fund are:

Pension fund money in Michigan

Fleetwing Terminal in Detroit—\$300,000 in 1959. This money was lent even though, ac-

cording to Pension Fund records, the company was in "a financial straitjacket." Even as far back as May, 1962, Fleetwing still owed the Fund a balance of \$251,000.

In the same year, the Park Plaza Motor Hotel in Birmingham received a \$500,000 loan. As already mentioned, a balance of over \$202,000 is still outstanding.

Detroit's Henrose Hotel borrowed \$1,600,000 in 1960, and was in financial trouble almost from the beginning. Almost no taxes, principal or interest was ever repaid, and Henrose finished its career in bankruptcy.

The Robinson office building in Detroit was the recipient of a \$335,000 loan in 1959. Financial difficulties were run into as early as 1962, and the loan balance today is over \$302,000.

Country club where the Mafia belongs

In 1961, the Hillcrest Country Club received a \$75,000 loan commitment. Hillcrest is referred to, among many circles, as "The Country Club Where the Mafia Belongs." These members of Detroit's Mafia have been identified as having Class A memberships at Hillcrest: Michael Santo Polizzi, William (Black Bill) Tocco, Anthony and Vito Giacalone, Anthony Zerilli, and Ronald (The Enforcer) Morelli. Rubbing elbows with these members, say concerned law enforcement officials, are a number of judges.

Bancroft Nursing Home in Detroit borrowed \$1,100,000 in 1962; in April, 1972, the balance was \$439,000.

The same year was a lucky one for Transport Realty, which got an OK for \$250,000. During the same period, the go-ahead was given to Detroit Harbor Terminal for \$5 million, and Dearborn Machinery Moving for \$1,250,000.

In 1963, St. Anne's Convalescent Center in Detroit borrowed \$200,000. As of this year, \$109,000 is still owed.

You pay the fund; it pays you

In the same year, Peoples Outfitting of Detroit received a \$500,000 loan. To date, records indicate \$355,000 is still owing. It is also interesting to note that the employees of this company are Teamsters members, and Peoples pays weekly amounts into the Pension Fund for the supposed benefit of these workers.

Jacob Kozloff, an "associate" of former Nevada Lt. Governor Cliff Jones, and who has been linked to the shadowy world of relationships between Bobby Baker and the Mafia, borrowed \$243,000 from the Fund in 1964, and the business it was for went into bankruptcy before the loan was repaid.

Detroit's Curtis Steel Corporation also borrowed money in 1964. Their original loan of \$150,000 is still \$93,000 short of being repaid.

In 1965, Kirkwood General Hospital in Detroit received a \$1,306,500 loan from the Fund. Between then and July, 1968, a series of Fund loans flowed to them, finally totaling \$2,334,500. Four years later, they still owe over \$2 million to the Fund.

A development called Professional Plaza in Detroit borrowed \$4,860,000 in 1966. This year, they have managed to show a balance owed of more than was borrowed: \$5,088,000.

The Shenandoah Golf Club in Detroit received \$553,000 in 1968, and now owes \$461,000 on it.

Another Detroit hospital—Northwest General—applied for and got a \$1,426,333 loan in 1969; their balance is currently \$1,229,707.

Half a million to Long Transportation

A face well-known to truckers in the midwest borrowed from the Fund in 1970: Wayne Long of Long Transportation in Detroit received a loan of \$554,000. Two years later, he still owed \$538,670 on it. Although it has been checked into, no one seems to be able to learn what the money was used for.

Another 1970 loan shows even less repayment. An outfit called A & C Promotions, Inc., borrowed \$50,055 on a supper club in

Crystal Falls Early this year, they still owed \$50,085 on the two-year old loan.

In apparent keeping with repayment schedules on loans made in 1970 is the H. F. Campbell Company in Detroit. Two years ago, they borrowed \$2,300,000. This year, they still owe \$2,185,880.

"High risk" but gets loan anyway

Built Right Center, Inc., of Detroit, for example, borrowed \$120,000 from the Fund in April, 1971. This loan, it would be presumed, was made because the company was stable enough to pay back the loan, plus interest. However, records obtained from the Michigan Treasury Department show that Built Right's financial condition, just four months before the loan was made, left something to be desired.

One CPA who reviewed their tax form said that he considered them a "high risk," and that this was the type of business that "no bank in the United States would loan money to." Perhaps that is why Built Right owed—two years later—\$141,903 on their \$120,000 loan.

But, Built Right Center is not alone when it comes to being in shaky condition when borrowing money from the Fund.

Flint Motor Inn, located in Flint borrowed \$1,425,000 in November, 1970. Treasury Department documents for the period prior to that (December 31, 1969) show that Flint Motor had \$2 million in outstanding long term loans, \$581,031 in currently due bills, and had just declared a deficit of \$242,431. Yet Flint Motor Inn received their loan less than a year later. As of April, 1972, they still owed \$1,383,888 on it.

Loan arranger is Mafia figure

Pension Fund loans have been made to Michigan companies controlled by the Mafia. One such company is the Home Juice Company in Detroit. In August, 1964, Home Juice received a \$500,000 loan from the Fund. The loan, according to several sources, was obtained when Anthony Giacalone made the arrangements with Jimmy Hoffa, Anthony's brother, Vito, was an officer of Home Juice Company, Inc., when the loan was made. The parent corporation of Home Juice is located in Melrose Park, Illinois, and has subsidiaries in Peoria, Milwaukee and Tulsa. As of this year, Home Juice still owed the Fund \$309,609 on the loan. Although this particular loan by itself doesn't deviate from the pattern of those previously mentioned, those involved in obtaining the loan and running the company, are noteworthy for their other activities.

Overdrive has discovered that the loan arranger—Anthony Giacalone—is one of the directors of the Mafia in Detroit, and is considered their chief enforcer. His arrest/conviction record shows charges of armed robbery, extortion, bribery, felonious assault and rape. Giacalone is considered to be "most important" in Detroit's Mafia structure.

In 1966, Anthony attended the Teamsters convention in Miami Beach as a guest of Jimmy Hoffa, no less. Hoffa commented on Giacalone's presence as "showing respect for a responsible union," and praised Anthony lavishly. Other information has been obtained showing that Anthony Giacalone donated \$25,017 to Hoffa's son, James P., when he unsuccessfully ran for a seat in the Michigan House of Representatives. What was especially interesting about this was that it was three times the total officially reported by Hoffa as campaign expenses.

Vito Giacalone, on the other hand, is a lesser official in the Detroit Mafia. Vito is listed as a lieutenant in the area's organized crime structure, and a "specialist" in gambling operations. In addition, he is considered "as tough as his brother as an enforcer." Vito's arrest record shows 13 entries since 1940.

Who gets the kickback?

Surprising to some, but not unusual within the Teamsters Union, is the method by which Mid-City Development Corporation in Detroit obtained a loan in August, 1964. Mid-City, a real estate firm sought a \$1,250,000 loan, but was told that it could only have \$1,075,000. The balance of \$175,000, it was explained to Mid-City, would have to come off the top for various kickbacks, bribes, etc. This, of course, is in keeping with the long-standing Pension Fund rule of kickbacks being no less than 10% of the total of the loan.

Mid-City, looking for a cut-rate deal, decided to go for the \$1,075,000 loan. The cost of obtaining this amount was more reasonable. By going to a less highly-placed corrupter named Samuel Marroso, Mid-City was only required to pay a \$25,000 kickback. Although Marroso is not in the top ten when it comes to arranging Central States loans, his credentials are impeccable: he is an ex-convict and ex-Teamsters Business Agent (which some may claim is saying the same thing twice) and has been convicted of conspiracy to solicit and accept bribes, income tax evasion, transporting counterfeit bonds and parole violation.

Central States auditor agrees to kickback

The problem for Mid-City still remained, however, as they claimed they still needed the additional \$175,000. The company then approached James (Jimmy Doyle) Plumeri, a Mafia official in New York, and asked if he could be of help in arranging a Central States loan through New York. The Detroit Mafia learned of this proposal, and became justifiably angry. After all, the agreement among Mafia families is that companies within their jurisdiction must deal with the nearest Mafia family; not go outside the area.

Plumeri (currently dead as the result of a Mafia execution) made a deal whereby Central States Pension Fund auditor David Wenger would receive a \$5,000 kickback for arranging the loan.

The ensuing jurisdictional quarrel that resulted between the New York and Detroit Mafia about who would receive what kickback was brought to the attention of the Mafia National Advisory Group. They ruled that an arbitration must take place. This meeting was held in Pittsburgh, and referred by Frank Amato, second-in-command of the Pittsburgh Mafia. Representing the New York Mafia at the meeting were: Salvatore (Sally Burns) Granello, Edward (Eddie Buff) Lanzieri, and Salvatore Celebrino. Pittsburgh's representation included John Larocca, chief of organized crime in western Pennsylvania, and Mafia members Frank J. Rosa, Joseph Sica and Gabriel Mannario. Detroit's viewpoint was put forward by Marroso and Dominic (Fat Dominic) Corrado.

After the dispute was thoroughly aired, the decision was made that the entire loan would be handled by the Detroit Mafia (including kickbacks). After the loan and kickbacks had been finalized, the New York Mafia would receive a percentage.

\$1 Million to Mafia-controlled company

The loans made to another Michigan company are also an insight into Detroit's Mafia. A total of \$1,210,000 has been borrowed by Valley Die Cast Corporation in Detroit. The three loans made to them occurred between October, 1963 and February, 1971.

Until 1967, the President of Valley Die was Michael Santo Polizzi, one of the Directors of the Detroit Mafia who specializes in gambling. By the time Polizzi left, \$910,000 in Central States loans had gone to the company. Valley Die was sold to Dallas-based Intercontinental Industries, but it is believed by several sources that although Polizzi is not there, his influence is. Lending credence to that theory is the fact that the Secretary

of Valley Die is attorney William Murray, who is also the Secretary of another company in which Polizzi is the president, Diversified Platers, Inc., Detroit. It has also been learned that Attorney Murray has represented Polizzi and Mike Rubino, another Detroit Mafia figure.

Polizzi was recently convicted in Los Angeles on 6 felony counts involving the Detroit's Mafia's obtaining a hidden interest in Las Vegas' Frontier Hotel, and then "skimming" profits from it. Two other Mafia figures were convicted with Polizzi in that trial: Anthony Zerilli, son of the chief of the Detroit Mafia and an official in his own right, and Anthony Giardano, head of the St. Louis Mafia.

Fruehauf and a felon in same club

An interesting sidelight discovered by Overdrive is that Polizzi is a member of the exclusive Grosse Pointe Hunt Club outside of Detroit. One official of the club was asked if Polizzi's membership would be revoked because of his recent convictions. No, we were told, a conviction does not prohibit membership; only activities which bring discredit to the club. That answer seems to say something about what "activities" are referred to, and we would be curious to have some examples. In order to learn what these "activities" might be, we attempted to contact one of the Directors of the Grosse Pointe Hunt Club. The one we called was Harvey C. Fruehauf, Jr., of the Fruehauf Trailer Company (and also a neighbor of Polizzi). As might have been expected, Mr. Fruehauf was never in to us.

Two of the current Directors of Valley Die are also associated with Intercontinental Industries. These men—S. Mort Zimmerman and Amon DeNur—pleaded guilty this past January to a total of 5 felony charges involving securities.

Although Valley Die has borrowed \$1,210,000 from the Fund, they still owe \$793,663. How the money benefited Valley Die is certainly open to speculation. A recent tax form of Valley Die was obtained by Overdrive, and a financial expert who reviewed it and said that, based on what it showed the financial condition of the company to be, Valley Die should have gone out of business.

\$4 million to Gil Mains

The most questionable and spectacular Fund loan in Michigan was that to Gil Mains Truck City in Dearborn. Within two years of the first loan, a series of events took place involving the diversion of Pension Fund money to buy a bank, siphoning it off for personal use, and non-payment of the loan with virtually no accounting as to where over \$4 million went.

The main cast of characters involved in this colossal scheme are Gil Mains, former Detroit Lions football star who was president of the truck stop, and the truck stop's vice-president, Charles Kassab, who, together with his brother Frederick, is said to have been involved in some "very disreputable real estate deals."

Central States money diverted in bank scheme

Documents obtained by Overdrive show that out of the first two loans made to Truck City in April and May, 1967 totaling \$3.5 million at least \$770,659 was diverted and used to purchase a controlling stock interest in the Warren Bank in Warren, Michigan.

One law enforcement investigator went even further. He said that the trustees of the Central States Pension knew when the loans were being approved "that the money was to be diverted, not to be used by the company, but to buy stock in the Warren Bank." Also, he claimed, "some of the money was used to pay personal obligations and debts of Gil Mains and Charles Kassab."

A close review of numerous documents and

records by Overdrive has led to the same conclusion.

Trying to trace the loan money

At the time that Truck City money was being used to buy Warren Bank stock, Truck City's vice-president Charles Kassab was on the Bank's Board of Directors, together with Thomas Moylan, a stockholder in Truck City. Other directors of the Warren Bank, and their backgrounds, are worth noting: William Romano, a state senator and co-owner of the Center Line Bar, where a number of gambling arrests have been made; David Lebenbom, Chairman of the Democratic Party of Wayne County; and George Parris, prosecutor of Macomb County whose prosecution practices have been called "questionable," and who has been seen in the company of Mafia figures.

At the same time that Truck City was buying Warren Bank stock, the directors were authorizing a series of loans. For example: within a month, Gil Mains personally borrowed \$256,000. One month later, Gil Mains' Truck City borrowed a total of \$230,000. A short time later, Harold Kassab, a brother of the director, received a \$115,000 loan, and Marvin Petrous, a relative of a Truck City stockholder, borrowed \$15,000. Another borrower at this time was Donald Fitzsimmons, head of Accurate Freight in Detroit, and son of Frank Fitzsimmons, current head of the Teamsters Union. Fitzsimmons received a \$5,000 loan. His involvement with Truck City should also be noted. Court records show that Don Fitzsimmons cashed a \$475 NSF check there, and that another outfit of his, D.E.F. Associates, owes Truck City \$15,360. D.E.F. Associates also laid 2 NSF checks on Truck City—one for \$131.45 and another for \$110.27.

While the transaction just referred to appears simple, the original information it was taken from is a complex tangle of documents requiring, finally, an elaborate chart to trace the flow of monies. These transactions are so incredibly intertwined, in fact, that investigators are still not certain where the money has gone involved in the stock purchases. The burning question, of course, is what really happened to the money received by Gil Mains and his company.

More money loaned after bankruptcy

At Truck City itself, even more money was changing hands. Between April 19, 1967 and August 23, 1968, Central States pumped \$3,550,000 into Truck City. By January 10, 1969, Truck City filed bankruptcy, claiming liabilities of over \$5 million, mostly in unpaid loans. Even after they filed bankruptcy, Central States dumped in another \$578,363.47.

Less than four months after the first loan was received, information obtained by OVERDRIVE shows that Truck City claimed a deficit of more than \$850,000. But at the same time, another source provided documents showing that Truck City had a "substantial balance" in account 70093 in the Bank of Dearborn. In August, 1968, the first of an entire string of tax liens was filed against Truck City. Yet less than three weeks after the first tax lien, another Pension Fund loan was made to Truck City.

But perhaps the most intriguing question involving the millions in Truck City is contained in their financial statements, documents which have been studied in some detail by Overdrive's team of CPAs. As of November 30, 1968, according to these records, Truck City showed a deficit of \$2,340,195. It would be virtually impossible, these experts say, for a truck stop to lose this kind of money—in a normal operation—within two years; especially when there were practically no payments on the massive amounts of money they were loaned.

Fraudulent books?

One hint lies in the \$400,862.26 charged to "unamortized expenses capitalized in con-

struction period." What this means, simply stated, is that the officers of Truck City supposedly had that much in expenses before the truck stop was opened. Or, was this simply a bookkeeping device to funnel out that money for other purposes?

We consulted a veteran auditor to explain how Truck City could have piled up these huge losses in such a short time. After examining the statements, he said,

"Well, if I were investigating this mess, the first thing I would do would be to trace this supposed \$1,500,000 claimed to have been paid in for capital stock. I just can't believe it was ever paid in. If it was not paid in in hard money, then the losses would be fictitious, which would make sense to me."

To prove these inferences beyond a doubt, a lengthy and expensive audit would have to be undertaken to follow every dollar that was supposed to have come into Gil Mains Truck City, and every dollar that went out. Such an investigation would reach far beyond the boundaries of Truck City, and would take a team of crack auditors. For one reason or another, no investigative agency has undertaken this. Until they do, the saga of Gil Mains Truck City and the Central States Pension Fund will be merely one more unexplained episode in the continuing saga of Pension Fund loans.

GRAIN WAREHOUSE FAILURES

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, farmers' grain deposits should be just as safe as money deposits in banks. In many cases they are not.

Where State law is inadequate, the Federal Government should assure farmers against losses from warehouse and elevator failure. Protection is now spotty and uncertain. Kansas, Nebraska, and several other States have good protection systems. In some States, such as Illinois, existing State law is inadequate. Still other States have no laws at all regulating grain warehouse storage.

The current U.S. Warehouse Act provides good protection where it is in effect. But participation in the Federal program is voluntary, and many warehousemen throughout the country choose not to ask for Federal licensing.

Because the need for protection for farmers is becoming increasingly more evident, I am surveying agricultural and grain trade leaders to determine the best legislative way to solve this problem.

The severity of the problem is demonstrated by the situation in Illinois. During the last year, 18 grain elevators have closed their doors, gone into bankruptcy, or lost their State licenses, resulting in more than \$2 million in losses to farmers who had their grain stored in these elevators. One such failure in north central Illinois resulted in losses of over \$900,000 to farmers in the immediate vicinity. Another in southern Illinois cost farmers over \$300,000.

Illinois is not the only State experiencing these financial disasters for farmers. Similar cases have occurred in Indiana and Minnesota.

Because of market conditions and the need for orderly marketing practices,

farmers cannot always wisely sell their grain when it is harvested. Prudence requires that they store it and wait for prices to rise to a level that will provide them a profit.

But when the elevator or warehouse where they have their grain stored fails, be it for poor business practices or outright criminal deception, the farmers are often left with only a percentage of the grain's worth, if anything at all.

One possible solution to this problem—that I am giving serious consideration—is the creation of a Federal Grain-in-storage Insurance Corporation modeled after the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Deposit insurance has proven to be an effective means of protection for bank deposits. Because grain is money to farmers, Federal grain-in-storage insurance could protect their grain deposits in much the same way.

Another possibility is the establishment of a standards system similar to the current State-Federal meat inspection program. Under this approach, State governments would be required to meet minimum grain-storage standards established by Congress, or step aside for the Federal program.

The survey I have undertaken will hopefully determine the best legislative approach and solve this problem.

REPUBLICAN PARTY REFORM

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I have recently had the opportunity to read the comments of one of our most promising freshmen Congressmen concerning reform of the Republican Party. At the age of only 33, Representative H. JOHN HEINZ III, of Pennsylvania, is the youngest Republican Member of Congress and we are fortunate that he can look forward to many years of rewarding public service.

Congressman HEINZ is currently deeply involved in efforts to reform the Republican Party's rules and procedures, and I am pleased to offer his remarks for each Member's attention:

The Republican Party has its work cut out for it in the next four years as it attempts to open its doors and become truly the party of the people.

If the Republican Party is to survive as a viable political force in this country, it must address itself to broadening its appeal among minority groups, women, young people, working men, and other citizens who consider themselves disenfranchised in the face of what they call big business, big money, and even bigger influences.

The combined turning point and kick-off will come this month at the Republican National Convention in Miami Beach when the long needed reforms of the party will begin in earnest.

As an elected delegate to that convention, I will have the opportunity to vote for, among other things, the Delegates and Organization (DO) Committee recommendation on convention reform to the Republican National Committee.

This sincere and hard-working group

chaired by Republican committeewoman Rosemary Ginn of Missouri has made several recommendations in such areas as limiting convention floor demonstrations, favorite son nomination speeches, new ways to present the platform, and especially opening the doors in every state to those who wish to participate in the procedures that lead to nominating a Republican for the Presidency.

In essence, I find it easy to approve and support each of the DO Committee's recommendations, but would only add that there is considerably more to be done in order to effectively reform the Republican Party and have it emerge four years hence as the real democratic (with a lowercase "d") voice of the people.

I say four years hence because we must use the period between now and the 1976 convention to go beyond the DO Committee recommendations and open up the ranks of Republicanism to embrace everyone who cares about the nation and its future through the political process.

I find it shocking that Republicans can count only one female among its Congressional ranks, and worse, not one black. I am equally disturbed to realize that I, at 33, am the youngest Republican in Congress during a period in our nation's development when youth must and will be served and should be heard on Capitol Hill.

I am convinced that if we apply our energies and enthusiasm during the next four years to these and other areas of interest to us all, we will have these ethnic and racial minorities, these women, and these young people in Congress, and in the Republican Party, sharing their knowledge, sensitivity and training for the betterment of all the citizens of this nation.

We are indeed fortunate to have in President Richard Nixon a Republican incumbent in the White House. It is not inconceivable that Republicans could carry the majority of seats in the Congress in November.

To accomplish this, however, we must seek to bring the delegate election process closer to the local level and encourage more interest and participation.

One of the DO Committee's recommendations would do away with the present system of naming certain party officials as automatic delegates to the convention and open the door to any and all who wish to be considered for selection.

Also, approving delegate selection guidelines that endeavor to have full representation of men, women, youth, and minority groups, would further strengthen the party and move us closer to becoming the party of the people.

Over the years, the Republican Party has been suspect by some and has been charged with being supported by responding to only the moneyed influential of this nation.

We must diligently strive over the next four years to dispel this unfounded bias through reform and an open call for participation so that we have what President Nixon has said he would like the Republican Party to be, the party of the open door. Through that door will come the strength of our nation.

RESOLUTION CONCERNING STAFF APPOINTMENTS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Rec-

ORD, I include the following resolution which I referred to and submitted earlier today:

RESOLUTION

Resolved, that upon the adoption of this resolution the Rules of the House are hereby amended as follows:

The Committee on House Administration shall be deemed to have approved

(a) all claims or vouchers for payment for services rendered after June 30, 1972 by employees of the standing committees of the House, provided that such claim or voucher has been signed or certified by the Chairman of the standing committee concerned, and provided further that the Clerk shall determine that such claim or voucher is otherwise in compliance with the applicable laws, resolutions and rules of the House, and

(b) all appointments of employees after January 1, 1972 by the Speaker or any officer of the House to positions already authorized, provided that such appointment has been duly signed or certified by the Speaker or officer of the House, and provided further that the Clerk shall determine that such appointment is otherwise in conformity with the applicable laws, resolutions and rules of the House.

The Clerk shall accept and honor all such claims, vouchers or appointments as though they bore the signature of the Chairman of the Committee of House Administration.

This resolution shall remain in effect until the Committee on House Administration shall have adopted procedures in the standing rules of that Committee which shall be published which will assure the protection of the rights of Committees, Officers and Members of the House in the consideration by that Committee of appointments of employees to authorized positions or in auditing and allowing claims for the payment of obligations incurred at the direction of a Committee, Officer or Member of the House.

Upon the adoption by the Committee on House Administration of such rules the Committee on Rules shall examine the same and if they appear to be adequate, shall submit to the House a resolution providing that upon its adoption this resolution is repealed.

SBA AND VA ANNOUNCE NEW BUSINESS BENEFITS AND OPPORTUNITIES TO ASSIST VIETNAM VETERANS

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the permanent Select Committee on Small Business, I am pleased to report that the Honorable Thomas S. Kleppe, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, and a former colleague in the House, recently announced jointly with Donald E. Johnson, Administrator of the Veterans Administration, three new areas of financial help and management training to Vietnam-era veterans.

Tom Kleppe has proven himself to be one of the most outstanding administrators of SBA and the steps taken under this newly announced program will give special assistance to our Vietnam veterans in an attempt to make up any disad-

vantages which they may suffer as a result of their service in the Nation's Armed Forces.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this program, I would like to insert in the RECORD the press release issued by SBA on Tuesday, August 1, 1972.

The release follows:

VETERANS BENEFITS EXPANDED BY SBA

WASHINGTON, D.C., August 1.—The U.S. Small Business Administration has opened up three new areas of financial help and management training to Vietnam-era veterans, Administrator Thomas S. Kleppe announced today.

The announcement was made at a press conference held jointly with Administrator Donald E. Johnson of the Veterans' Administration.

The new assistance, which will make it easier for veterans to start and maintain businesses, is in response to President Nixon's recent call for renewed commitment by all Federal agencies toward men and women who will have served in the Armed Forces anywhere in the world during the Vietnam period, which began August 5, 1964. An estimated 5.8 million such veterans have returned to civilian life to date.

These veterans will now be eligible for business loans, Federal government contracts, and management assistance under SBA programs which previously were restricted to socially or economically disadvantaged persons.

"We have broadened our directives in order to give veterans the best possible break as they return to civilian life and enter the business community," Kleppe said. "They now can take advantage of the most liberal financing programs that we have."

Johnson termed the SBA action as "providing additional opportunity for young veterans to participate in the economic life of their communities and to reach the level of success we all wish for them."

Under the expanded programs, honorably discharged Vietnam-era veterans are now eligible for:

1. *Economic Opportunity Loans (EOL)* of up to \$50,000 for 15 years at a low interest rate (under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964).

Criteria for such loans are more liberal than in other SBA lending programs, although the veteran still will be required to satisfy certain credit and character requirements, and to furnish reasonable assurance that the loan will be repaid. Such loans are available to veterans who wish to expand an existing business or to establish a new business.

As with all SBA loans, the EOL program is predicated on the assumption that the veterans cannot obtain financial assistance through his bank or other normal lending channels at reasonable terms, or cannot obtain funds under SBA's regular business loan program.

Such a loan also assumes that the veteran does not have sufficient personal financial resources, i.e., is in a low-income status.

Applicants may be sole proprietorships, partnerships, or corporations. Where there are two or more principals, the veteran must own at least 50 percent of the business.

Since the Agency considers that proper management is necessary to a successful business, a condition of such a loan may require that the veteran undertake management training or counseling if it is necessary.

2. *Federal Government Contracts*, under the SBA program that obtains for small businesses a fair share of purchases made by the government for goods and services.

Again, under the same program that previously has applied only to minorities and

other disadvantaged persons, veterans are now eligible for Federal contracts (under section 8(a) of the Small Business Act), commonly called "8(a)" contracts.

In such contracts, the SBA obtains from other Federal agencies prime contracts suitable for small businesses and subcontracts them to small firms.

Once a veteran's firm is approved by SBA as to its financial status and performance capability, the Agency then locates and awards contracts that fit the firm's capabilities.

3. Management and Technical Assistance from private management consulting companies contracted by SBA to provide such assistance (under provisions of section 406 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964). Such counseling was previously available only to socially or economically disadvantaged persons and those in high unemployment areas.

The new assistance announced today follows a previous agreement between SBA and VA last August to help veterans receive schooling and training necessary for eligibility for SBA loans.

The expanded programs are designed to provide special assistance to Vietnam-era veterans. Such veterans are also eligible to receive all standard SBA services for small business—equity financing, long-term loans, government contracts, management and technical training, surety bonds, certificates of competency, lines of credit, Federal regulation compliance, and other assistance.

Veterans interested in taking advantage of any SBA programs may apply in person, or telephone or write to their nearest SBA office. There are 85 such offices located in the principal cities of all 50 states and Puerto Rico and Guam:

LIST OF SBA FIELD OFFICES

Agana, Guam; Albany, New York; Albuquerque, New Mexico; Anchorage, Alaska; Atlanta, Georgia; Augusta, Maine; Baltimore, Maryland; Birmingham, Alabama; Boise, Idaho; Boston, Massachusetts;

Buffalo, New York; Casper, Wyoming; Charleston, West Virginia; Charlotte, North Carolina; Chicago, Illinois; Cincinnati, Ohio; Clarksburg, West Virginia; Cleveland, Ohio; Columbia, South Carolina; Columbus, Ohio; Concord, New Hampshire; Corpus Christi, Texas; Dallas, Texas; Denver, Colorado; Des Moines, Iowa; Detroit, Michigan; Eau Claire, Wisconsin; El Paso, Texas; Fairbanks, Alaska; Fargo, North Dakota; Fresno, California; Gulfport, Mississippi; Harlingen, Texas; Hartford, Connecticut; Hato Rey, Puerto Rico; Helena, Montana; Holyoke, Massachusetts; Honolulu, Hawaii; Houston, Texas;

Indianapolis, Indiana; Jackson, Mississippi; Jacksonville, Florida; Kansas City, Missouri; Knoxville, Tennessee; Las Cruces, New Mexico; Las Vegas, Nevada; Little Rock, Arkansas; Los Angeles, California; Louisville, Kentucky;

Lubbock, Texas; Madison, Wisconsin; Marquette, Michigan; Marshall, Texas; Memphis, Tennessee; Miami, Florida; Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Minneapolis, Minnesota; Montpelier, Vermont; Nashville, Tennessee;

Newark, New Jersey; New Orleans, Louisiana; New York, New York; Oklahoma City, Oklahoma; Omaha, Nebraska; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Phoenix, Arizona; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Portland, Oregon; Providence, Rhode Island;

Richmond, Virginia; Rochester, New York; St. Louis, Missouri; Salt Lake City, Utah; San Antonio, Texas; San Diego, California; San Francisco, California; Seattle, Washington; Sioux Falls, South Dakota;

Spokane, Washington; Springfield, Illinois; Syracuse, New York; Tampa, Florida; Washington, District of Columbia; Wichita, Kansas; and Wilmington, Delaware.

LOW-COST HOUSING IN DEMAND

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Terry D. Schunk, mayor of Portland, Oreg., in a letter to me has outlined some very critical problems confronting the Housing Authority of Portland in its efforts to provide much needed low-cost housing and necessary services pertaining thereto. I am confident other housing authorities throughout the country are experiencing similar difficulties. It is urged that the Department of Housing and Urban Development take all possible action to help our various housing authorities alleviate their problems.

The letter follows:

CITY OF PORTLAND, OREG.,
July 28, 1972.

HON. WENDELL WYATT,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WENDELL: This will acknowledge your letter of July 20, in which you enclose a letter from Norman Watson indicating that funds would be allocated to regional offices of HUD. The Seattle Regional Office received a total of \$30,000. The Portland Area Office, which covers southern Washington, Idaho, and Oregon, received the total amount of \$10,000, which was allocated to Idaho because of particular problems.

The total 1972 Housing Authority of Portland (HAP) operating expense for the year ending March 31, 1972, was \$4,030,000 of which the federal subsidy for operation expenses was \$1,116,536.

HAP estimated their total operating costs for 1973 at \$4,912,150. This amount is to cover the increase in salaries negotiated by HUD for maintenance personnel. Also the salaries of administrative personnel to be in line with the City of Portland pay scale, the increased cost of material, services, etc.

However, our operating subsidy has been decreased from \$1,116,536 in 1972 to \$448,011 in 1973—a 60 percent reduction. This decrease in subsidy at the same time our costs are increasing forces us to revise our present budget to \$4,155,000 with the following results:

(1) Laying off 32 personnel, 20 from our administrative staff and 12 from maintenance. This will cut down our services to people which will be very difficult, particularly for the elderly. It has been our practice to look in on each of our tenants once a day to see if they are alive and well.

(2) HAP will do no painting and it is unfortunate that this will have a geometric effect on deteriorating facilities. And it does not allow for sufficient material with which to make repairs.

(3) The Brooks amendment requires the tenant to pay no more than 25 percent of his income for rental, and in some instances, for example students with families, pay nothing at all. HAP is changing its policy in accordance with HUD requests to house only those persons with higher incomes. This policy change does not permit us to give proper attention to the destitute and in my opinion it is catastrophic that this should occur. It may have the effect on people who were developing the hope and desire to participate in our mainstream of life to lose confidence in the so-called establishment and express their frustration in the only way they know how—violence. This change also knocks out

the objective of public housing, which as I understand it is to assist people to participate in our economy and to become whatever they wish within the limits of their own capacity.

(4) HAP is also taking \$230,034 from its own reserves to carry through the current year on the revised budget. But they will be unable to do so again.

We are trying to make some additional funds available through the Public Employment Program (PEP) funds, especially to reinstate some security for the larger projects as well as in high-rise buildings for the elderly. I have the goal of \$70,000 for HAP but to do this we will be taking away from others, such as our Park Bureau, city administration, etc.

I appreciate your past efforts to help us with our problems in this area, and I am confident you will continue.

Yours truly,

TERRY, Mayor.

WAKEFIELD SPEAKS ON ENERGY

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last week, Stephen A. Wakefield, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Energy programs in the Interior Department made an informative speech in New York City. He was talking to the Civic Associates on Energy. New York City goes from one critical emergency to another. But the entire country should realize the magnitude of the energy crisis facing our country by 1980.

You will be interested in the remarks of Stephen Wakefield who is an authority on energy. Here are his remarks:

WAKEFIELD SPEAKS ON ENERGY

Despite a barrage of studies and pronouncements that there is a developing energy "crisis" in this Nation, there is little evidence of a general public awareness or concern with the energy situation. I believe the energy and fuels problems facing New York City and the East Coast are so much more severe and critical that they warrant a far more serious concern and greater attention than those of the Nation at large. Accordingly, I propose to share with you some of my thoughts and those of other responsible Government officials on the developing general energy situation, the near-term and long-term energy future facing New York and the East Coast and offer some views on the courses of action needed to help resolve the acute energy supply problems we envision for the area.

It has been amply and repeatedly demonstrated in the United States and other highly industrialized societies that an adequate and dependable supply of energy is essential to the economic progress and standard of living of all nations. There is an almost direct relationship between energy consumption and economic output as measured by Gross National Product (GNP). The growth in energy consumption and GNP have followed the same upward course for the past 50 years. Until about 1967 it lagged slightly below GNP but since then energy use has increased even faster than GNP. In order to sustain a healthy economy and provide jobs for our expanding work force, an annual growth rate of about 4 percent in GNP is needed. So, we

must also contemplate the requirement for an energy growth rate of about the same magnitude. Actually, we estimate that energy demand will grow at an annual rate of about 3.6 percent to the end of the century. By 1985, annual gross energy consumption is expected to increase to about 133 quadrillion Btu. or about double the 1971 level of 69 quadrillion Btu.

Over the years, oil and gas have increasingly supplied the largest share of our energy needs at the expense of coal. In 1971, petroleum supplied 44 percent of our energy needs; natural gas supplied 33 percent; coal, 18.3 percent; hydropower, 4.1 percent; and nuclear power, 0.6 percent. In the next three decades, nuclear power is expected to assume a greater share of the energy mix—about half of all electricity generated and one-quarter of total energy by the year 2000—at the expense of all the other sources. Despite the long promised arrival of significant contributions of nuclear energy, however, Interior still projects that fossil fuels will provide three-fourths of our energy requirements at the turn of the century.

In looking ahead, the supply situation for energy and fuels is not reassuring. Nuclear powerplant construction is behind schedule because of delays in equipment deliveries and environmental protection considerations. Since the *Calvert Cliffs* court decision 1 year ago, licensing of new facilities by the Atomic Energy Commission has almost ground to a halt. Whereas new plants can be operational in 4 or 5 years following the decision to build in many countries, utilities in the United States must plan for lead times twice as long. Coal is being forced out of markets it used to serve because of increasingly stringent antipollution regulations which have gone beyond the capabilities of technology available within the short timeframe established for implementation. Our domestic oil and natural gas wells are producing virtually at the limits of their capabilities and without a strong upsurge in domestic exploration and development activities, it is probable that we will see a decline in the production of these energy sources.

Given the lead times and technological developments required, we can only realistically look to oil and gas to meet the increased energy demands over the next 10 to 15 years. Within this limited alternative, we can anticipate a substantial increase in both importations of foreign oil and, while probably to a lesser amount, liquefied natural gas. The implications of becoming overly dependent upon sources of energy beyond our control should give every American cause for concern. These concerns become magnified when those foreign sources may be inherently insecure and unreliable.

In 1971, our total oil products demand was about 15 million barrels daily and imports accounted for about one-fourth of the total. Canada and Venezuela were the principal sources and North Africa and Middle East production supplied only about 5 percent, a mere trickle.

By 1985, we foresee a very drastic change in the relatively comfortable oil supply situation of today. In order to meet a petroleum demand in 1985 of some 25 to 27 million barrels per day, if present trends continue, we can contemplate a daily supply of only about 9 million barrels from the Lower 48 States and 2 million from the Alaskan North Slope. This leaves an enormous gap of some 14 to 16 million barrels a day—or more than half our needs. To compound the problem, we estimate that nearby Western Hemisphere sources can supply no more than 6 million barrels per day. Thus, like it or not, we must look to the politically unstable, troubled Eastern Hemisphere for some 8 to 10 million barrels or about 34 percent of our supply. Without North Slope oil available to us, this share increases to some 42 percent.

To you here in New York and those of us who live along the East Coast, the situation is even more ominous. This is the largest oil consuming area in the country, yet it has no significant production of its own. Last year it consumed about 6 million barrels per day of petroleum products, supplied by about 60 percent from Texas and Louisiana and 40 percent from imports. This situation will change rapidly to one of overwhelming dependence on imports. By 1985, this region may have to import some 9 million barrels per day from overseas, or approximately 20 shiploads a day by the largest tankers that can now enter East Coast ports.

This is the immediate outlook and we must face it for the next several years. Alternatives available to effect a major change in energy supply and lessen dependence on foreign oil imports all require long lead times. Nevertheless, we do not have to accept this as a permanent and worsening condition.

We must choose among and act upon alternatives that will over the short-term minimize the growth of our dependence on foreign energy sources and in the long-term provide an enduring solution to our problems of insuring an adequate and secure supply of all our energy needs. And, we do have viable alternatives. We have billions of barrels of oil and hundreds of trillions of cubic feet of natural gas resources still in the ground which could be made available to American consumers. They simply are not being discovered and developed as fast as we are using them. Known coal resources are so great that they will last for hundreds of years at current and projected rates of consumption. The vast oil shale deposits of Colorado, Wyoming and Utah contain more hydrocarbons and can yield more oil than has so far been discovered in the Middle East. Time, money and a specific act of national will are required to perfect the technologies and establish the industries needed to recover and convert these vast resources into more acceptable and economic energy forms.

Beginning with specific actions that will pay off in the short run, we must expedite the movement of Alaskan North Slope oil to markets and utilize the already discovered 10 billion barrel reserves in this area. In May, Secretary Morton announced his decision to grant right-of-way permits for the needed Trans-Alaska pipeline. No permits will be issued until all legal requirements have been met. Then, the problems of reconciling oil development with environmental requirements will be resolved so that this long awaited and critically needed new domestic oil source will make its important contribution to our national oil supply. Thereafter, further exploration and development in the vast Arctic region will greatly expand the amount of domestic reserves that we can count on in subsequent years. Large reserves of natural gas also exist in this area and, although dependent upon oil production, should be available to Midwestern consumers later in this decade.

In the Lower 48 States, the Outer Continental Shelf, owned by the Federal Government, is the best remaining prospective territory for oil and gas development. Only around 5 million acres or less than 2 percent of the OCS has been leased to date. Yet, it now accounts for about 12 percent of our domestic oil and natural gas production and its share is continuing to grow. A key element of President Nixon's Clean Energy Message of June 1971, was his directive that oil and gas leasing on the OCS be expanded and accelerated. The Department of the Interior responded with a leasing schedule calling for two general lease sales per year for the next 5 years. The first scheduled sale was successfully challenged in court on environmental grounds with a resulting delay of at least 9 months. A new lease offering which

we believe will stand up to any legal challenge has been prepared and is scheduled for September. A second lease sale has been tentatively set for December.

But these are only two sales involving less than a million acres off Louisiana. I personally believe we ought to be leasing more than a million acres each year for oil and gas prospecting on the OCS and extend more intensive searches to other areas, including the Atlantic continental shelf. Nowhere is oil and gas needed more critically than on the Atlantic Coast.

Although there has been no production of oil or gas on the Atlantic Coastal Plain, geological evidence indicates that several areas along the coast have a potential for significant oil and gas deposits. The Association of Petroleum Geologists considers this potential to be as much as 19 billion barrels of recoverable oil and 46 trillion cubic feet of gas. Of course, these are speculations at this time but they support going forward now with explorations of the oil and gas potential of the region, particularly in light of sizable discoveries off of Nova Scotia.

It should be pointed out, however, that extremely vocal political opposition has arisen against any mention of offshore drilling in the Atlantic. Much of this opposition may be based on less than firm factual grounds. For example, any drilling would take place more than 30 miles from shore, thus out of sight of the beaches. Oil spills from offshore drilling are extremely rare. Only four major instances resulting in serious threats to the environment have occurred from over 16,000 offshore wells drilled in the United States and regulations and inspections have been tightened by the Geological Survey in the past 3 years. Offshore drilling accounts for only 2 percent of the oil in the oceans, according to a Coast Guard study, while tankers account for almost 30 percent. Fishing grounds off the Louisiana coast, both commercial and sport, have become among the world's most productive since the introduction of offshore drilling there. But perhaps of greatest importance is the fact that every barrel of oil that we can produce domestically is one less that we do not have to import and that much less reliance on foreign sources beyond our control.

In the long-term, the solution to our energy problems rests with the development of technologies that will improve efficiencies in the finding, developing, production, transportation, conversion and use of all energy sources. To date, continuous improvements in all these areas have made energy abundant and cheap in America and fueled its economic development.

Current technology is not keeping pace with the ever-increasing energy demand while at the same time providing the desired environmental protection. A whole series of new and improved technologies are needed. These include processes to provide clean fuels, develop marginal resources, improve conventional energy sources and develop new energy sources. All involve large commitments of capital to R&D programs and will require long periods of time to bring them from inception to commercial reality.

It is an appropriate national objective that a fertile climate for private invention and innovation be maintained and that the Government initiate and support R&D in technologies which are in the broad national interest, but which cannot or will not be done by the private sector. The need is clear but how can it best be done? Some have argued that energy R&D needs are so great, so urgent, and so costly that the Federal Government should take over, fund, and direct all major efforts through a single energy agency. Others have proposed a joint Government-industry corporation such as Comsat.

We believe that the answer lies in letting both Government and industry do those things it does best separately and cooperate in joint efforts where they are clearly needed. At one extreme is the high-risk, high-cost technology in which returns to private enterprise cannot be clearly foreseen in the reasonable future, while at the other extreme is the threshold R&D which can provide for a reasonable recovery of investment within a short period of time. In my view, Government must play the predominant role in the former and industry in the latter. Between these extremes the opportunity for a joint effort between the public and private sector is strongest and should be encouraged. The contribution of Government should be greatest at the pilotplant stage of development with the financial burden shifting toward industry as the project moves into its demonstration phase.

The efforts of the Department of the Interior in carrying out President Nixon's directions to accelerate the development of clean fuels from coal is a good example of what I mean. The President's Clean Energy Message contained the specific proposal that this effort be pursued as a jointly sponsored Government-industry undertaking. Industry has responded by pledging its part of the initial funding and an agreement was reached between the Department of the Interior and the American Gas Association for a cooperative program. We view this venture as a landmark in Government-industry teamwork in energy R&D and we hope it will lead to further efforts in meeting our national energy needs.

ELECTRONIC SENSING DEVICES

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation that will require that all airlines boarding passengers in the United States have, and use, effective electronic sensing devices or X-ray devices to detect concealed weapons carried by passengers or in luggage. It requires that these devices be installed by December 31, 1972, and imposes fines of up to \$25,000 per violation for any airline that fails to install such devices or fails to use them in scanning boarding passengers and luggage.

This measure complements two earlier measures that I proposed. The first would close all U.S. airports to any international airline that continues to serve any nation that harbors an accused skyjacker. I am happy to report that this measure, which I first introduced on August 2 of this year, now has 51 cosponsors in the House. The second measure, which authorizes the President to shut off economic and military aid to any nation that refuses to prosecute or extradite air pirates, was adopted by the House as an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act last week and is now in conference.

These are all tough measures. But the situation more than warrants tough and effective action. There are only two points at which we can safely act against air piracy: Before the skyjacker boards the plane with a weapon; and after the sky-

jacking has taken place—with swift, stern, and sure justice.

It may seem strange that legislation is necessary to compel airlines to install protective devices, which after all, are much in their own self-interest.

The hard fact is that today, almost exactly 2 years after President Nixon first called for "the use of electronic surveillance equipment—at all gateway airports and other appropriate airports in the United States" only five of the 36 U.S. airlines have installed enough devices to cover all departures. In fact, six of the 16 largest airlines had installed no devices whatsoever by last week.

I am appending to these remarks a chronology of events since the President issued his demand 2 years ago. From this it can be seen that both the Federal Aviation Administration and the Nation's airlines have been dragging their feet.

While skyjacking and skyjacking related deaths in 1972 are running 100 percent above 1971, the majority of U.S. airlines still refuse to install electronic devices and the FAA has repeatedly failed to exercise its authority to force them to act.

There already have been 28 skyjackings and four deaths in the first 7 months of this year as against 27 skyjackings and four deaths in the full 12 months of 1971. Ransom losses to date are running 650 percent above last year's losses, although this will be reduced to slightly more than 100 percent if Algeria returns the \$1 million taken in the most recent skyjacking.

Apparently one reason for the airlines delay has been the hope that Congress will foot all or part of the bill for these devices, which are estimated to cost in total some \$4 million for the relatively unsophisticated equipment now advocated by the FAA. The transportation appropriation which has been passed by the House and Senate would provide \$3.5 million for this purpose. It only remains for the House to approve the conference report for this funding to be available.

The legislation that I am introducing makes one further important provision. It would require the airlines to install more sophisticated and more sensitive equipment than is now contemplated by the FAA and the airlines.

The device now in use, the magnetometer, is by no means adequate. Because of the way it operates, it is incapable of detecting about 25 percent of the weapons now manufactured.

There is more sophisticated equipment, metal detectors and X-ray devices, that would detect all such weapons, and my bill requires that these be used in place of the magnetometer.

The only apparent reason why metal detectors or X-ray devices have not already been installed is that they cost slightly more than the magnetometers. The range is approximately \$1,500 to \$2,000 for magnetometers as against \$2,500 to \$3,000 for metal detectors, for example.

The cost of providing 2,000 metal detectors, the number required to protect 2,800 gateways of the Nation's 530 airports is approximately \$6 million. This breaks down to slightly less than 4 cents

for each commercial passenger carried.

This is a cost we can afford. It is a cost we can ill-afford not to bear. So far, it is only luck that has prevented a catastrophe from occurring as a result of a skyjacking attempt.

It is within the power of Congress to see that effective action is taken to assure that we will not have to rely on luck any further. I believe that the legislation I have proposed will accomplish that goal.

As of possible interest to my colleagues, I am also appending to these remarks a summary of statistics relating to skyjacking incidents in 1972, a list of statistics on the effectiveness and cost of metal detecting devices, and a letter endorsing this legislation from the Air Lines Pilots Association:

GOVERNMENT ACTION TO PREVENT HIJACKINGS

September 11, 1970: President Nixon delivers his Anti-Air Piracy Message and voluntary security programs are initiated by the airlines.

September 30, 1971: Air Transportation Security Director, James Murphy, issues Notice 71-28 and Notice 71-29 which propose to amend the Federal Aviation Regulations. Interested parties are invited to comment on the proposed revisions before Dec. 29, 1971. Notice 71-28 primarily deals with protection against unauthorized access to air operations areas and identification of authorized persons and ground vehicles. Notice 71-29 deals with procedures, facilities, and or screening systems which prevent the carriage aboard aircraft any sabotage device or weapons or unauthorized access to the aircraft. Notice 71-29 also deals with procedures to assure that baggage is checked in by a responsible representative of the certificate holder and to prevent cargo and checked baggage from being loaded aboard its aircraft until cleared in accordance with security measures.

Interim: Seven hijackings took place and one pilot was killed. One hijacker extorted \$200,000 from Northwest Airlines and two attempted extortion of \$300,000 and \$200,000 occurred where the hijacker was either overpowered or surrendered.

February 2, 1972: FAA Administrator, J. H. Shaffer, ordered the adoption of a screening system to prevent or deter the carriage aboard aircraft of sabotage devices or weapons in carry on baggage or on or about the persons of passengers. Air carriers and commercial operators were allowed 72 hours to implement the system.¹

Interim: Eight hijackings took place in which three passengers were wounded. Three extortion attempts occurred in the amounts of \$1 million, \$200,000, and \$50,000.

March 7, 1972: FAA Administrator, J. H. Shaffer, amended the Federal Aviation Regulations, effective April 6, 1972, to require air carriers to submit for the approval of the Regional FAA Administrator a security program. In addition to the screening program ordered in February, three other elements were required of a security program: (1) prevent or deter unauthorized access to aircraft; (2) assure that baggage is checked in by a responsible agent or representative of the certificate holder; and (3) prevent cargo and checked baggage from being loaded aboard aircraft unless handled in accordance with security procedures.

¹Two hijacking took place after Feb. 5, 1972 in which the hijacker was a "selectee" but he was not screened. Both United and PSA were fined \$1,000 for violating the regulation that all selectees be screened.

Interim: Nineteen hijackings took place in which one passenger was killed and two were wounded. Two of the eleven extortion attempts were successful. In both successful extortions the planes were hijacked to Algeria—the \$500,000 from the first was returned by the Algerian government after granting political asylum to the hijackers and the fate of the \$1 million from the second hijacking is uncertain at this time as is the status of the hijackers. The unsuccessful extortions involved the following amounts: \$500,000, \$303,000, \$200,000, \$502,000, \$50,000, \$800,000, \$450,000, \$600,000, and \$550,000.

August, 1972: FAA changes the screening system to require a body search of all selectees (either physical or by magnetometer) and a search of all their carry on baggage in addition to the previous requirement of proper identification. The recent hijacking to Algeria and the \$1 million extortion prompted this revision.

August 17, 1972: Deadline for the filing of petitions to the Administrator appealing the FAA's modification of the air carrier's security program. Approximately 24 of the 36 carriers have had their programs approved as of 8/11/72.

1972 HIJACKING INCIDENTS STATISTICS

Total number of hijackings in 1972... 28
Total number of persons involved in 1972... 39

	Hijacker profile applied		
	Hijacker profile not applied ¹	Did meet profile	Did not meet profile
Persons involved in hijacking incidents in 1972...	17	17	5
Persons involved in hijacking incidents after the hijacker profile screening system was implemented...	14	13	5

¹ Hijacker profile not applied in various circumstances: Hijacker forced his way aboard aircraft; type of flight (e.g., no screening on commuter flights); hijacker by-passed ticketing; screening not applied to round trip ticket holders; and conspirator involved but not aboard the plane.

² In the case of the McCoy hijacking (Apr. 7, 1972—United Airlines) and the Speck hijacking (Apr. 9, 1972—PSA) the hijacker was designated as a selectee but was not screened, i.e., asked for proper identification. Both United and PSA were fined \$1,000 each for failure to comply with the screening regulation.

Weapons involved in 1972 incidents

	Number of incidents
Firearms:	
Real	20
Alleged	2
Explosive devices:	
Real	0
Alleged	11
Knife	3

HIJACKER PROFILE SCREENING SYSTEM

This system was implemented on Feb. 5, 1972, "to prevent or deter the carriage aboard aircraft of sabotage devices or weapons in carry-on baggage or on or about the persons of passengers. Certain individuals who met the 'hijacker profile' were designated as 'selectees.' All selectees were cleared for boarding upon presentation of proper identification. In August the screening procedure was revised to include the search of the selectee's carry-on baggage and either a physical body search or a magnetometer search of the selectee, in addition to proper identification.

METAL DETECTING DEVICES—STATISTICS

Metal detecting devices:

(1) Magnetometers, range of detection:

only ferrous metals (i.e. does not detect 20%—25% of all weapons); cost: \$1,500–\$2,000.

(2) Active metal detectors, range of detection: all ferrous and nonferrous metals; cost: \$2,500–\$3,000.

AIRPORT INFORMATION

Total number of airports..... 530
Total number of gates..... 2,800
Total number of passengers enplaned—1969 148,072,090

SUFFICIENT AIRPORT COVERAGE

Sufficient airport coverage would require at least one device at each airport and one device per every three gates at the airport. Therefore, approximately 2,000 metal detectors are required. The cost would be approximately \$6 million, or \$.04 per passenger who enplaned in 1969.

AIR LINE PILOTS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., August 15, 1972.

HON. OGDEN REID,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REID: The 46,000 men and women of the Air Line Pilots Association applaud your aggressive moves to further tighten the defenses of our nation against the menace of air piracy.

While we are moving forward domestically with tighter security measures at airports, hijackers' havens overseas continue to lure aerial extortionists and political fanatics to their shores. The legislation you have proposed, when enacted, should go a long way toward closing these sanctuaries.

It is imperative that top-priority action be taken to thwart this rapidly escalating threat. If a criminal does manage to slip through an airport security screen, and he does manage to commandeer an airliner, there should be no place in the world where he can step off that plane without being arrested and tried under the stiffest possible penalties—or, preferably, returned to the country where the crime was committed for such punishment. Your bill represents a giant step forward toward achieving this goal.

ALPA fully supports the speedy passage of this legislation, which would call upon the President of the United States to impose hard-hitting economic blockades against nations that harbor or encourage air criminals.

We also note with much pleasure the favorable passage of your amendment to the Foreign Aid bill—an amendment that would deny U. S. assistance to nations that provide sanctuaries to sky pirates.

On behalf of the pilots and cabin attendants of ALPA, I assure you of our appreciation of and full support for your efforts.

Sincerely yours,

J. J. O'DONNELL, President.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 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?

SPIRALING WELFARE COSTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, in recent months I have been investigating new avenues of possible reform designed to extricate the overburdened taxpayer from financing increasing welfare rolls. No doubt, there is one jurisdiction where Congress should center its efforts—the District of Columbia.

Mr. Joseph Yeldell, Director of the District of Columbia Department of Human Resources, recently responded to several questions I asked regarding welfare fraud, increases in the caseload of aid to families with dependent children, and changes in benefit amounts in the Nation's Capital.

His answers indicate that: First, Congress needs to beef up the Corporation Counsel's office to prosecute welfare fraud cases; second, welfare workers must be required to verbally explain to applicants and recipients more than once the penalties for welfare fraud; third, identification and a handwriting specimen must be required of all recipients before they can be allowed on the rolls; fourth, title 3, section 216 of the District of Columbia Code must be modified to increase subpoena power in fraud cases; and fifth, social workers and welfare recipients need to know that welfare is not a "right."

I submit Mr. Yeldell's replies for my colleagues' attention:

MR. YELDELL'S REPLY

Question: What are the criteria for referring cases of fraud for prosecution? Can we explain why so few cases have been prosecuted?

Answer: The criteria for referring cases of fraud for prosecution are:

1. *Timeliness*: The Corporation Counsel's office has indicated that if a period of more than six months elapses from the time of the last occurrence of fraud to the date of the fraud referral to him for prosecution, the defendant's right to a speedy trial may be infringed upon.

2. *Amount*: The Corporation Counsel's office feels that if the amount of the fraud does not equal the dollar amount of the fraud penalty (\$500.00 under Title 3, Section 216, of the D.C. Code), the case should not be prosecuted.

3. *Evidence*: Documentary evidence is preferred over verbal testimony. Handwriting on checks and documents is verified by the Metropolitan Police Department's Questioned Document Laboratory, using known samples of the defendant's writing.

4. *Availability*: Title 3, Section 216, of the D.C. Code, under which welfare fraud referrals are made, limits power to summon defendants and witnesses, and to subpoena records and documents, to District of Columbia boundaries.

5. *Hardship*: The personal circumstances of a defendant are carefully reviewed, because of the sympathy of the Court and juries to persons in destitute situations. Persons with large families, persons with physical handicaps, and cases in which unusual circumstances mitigate the offenses, are usually not

referred to the Corporation Counsel.

6. *Education:* Defendants who have been so inadequately educated that their ability to read and interpret the documents presented to them in the course of their applications for public assistance cannot be presumed to understand the consequences of signing a statement concerning their responsibilities to the agency in terms of resources and family composition.

7. *Intent:* A basic criterion of fraud is "Mens Rea" (State of Mind). If a review of the case does not reveal this important aspect of fraud, it is usually not referred because of the difficulty of successfully trying a case without strong evidence that the defendant intended to defraud the Government when the fraudulent action occurred. Only those cases which are blatantly fraudulent are referred for prosecution.

Some of the reasons for the relatively small number of prosecutions of welfare fraud are implicit in the profile of our referral criteria. In addition, the social and legislative climate toward the welfare program influences the reception of cases referred to the Corporation Counsel.

During the period 1968 to 1971 no cases of welfare fraud were prosecuted, although at times during that period the Corporation Counsel's office was holding as many as 150 welfare fraud referrals. An administrative change in attitude occurred in 1971, and welfare fraud cases referred to the Corporation Counsel's office are again being prosecuted.

The lead time to review, present, and collect evidence for successful prosecution is lengthy, particularly in obtaining the original public assistance checks from Government storage. A decision by the Corporation Counsel not to prosecute may occur at the time of trial, when considerable time and effort have already been expended.

It should be made clear that the number of cases prosecuted by the Corporation Counsel's office is not linearly related to the number of cases referred by Agents of the Court Section, since the Agents are not involved in the ultimate decision to pursue Court prosecution.

Question: Explain the 7,029 increase in AFDC between FY 71 and 72.

Answer: There is no single cause for the increase. Among the variety of reasons are the following:

1. Increase in the number of applications. For the six months, July through December 1969, an average of 1,180 applications per month were received at 500 First Street, N.W.
- For the six month period, July through December 1971, applications averaged 1,680 per month—an average increase of 500 per month or 8,000 per year.

About one-third of the applicants come in to the office on their own and the remainder are referred by relatives, friends and outside agencies. Clinics and hospitals are the largest single source of referral.

2. Community involvement. There is considerable outreach on the part of agencies, organizations and individuals, ranging from Welfare Rights to United Planning Organization to Settlement Houses, even to the extent of knocking on doors to inform people of the service of the Department.

The Department itself has been aggressive in meeting with community groups and agencies to explain its functions and operations.

3. The Department provides a wider range of services than ever before in its history and, therefore, meets the needs of many more District of Columbia residents.

4. Greatly increased publicity through the news media. Formerly this was limited mainly to newspapers, but now television and radio provide ever increasing coverage.

5. Revised policies. Through the courts and Federal regulations a number of very significant changes, such as the elimination of the residence requirement, have enabled more people to seek public assistance.

Other regulation changes over the past two fiscal years are:

- a. The AFDC-UF Program was effective in the District of Columbia on August 3, 1970.

- b. The AFDC-Supplementation of full-time earnings of mothers was effective by City Council regulation on April 1, 1971.

- c. The Declaration method for determining and redetermining eligibility was begun on an agencywide basis May 1, 1970.

- d. On August 1, 1970, the Standard for Requirements was updated to February 1970 cost of living.

- e. The "Availability of a mother to accept employment" policy was rescinded effective September 7, 1970, as a result of a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare requirement.

- f. Effective September 7, 1970, as a result of a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare mandate, mothers or caretaker relatives are not required as a condition of eligibility to name the father or take court action to obtain support.

- g. Also on September 7, 1970, as a result of a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare requirement, military families receiving Class Q allotments may have their income supplemented by public assistance.

Effective December 7, 1970, the Congress amended the D.C. Public Assistance Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-807) changing the definition of legally responsible relatives from "the husband, wife, father, mother or adult child" to "spouse for spouse and parent for a child under the age of twenty-one".

6. There is a change in philosophy in that public assistance is viewed increasingly as a right and is consequently more acceptable to more people.

Question: Explain the 48,000 amount change. How many were increases and how many were decreases?

Answer: No actual count of the number of payment changes resulting in increased payments and the number resulting in decreased payments has ever been maintained.

Based on the observation of the staff of the Payroll Branch, decreases and increases are about equally divided.

The principal reasons for a change in the public assistance payment are:

1. Change in living arrangements.
2. Addition or deletion of allowance for transportation or other special needs item.
3. Change in the amount of the resource available to the individual or family—as, for example, the 20 percent increase in Social Security benefits.
4. Change in the number of persons included in the payment.
5. Change in the allowance for a child when there is an age change.
6. Change to correct an underpayment or overpayment.
7. Addition of a work or training allowance.

TRIBUTE TO EMANUEL RIDGELL

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on August 6, the House of Representatives lost a trusted friend and a devoted servant in Emanuel Ridgell, superintendent of the House Office Buildings.

Mr. Ridgell served the Congress for the past 40 years, beginning at the age of 20 as a messenger. He served as assistant superintendent of the House Office Buildings and was appointed superintendent on July 1, 1948. During the peri-

od of his service, "Manny" Ridgell exemplified the spirit of cooperation and congeniality which marks the true American. All of us who benefitted from Manny Ridgell's fairness and good judgment will miss him.

I wish to extend my deepest sympathy to the family of Manny Ridgell and assure them that he will not be forgotten by his friends in Congress.

COMMUNITY IMPACT ON COMMUNICATIONS MEDIA

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, in March of this year, the Congressional Black Caucus conducted 2 days of public hearings on the mass media and the black community. The purpose was to study the effect and influence of the media on the formulation of opinions and attitudes in the black community, and to investigate the media's unwillingness to adequately increase minority employment at all levels.

On concluding these hearings, the caucus called for the establishment of watchdog committees to monitor the fairness of the media in the areas of hiring, entertainment and advertising, and to initiate license challenges and lawsuits to remedy discriminatory practices.

Recently, members of the black community of St. Louis have taken such actions against a local TV station and its actions in canceling the popular program "Black Journal". The group, known as the Friends of Black Journal, have charged KETC-TV, St. Louis, with discrimination in programming, employment and civil rights, and have called on the FCC to conduct a complete investigation.

In support of this community action, the National Urban League has issued a resolution to "marshal all resources within the hallowed halls of the Urban League generally toward the immediate reality of black programming in public media", using the St. Louis action as a pilot project.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the actions of the Urban League, and extend my support to the St. Louis Chapter of the Friends of Black Journal. Further, to awaken others to the critical need for such actions, I submit this resolution, and the statement of the Friends of Black Journal, for the Record of today's proceedings.

FRIENDS OF BLACK JOURNAL,
St. Louis, Mo., August 4, 1972.

DEAR SIR: We, the Friends of Black Journal, are lodging the following complaints against the public broadcasting station KETC-TV Channel 9. These complaints are based on both factual information and our meager knowledge of the FCC regulations as they apply to public broadcasting.

We believe that the black community rights have been violated in the following:

1. We believe that there has been the misuse of federal funds thereby violating HEW

guidelines for public broadcasting in educational television.

2. The practicing of discrimination against the black community in programming, employment, and civil rights.

3. We believe that the showing of lewd and immoral programs has been detrimental to the healthy psychological development of our children.

4. We believe that KETC-TV is guilty of promoting racism through their local program scheduling.

The Friends of Black Journal are calling for a complete investigation of these charges and complaints. Please notify us immediately in writing, of the actions you plan to take in regards to these charges.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

THE FRIENDS OF BLACK JOURNAL.

RESOLUTION SUBMITTED TO THE NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE

Whereas Public media is the most obligated to respond to the needs/requests/demands of any national/local community it is licensed to serve;

Whereas the grounds for accountability is the direct result of the community's "tax dollars" providing the funds for the station's operation;

Whereas the accountability should hold fast across all sectors of these communities e.g. socio-economic, racial sectors;

Whereas any evidence contrary to the above statement represents an FCC violation and calls for a challenge by the affronted sector of the community regarding the legitimacy of said Public media; and

Whereas surveys of Public media programming prove that by and large, there is a racist approach to this accountability in regards to the Black Community on both the national and local level;

Be it resolved that this workshop will marshal all resources within the hallows of the Urban League generally toward the immediate reality of Black programming in Public media, and

support nationally efforts of Black communities who are challenging Public media and to challenge Public media in violation of FCC requirements as a League, and as a civil/human rights organization concerned with human development, the Urban League will also oppose racism in employment practices as it relates to Public media, and make St. Louis the League's pilot effort by actively supporting and assisting the St. Louis Chapter of Friends of Black Journal in its challenge of locally based Public media KETC-Channel 9, which has blatantly committed racist affronts repeatedly against the Black community.

A REAL FOOD BARGAIN

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the hardest working Members of the House is our mild-mannered, intellectual colleague, H. R. Gross of Iowa. I never cease to be amazed at the people around the country who know of and respect "H.R.," recognizing his determination to protect the taxpayer from the excesses and abuse of certain governmental programs.

It was, therefore, with special interest that I noted a column in the Lansing, Ill.,

Sun Journal of August 10, by Jim Alvord, managing editor of that newspaper, commenting upon one of "H.R.'s" disclosures of governmental programs gone awry.

The pertinent section of the column follows:

A REAL FOOD BARGAIN

A Republican Congressman from Iowa, H. R. Gross, made an interesting statement to the press last week concerning our pitiful welfare system. He explained that a hippie living in California can buy \$28 worth of food stamps for 50¢. The crafty ones employ the following con game. They will buy exactly \$27.51 worth of groceries and receive 49¢ in change (the maximum they can receive back on any purchase). The hippie then adds one penny to his change and has the 50¢ necessary to buy another \$28 worth of groceries next week. The fourth week he sells his food stamps to friends for \$15 cash.

Thus in one month he's paid 53¢ for \$112 worth of stamps for which he gets \$82.53 worth of food and \$14.47 net profit in cash. Neat trick, but not too funny when you consider that the joke is on you, the taxpayer.

One food store owner verified the practice and added: "Can you imagine how this adds up when there are 15 of these kids living together all doing the same thing?" Surely the deep thinkers in Washington can come up with a better system than this.

BEVERLY HILLS TOASTMISTRESS CLUB

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, in a society that offers its biggest reward to those who do things, I bring your attention to an educational organization dedicated to the art of performance, and communication and skills in organizational techniques. I speak of the International Toastmistress Clubs, and with specific regard to its affiliate, the Beverly Hills Toastmistress Club.

In September of this year, the Beverly Hills Toastmistress Club will celebrate its 30th anniversary having received its charter on September 21, 1942. The club, as its parent, the International Toastmistress Club, was formed for the purpose of providing educational programs designed for member self-improvement in skills of leadership and communication. Training is offered in club procedures, public speaking, and analytical listening. The opportunities afforded members by Toastmistress Club training are unlimited. They learn to communicate effectively and then continue to practice what they have learned. While learning to do so, they also learn to say so. The motto of the club is "to love our language and to use it with grace and facility."

Much of the success attained by the Beverly Hills Toastmistress Club is due in large measure to Mrs. Nan Warshaw in her capacity as professional evaluator. I believe the precepts of both the International Toastmistress Clubs and the Beverly Hills Chapter are exemplified in the words of International Toastmistress founder, Ernestine White:

If all of us, realizing our limitations, endeavor to do our best, or even slightly expand our limitations; and if we place our experiences at the disposal of all others through our Club and through the International Toastmistress Clubs, then no one can fathom the boundless possibilities and the great role this organization is destined to play in the history and progress and development of womankind.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the week beginning July 17 was the week proclaimed by the President and observed in all of the United States as Captive Nations Week.

The resolution of Congress, adopted in 1959, expressed the principle of freedom for all persons and from its beginnings cooperated with the nations under the subjugation of Soviet imperialism.

The object of these celebrations and manifestations held during Captive Nations Week is to remind all of us living that the present world, divided between the free and the subjugated, will never attain peace.

And so, this and other tyrannies will not disappear from the political scene as long as there are wars ever bloodier and more and more ruthless—as long as there will be oppression, exploitation, plunder and the denial of basic human rights which is evident in the nations confined behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains who cannot speak in the defense of their equitable rights and lawful causes.

It is the duty of the free people of America and other countries to strive to liberate the people of these captive nations through sensible and determined deeds and through proper governmental channels so that they can remove the yoke of subjugation in a peaceful manner.

The captive nations, whose governments are only temporary, showing the tendency to be anti-American; were, are, and will remain on friendly terms with the United States, and we expect from them a helping hand in our efforts to free them from alien oppression.

Let us do whatever we can so that the aggression and greed of the Communist imperialists be brought to a halt. Through our celebrations and manifestations we will give evidence that we not only value, but also understand their plight and also fully support their just endeavors to attain peace and full national freedom and independence.

Let our efforts help, that America the sole bastion of hope to free the captive nations, will fulfill its mission in the guidance of the people of the free world to help those who know only the leadership of an alien government in their daily lives.

The freedom-loving people of the captive nations look toward the United States to take the lead in bringing about their freedom and independence.

As Americans, we cannot stress the great importance for us to morally sustain the hope and faith of the captive peoples that they will once again regain their freedom. I hope that this memorable day will arrive soon.

**RESULTS OF STATEWIDE SURVEY
IN ILLINOIS ON STRATEGIC
ARMS LIMITATION TREATY AND
A PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO
STRENGTHEN THE AGREEMENT**

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as the House prepares to vote Wednesday on the Executive Agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union limiting offensive missile capacity of the two nations, I should like to present for my colleagues the results of a very extensive survey which I conducted in Illinois on this question.

This was a statewide survey in keeping with President Nixon's call for exhaustive public scrutiny of the nuclear arms agreement.

I am pleased to report we received replies from 102 counties—every county in the State.

The results show that while the people of Illinois have grave reservations about the offensive missile limitation agreement and voted it down by a vote of 69 percent against, to 31 percent for, those same respondents said that despite its shortcomings, both the treaty and agreement should be approved by Congress as the first step toward nuclear arms control. The vote was an overwhelming 81.1 percent for approval of the package to 18.9 percent against.

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that while our citizens have objection to the imbalance proposed in the offensive missile limitation, they feel we should approve the agreement as a first step toward nuclear arms control.

This poses a difficult question for Congress. I believe this dilemma can be helped toward solution by improving the executive agreement.

I believe Senator HENRY JACKSON has offered a reasonable amendment in the other body which would strengthen the proposed agreement and perhaps alleviate the fears of those who voted against approval.

I would hope we could offer Senator JACKSON's amendment here in the House and shall discuss the prospects of its approval when the measure comes before us Wednesday.

For the guidance of our House colleagues, I am placing in the RECORD today the results of my survey and also Senator JACKSON's proposed amendment. I am also including a brief summary of the amendment and a speech on the amendment which the Senator recently delivered.

I fully endorse addition of the amendment to the executive agreement in offensive missile limitation. I believe the

amendment goes a long way toward protesting America's position and hope that before this agreement is finalized, the amendment will have been added by Congress.

Following are the results of my questionnaire:

**STRATEGIC ARMS LIMITATION TREATY BETWEEN THE U.S.
AND SOVIET UNION**

	Yes	No
(A) The Treaty would limit each nation to no more than 200 defensive antiballistic missiles. Do you approve?	78.6	21.4
(B) The Treaty provides each nation shall distribute part of its 200 defensive missile quota around its own capital—Washington and Moscow—and the remainder around only 1 offensive missile launching site in each nation. Do you approve?	53.0	47.0
(C) Would you prefer the U.S. deploy its ABM's around our principal industrial centers (Chicago, Detroit, Pittsburgh, etc.) since most of Russia's industry is already near Moscow?	71.5	28.5
(D) An Executive Agreement limits U.S. offensive missile capacity to 1,054 intercontinental ballistic missiles and 41 missile-firing submarines, while Russia shall be permitted to develop her strength to 1,618 ICBM's and 42 missile-firing submarines. Do you approve?	31.0	69.0
(E) The Treaty permits "open sky" inspection. Do you believe we should insist on "ground inspection" to prevent cheating?	76.1	23.9
(F) Despite any shortcomings, do you believe these agreements should be approved by Congress as the first step toward nuclear arms control?	81.1	18.9

Following is the bipartisan amendment offered by Senator JACKSON and a statement of explanation:

S.J. RES. 241

On page 1, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following: "That the Government and the people of the United States ardently desire a stable international strategic balance that maintains peace and deters aggression. The Congress supports the stated policy of the United States that, were a more complete strategic offensive arms agreement not achieved within the five years of the interim agreement, and were the survivability of the strategic deterrent forces of the United States to be threatened as a result of such failure, this could jeopardize the supreme national interests of the United States; the Congress recognizes the difficulty of maintaining a stable strategic balance in a period of rapidly developing technology; the Congress recognize the principle of United States-Soviet Union equality reflected in the antiballistic missile treaty, and urges and requests the President to seek a future treaty that, inter alia, would not limit the United States to levels of intercontinental strategic forces inferior to the limits provided for the Soviet Union; and the Congress considers that the success of these agreements and the attainment of more permanent and comprehensive agreements are dependent upon the maintenance of a vigorous research and development and modernization program leading to a prudent strategic posture."

On page 1, line 3, strike out "That the" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 2. The".

**STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENRY M. JACKSON
ON AMENDMENT TO SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 241**

The amendment I am introducing today with bipartisan support is a simple declaration of the policy of the Congress with respect to the future strategic relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union. It does three things:

First, it recognizes that the failure of the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. to achieve a treaty limiting the threat to the survivability of U.S. strategic deterrent forces could jeopardize

our supreme national interests. Surely, we would all agree that our supreme national interests would be jeopardized if the survivability of our strategic forces were threatened. The language in which this Congressional policy is stated in the resolution differs from the language used in an earlier draft to make the same point. Far from being controversial, this is a policy to which the Administration committed itself during the SALT talks and which the Congress is here asked to join in supporting.

Second, my amendment puts the Congress on record in opposition to a follow-on SALT agreement in which the United States is limited to levels of intercontinental strategic forces inferior to the level accorded to the Soviet Union. In insisting on equality in any treaty to merge from SALT II, I am certain I am speaking for the good sense of the overwhelming majority of the American people. We should support the principle of equality on which the ABM treaty is based by applying it to offensive systems as well. We have, in the few brief years since the Kennedy Administration, gone from strategic superiority to parity to sufficiency (whatever that means) to interim sub-parity. We must not, and cannot accept strategic inferiority.

Moreover, in insisting that the limits to be negotiated in SALT II are confined to intercontinental strategic forces, the Senate would be strongly supporting the proper refusal of the President and our negotiators to compromise the interests of our European allies by including forces dedicated to their defense in the calculation of the overall U.S.-U.S.S.R. strategic balance.

Third, my amendment simply reaffirms the importance of research and development and force modernization leading to a prudent strategic posture.

I am confident that the Senate will give a solid vote of approval to this amendment expressing our determination to secure a stable future strategic relationship with the Soviet Union.

Many of my colleagues have argued for some time that the Senate ought to play a more significant role in the formulation of our foreign and defense policy. My amendment provides the Senate with an opportunity to join with the Administration as a full partner in the effort to broaden the understanding of as well as support for the interim agreement.

Following is an extensive speech given on this amendment by Senator JACKSON. I have asked the Senator if I may place it in the RECORD today as part of our discussion of the executive agreement. I am pleased to associate myself with his remarks for I know of no one more knowledgeable on this subject than my good friend from Washington, Senator HENRY JACKSON.

His remarks follow:

**THE SENATE AND THE INTERIM AGREEMENT
(Statement by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON)**

Mr. President, the Senate fully appreciates that it has before it an arms limitation measure of very great importance. Equally important, in my view, is how we in the Congress come to judge that agreement and how we convey our judgment to the Soviet Union, to our allies, to the Executive Branch and to the American people.

International agreements, this one included, have always had a dimension deeper than their words—a dimension that embodies hopes and expectations and reservations, all unwritten, and all of which reflect the blend of risks, doubts and assurances of which treaties are made. The present agreement, which rests to so remarkable a degree on statements with which the other party did not concur, has all of these in full measure.

SOME AMBIGUITIES RESOLVED

In an agreement that goes to the heart of America's security—our capacity to deter nuclear war—nothing is more important than a precise understanding of what the parties have agreed to. Precision can never weaken an arms control agreement, ambiguity can be a source of future tension.

From the moment the agreements were signed in Moscow, there were vague and conflicting reports about the contents of the accords. The press relied on confusing background briefings held in Moscow. Various statements and attachments, integral parts of the agreements, were not made public for weeks. Public figures issued statements of support before the terms of the accords were revealed or analyzed. High Administration spokesmen offered contradictory interpretations.

Thus, when the President finally submitted these agreements to the Congress, I was concerned that the Senate and the American people understand what we and the Russians could and could not do within their terms. The Senate Armed Services Committee, under the distinguished chairmanship of my able friend the Senator from Mississippi, held extensive hearings on the military implications of the SALT accords during which we tried very hard to bring before the American people the terms, and the meaning of the terms, of the interim agreement and the ABM treaty. We endeavored to obtain a clear and consistent Administration position on key provisions—which is not always easy.

Let me illustrate the kinds of problems the Committee hearings had to address. Article I of the interim agreement obligates the parties not to build ICBM launchers after July 1, 1972. But nowhere in the agreement does there appear the number of ICBM's the Soviets are thereby permitted to have. Article II contains a prohibition against substituting "heavy" ICBM launchers for "light" ICBM launchers. But nowhere is there an agreed-upon bilateral definition of what a "heavy" ICBM is. Terms like "modernization" and "significant increase" were used in the agreement, but precise definitions of these terms are not provided.

Mr. President, although the texts of the treaty and the executive agreement contain few numbers many more numbers have been discussed in connection with the SALT accords. In the last several weeks we have heard these: 1,054; 1,618; 313; 41; 42; 62; 84; 710; 740; 656; 950; and zero. The crucial questions for the nation and for the cause of world peace is whether these numbers add up to stable parity or unstable inferiority. It may clear the air to discuss some of them.

(a) 1,054—this is the maximum number of land-based ICBM's that the United States is permitted to retain under the agreement.

(b) 1,618—this is the maximum number of land-based ICBM's that the Soviet Union is permitted to retain given our understanding of the agreement. I emphasize "our understanding" because the figure 1,618 is a U.S. intelligence estimate and not a Soviet supplied number. This vagueness on the Soviet part is most unfortunate and can only lead to uncertainty and possible tensions. The agreement would be much improved by the use of specific numbers on both sides.

(c) 710—this is the maximum number of submarine launched ballistic missiles that the United States is permitted to deploy under the agreement. It is arrived at by adding our present 656 Polaris/Poseidon missiles to our potential, under the agreement, to replace 54 of our Titan missiles with new submarine launched ballistic missiles.

(d) 950—this is the maximum number of

submarine launched ballistic missiles that the Soviet Union is permitted to deploy under the agreement. To achieve this total the Soviets would retire their obsolete SS-7 and SS-8 ICBM's and replace them with new submarine based missiles. This would give the Soviets a total of 62 modern nuclear (Y-Class) submarines.

(e) 84—the total permissible number of Soviet missile firing submarines that can be deployed under the agreement. This is derived by adding 22 Soviet G-Class submarines to the 62 Y-Class submarines that they are permitted to construct.

(f) 44—the total permissible number of American missile firing submarines that can be deployed under the agreement. However, only 41 in actual fact are part of the U.S. deterrent in this period.

(g) 313—this is the maximum number of "heavy" ICBM's that the Soviet Union is permitted to deploy under the agreement. This again is a U.S. intelligence estimate. Not a confirmed Soviet figure. Each of these missiles can carry at least a 25 megaton warhead and perhaps, eventually, as much as 50 megatons. Of course the Soviets are free to replace single large warheads with many MIRV warheads per missile when they are able to do so.

(h) 0—this is the maximum number of "heavy" ICBM's that the United States is permitted to deploy under the agreement.

These numbers, Mr. President, are merely representative of the thrust of the agreements—which is to confer on the Soviet Union the authority to retain or deploy a number of weapons based on land and at sea that exceeds our own in every category, and by a 50% margin.

Now there will be some who argue that "numbers don't matter"—that both sides have "sufficiency" and that therefore the strategic balance is stable. How curious it is that the people who hold to the "numbers don't matter" doctrine are the same ones who believe that without an immediate arms control agreement the world is in danger of a great nuclear war. Either numbers matter or agreements don't—you can't have it both ways.

I have never seen an international agreement that depends so greatly on the attachment of unilateral statements. Clearly each of these unilateral statements reflects not U.S.-Soviet agreement but, on the contrary, a failure to reach agreement. In my view the interim agreement is substantially weakened as a result of the failures indicated by the resort to unilateral assertions with no legal standing. No long-term treaty covering these vital matters would be acceptable to me and, I suspect, to a majority of my colleagues, if it depended to the extent of the present agreement on unilateral statements. The fact that the present agreement runs for only five years mitigates a situation that would be intolerable in a future treaty. I believe that in expressing this view I am joined by Ambassador Smith who informed the Armed Services Committee that he expected provisions that could not be agreed upon in SALT I to be resolved on a bilateral basis in SALT II.

In seeking to establish clearly what the parties were permitted to do over the next five years and what they would be prohibited from doing—not all of which was self-evident—two points were of particular interest, and illustrate the complications that arise from vague language in the agreement and from negotiating not only against one's adversary but against self-imposed deadlines as well:

(1) Under the terms of the agreement, the Soviets are permitted to have *operational*, by July 1, 1972, 62 Polaris-type Y-Class submarines. The agreement is very explicit on this. Owing to a provision that could have constituted a serious loophole, the issue arose

as to whether the Soviets might have additional such submarines *under construction*, but not yet operational, on July 1, 1972. Some witnesses, including Ambassador Smith and Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Zumwalt, indicated that, technically, this was permissible. Were that the case, the Soviets could continue to turn out Y-Class submarines like sausages, 8 per year, with absolutely no perturbation of their deployment momentum.

Therefore, on July 24, I raised this problem with Secretary Laird in order to get the Administration position as understood at the highest levels. Secretary Laird said: "The protocol to the interim agreement specifies that the Soviet Union may have 950 SLBM launchers and not more than 62 modern ballistic missile submarines." Then Secretary Laird, speaking for the Administration, said: "In the event that during the period of the interim agreement they were to initiate construction of additional modern ballistic missile submarines beyond the number necessary to reach the total of 62, this could be done only as replacements [for older Y-Class submarines] and this would be under the procedures as specified under article 3 of the interim agreement. We would consider any new construction starts which were merely for the purpose of maintaining the momentum of the Soviet Union construction program to be contrary to the intent of the agreement."

This point is made equally clear in a colloquy between the Secretary and me. In order to understand the Administration view, I asked: "I take it that it is your judgment and the view of the President and the Administration that any attempt to use this ambiguity to build up—especially toward the end of this 5-year period—a pipeline of advanced Y-Class boats under construction—as a technical means of getting around the limit of 62 operational submarines, would be in clear violation of what we understand to be the agreement." Secretary Laird answered: "I would, and that would also apply to the United States."

(2) Another area of potential misunderstanding relates to the modernization of missile silos under the agreement. The agreement allows for the modernization of existing silo-launchers, but stipulates that, in the process of modernization, the dimensions of those silos cannot be significantly increased. In a further attachment to the agreement, a significant increase is defined as not greater than 15%.

Testimony from Administration witnesses on the meaning of these provisions was conflicting. Therefore, on July 24, I asked Secretary Laird for the definitive Administration position. He replied: "I would not go along with the interpretation that some Members of the Senate and House have given to that provision in which they read that the 10 to 15 percent increase in dimensions could allow an increase in both dimensions." I then asked: "Diameter and length?" Mr. Laird said: "Yes." He went on to say: "The major increase that would be possible under the agreement would be in any one silo dimension."

In order that there be no misunderstanding on this point, I want to cite the colloquy which followed this official policy declaration by Mr. Laird:

"Senator JACKSON. Do you reject the interpretation that an increase in both dimensions is allowable?"

"Secretary LAIRD. I have always rejected that from the first day that the treaty and the agreement became public—the idea that both diameter and depth could be increased by as much as 15 percent."

"Senator JACKSON. It is the Administration's position that only one dimension of a silo can be increased?"

"Secretary LAIRD. That is correct. That is the Administration's position."

"Senator JACKSON. It cannot be both dimensions?"

"Secretary LAIRD. It cannot be both diameter and depth."

THE MOMENTUM ARGUMENT OR HOW TO GO FORWARD WHILE STANDING IN PLACE

Mr. President, the present agreement is intended to slow the momentum of the build-up of Soviet offensive forces, a build-up that has taken the Soviets far beyond the force levels required for implementing a deterrent posture based on a simple notion of "assured destruction." My own examination and assessment of the appropriate intelligence data coupled with an analysis of the latitude granted under the terms of the agreement has brought me to the conclusion that, as a means of halting the Soviet momentum it is a failure and as a means of slowing Soviet momentum it accomplishes far less than has been claimed.

Mr. President, it is instructive to examine the comments made by the President and by his national security adviser, Dr. Kissinger, on the effect of the interim agreement. They add up to what I would call the "headache theory of treaty-making," according to which one signs an agreement not because it is good but because non-agreement is worse. That's about as close as public policy can come to beating your head against the wall because it feels so good when you stop. Listen to Dr. Kissinger:

"I do not deny that the initial reaction of some people will be to look at the gap in numbers. But once they understand . . . what the gap would be without this agreement . . . I believe that many of those who express some hesitation will come around."

Now, what I understand Dr. Kissinger to be saying is that those of us who are concerned at the gap in numbers in the interim agreement will be persuaded that a balance even more adverse to the United States would have resulted from a failure to reach the interim agreement. The President himself made this argument in his press conference of June 29, 1972 when he said:

"Had there been no arms control agreement, the Soviet Union had a program underway in the field of submarines which would have brought them up to over 90. The agreement limits them to 62."

"Had there been no arms control agreement—and this is the most important point—in the terms of offensive strategic weapons, the Soviet Union that has now passed us in offensive strategic weapons—they have 1,600; we have roughly 1,000—they would have built 1,000 more over the next 5 years. Now, under those circumstances, any President of the United States could see that in 5 years the United States would be hopelessly behind; our security would be threatened, our allies would be terrified, particularly in those areas, and our friends, like the Mideast, where the possibility of Soviet adventurism is considered to be rather great."

"Therefore, the arms control agreement at least put a brake on new weapons."

So we have before us an agreement designed to see us through the next few years, the chief virtue of which is that life under it will be less dangerous, hopefully, than life without it. This may be a sufficient argument for the Senate giving approval to the interim agreement. It is not, in my view, a sufficient argument for allowing our approval to go unqualified, either by our recognition of the risks or the assertion of our own view of the future.

Understanding what the agreement does is of such importance that I raised the question of the extent to which it slows Soviet momentum on a number of occasions. For example, on July 19 I had the following exchange with General Ryan, Chief of Staff of the Air Force:

"Senator JACKSON. One method of assessing the impact of the SALT accords on Soviet programs would be to compare what they are free to do under the agreement with what we have projected that they might have done in the absence of the agreement. Speaking generally, and without getting into precise estimates, how does the lower end of the spectrum of official estimates of the Soviet strategic offensive force for mid-1977 compare with the permitted Soviet force under the SALT accords?"

"General RYAN. Roughly equivalent, Senator, lower end of the spectrum."

Again, on July 21, I put the same question to the Chief of Naval Operations.

Admiral Zumwalt, who, like General Ryan, is fully apprised of our intelligence projections. The Admiral answered:

"The lower end of the spectrum of the official estimates is lower than the force permitted under the SALT accords."

Mr. President, I ought to make clear for the record that I put the same question to both Ambassador Smith and General Allison of the SALT Delegation when they appeared before the Armed Services Committee on June 2. Both gentlemen declined to answer stating that security considerations precluded comment. Now, the figures in question are readily available to any Senator who wishes to judge for himself the extent to which the forward momentum of the Soviet build-up has been slowed by the interim agreement.

The Director of Defense Research and Engineering commented on this question of the impact of the interim agreement on Soviet deployment programs when he appeared before the Armed Services Committee in executive session on June 22, 1972. At that time Dr. Foster engaged in an important exchange with my good friend the Senator from Nevada:

"Senator CANNON. I want to turn for a moment to the discussion of momentum that Senator Jackson was talking about that both sides have in building strategic weapons and how that will change our relative strategic posture as a result of SALT. I think this is a subject which is relevant to a meaningful discussion of the role of the ABM in the NCA defense."

"The Interim Offensive Agreement limits both the United States and the Soviets to their present ICBM force, with allowances made for the Soviets to complete 90-odd silos now under construction. Therefore, the Soviets have slightly more than a 1.5 to 1 ratio of ICBM launchers and their numerical advantage is about 600."

"The interim agreement also allows the Soviets to build up to a 62-submarine force, an increase of about 40 or so from their present level of about 22 Yankee class."

"On the other hand, we are essentially frozen at a maximum of 44 submarines, only three more than our present level, and therefore, the agreement grants the Soviets the advantage of completing their current momentum in submarine building."

"Is that not basically correct?"

"Dr. FOSTER. Yes, that is correct."

"Senator CANNON. Concerning the quid pro quo of the treaty and agreement, is it not true that the Soviets will not have to exercise restraint in their momentum, that is, they will not have to curtail their current building rate of production on submarines for at least 3 years and perhaps more?"

"Dr. FOSTER. Yes, sir; that is correct."

"Senator CANNON. In other words, they will not be giving up anything in terms of momentum until at least 3 years from now and possibly 4 to 5."

"On the other hand, the United States has agreed to give up something this year, and that is work on three ABM sites at the Minuteman missile installations. In fact, we will actually be dismantling work already

started at Malmstrom Air Force Base. Thus we are giving up something now whereas they might give up something 3 years from now, or then again they might not."

"Is that a correct assessment?"

"Dr. FOSTER. Yes, that is correct."

Mr. President, I have tried to put in perspective the claim that the interim agreement halts the momentum of the Soviet build-up not to reflect adversely on the interim agreement, but to help the Senate form a judgment that bears directly on our policy with respect to SALT II. It is essential, in my view, that we enter the second phase of the SALT deliberations with a clear view of the emerging relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union and with the conviction that SALT II, whatever else it does, must assure equality between the parties on offensive intercontinental strategic arms. To insist on such equality with respect to offensive weapons is to require no more than was done, at Soviet insistence, with defensive weapons in the ABM treaty.

THE CASE FOR THE AMENDMENT

Mr. President, my amendment, which is broadly co-sponsored by a bipartisan group of Senators, deals with three issues: (1) the threat to the survivability of the U.S. strategic deterrent under the interim agreement; (2) the need for equality in any follow-up agreement on offensive intercontinental strategic weapons; and (3) the need for research, development and force modernization. These are issues that I have thoroughly discussed with the Administration, with the witnesses before the Armed Services Committee and, in many cases, with my colleagues in the Senate. It is my firm conviction that we ought to state our views with respect to these issues and I believe my amendment is a medium for the expression of views that I am confident are shared by a majority of my colleagues.

(1) The threat to the survivability of the U.S. strategic deterrent

Clearly any treaty that authorizes the latitude retained by the parties under this interim agreement contains certain risks. How severe those risks prove out to be depends less on the letter of the interim agreement than on the spirit of it. The simple fact is that the Soviets could, by pursuing an aggressive program of qualitative improvement to their offense, acquire the capability to destroy virtually the entire U.S. land-based deterrent force, missiles and bombers. This could be accomplished within the agreed number of launchers by such means as increasing the throw weight of the Soviet offensive force (already four times that of the United States), extensive MIRVing coupled with improved missile accuracy, etc. Since we would be prohibited by the agreement and treaty from a number of stabilizing responses, the strategic balance could deteriorate under the terms of the interim agreement.

The situation we face in this regard was developed, in part, in testimony by the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Dr. John Foster, before the Committee on Armed Services on June 22. In response to a question put by my friend, the Senator from Ohio, Dr. Foster identified some potential sources of instability that are wholly within the terms of the interim agreement:

"Senator SAXBE. You state that Soviet exploitation of their numbers and throw-weight capabilities could adversely affect the strategic balance. Will you elaborate on that statement and indicate specifically how and when?"

"Dr. FOSTER. I was referring simply to the fact that the Soviet strategic missile capability exceeds our own capability in both numbers and payload-carrying ability. In numbers of ICBM's alone, they exceed us by approximately 50%, and in payload capability by greater than 50%."

"If they were to exploit these numerically greater capabilities, such as by improving accuracy, resorting to MIRV, use of warheads having higher yield-to-weight ratios, upgrading their SAM's, or some combination of these and others, the strategic balance would be affected adversely. For example, with MIRV and accuracy improvements, the SS-9 force alone could be a severe threat to pre-launch survivability of our own land-based force. Or, other Soviet land-based missiles exist in sufficient numbers so that, with accuracy improvement, they could threaten our land-based force, leaving the SS-9 for other things—such as threatening our cities.

"You asked when this could occur. I am not able to answer when it will or if it will. Should they wish such a capability, it could be achieved in perhaps 3-5 years."

It is my great hope, Mr. President, that these developments will not occur, that the Soviet Union will recognize that the overriding intent of the interim agreement is to contain the threat to the survivability of our deterrent forces and that, consistent with this intent, they will refrain from programs that would undermine it.

What we have sought in our negotiations with the Soviets is a stable strategic relationship based on survivable strategic forces. Therefore, any action by the Soviets that threatens the survivability of our deterrent forces must be a source of great concern.

I pursued this problem with Secretary Laird on July 24, and I believe our colloquy on this subject is highly instructive:

"Senator JACKSON. The intent of the agreements is to enhance our security by enhancing the survivability of our deterrent. So you would view Soviet behavior that threatens the survivability of our deterrent as a violation of the intent of the agreements?"

"Secretary LAIRD. I would agree.

"Senator JACKSON. If there is a pattern which threatens the survivability of our deterrent, you would treat that as a violation of the intent of the parties in making this agreement, would you not?"

"Secretary LAIRD. I certainly would.

"Senator JACKSON. For example, the replacement provision on submarines, which we have discussed, as a subterfuge for sustaining momentum—

"Secretary LAIRD. That is correct. We would interpret it the same way and it applies to us, too.

"Senator JACKSON. That is, on a bilateral basis?"

"Secretary LAIRD. That's right.

"Senator JACKSON. An aggressive program, beyond modernization, to deploy silo-killing warheads which threatens the survivability of our Minuteman force—you would treat that in the same way?"

"Secretary LAIRD. Yes, sir, and would recommend action if such a program were developed and tested."

Mr. President, Senators who share my view that the Senate ought to go on record in support of the policy of the United States to seek a follow-on agreement that limits the threat to the survivability of our deterrent forces will welcome my amendment. The first part does precisely that. It urges restraint on the part of the Soviet Union by indicating that a failure to achieve a threat-limiting agreement could jeopardize the supreme national interests of the United States. In so doing, the amendment takes account of the fact that while the interim agreement may have some slight effect on the rate of growth of the Soviet threat to the survivability of our deterrent, it does not halt it. Therefore, should the threat overtake the negotiation of a follow-on agreement at any time within the next five years, our supreme national interests could be jeopardized. I will be surprised, Mr. President, to learn that there is any substantial opposition to this view within the Senate.

(2) Equality in SALT II

Mr. President, I have elsewhere described the present agreement as providing the United States with "interim sub-parity." The agreement confers on the Soviets a 50% advantage in numbers of land and sea-based launchers and a 400% advantage in throw weight. Now, the argument is made that this enormous disparity in numbers of launchers and throw weight is offset by superior technology and numbers of warheads on our side. There is a certain limited truth to this claim. It is not an enduring truth: for while numbers are limited under the agreement, technology is not. It stands to reason, therefore, that in the long run "superior" technology cannot be relied upon to offset inferior numbers.

The inability of technology to compensate for numbers is not only true in general but is, in the present case, true for specific reasons as well. The greatest part of our presumed technological advantage lies in our lead over the Soviets in the development and deployment of MIRV warheads on our missile forces. This lead is not one that can be maintained at anything approaching our current margin. On the contrary, when the Soviets develop a MIRV capability—and they are expected to do so at "any moment"—the combination of that capability and their vastly superior throw weight will give them, given time and effort on their part, superiority in numbers of warheads.

There is an enormous volume of misinformation on the subject of alleged U.S. advantages arising from technology and geography. There is no doubt that in the long run technology will tend toward equalization. How well I remember those who argued that the Soviets would require a decade or more to catch up with the United States in developing hydrogen weapons. The same sort of scientists who today argue that we can rest comfortably with inferior numbers of launchers because of an unbridgeable advantage in technology miscalculated by about 9½ out of 10 years back in 1947. The Russians, of course, were only months behind us, and our scientists were behind the eight ball.

As to geography I have heard it argued—the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee made the case himself last week—that owing to our possession of forward bases for our submarine fleet we need fewer submarines than the Soviets in order to maintain on-station times equal to theirs. Now, sea-based strategic forces are assuming increasing importance so it is essential that we be correct on this point. Despite some statements to the contrary, the geographical asymmetries favor the Soviet submarine fleet and not our own. With the increased range such as that of the Soviet SSN-X-8 submarine launched missile the importance of forward bases is greatly diminished. Russian submarines will be on-station with respect to a large number of U.S. targets within one day's travel time from Murmansk or Petropavlovsk. This is not substantially different from the situation of our submarines operating out of their forward bases. What is more important, however, is that the Russians have a very large land mass between our submarines and their vulnerable points while we do not: most of the U.S. points that are targets for Soviet submarine launched missiles are coastal or near-coastal.

So there is little substance to the claim that we are in a favorable geographical situation.

The point I wish to make, Mr. President, is that, over the long run, there is no substitute for equal numbers of launchers taking account of throw weight differentials. I believe that the Senate should join with our negotiators and Administration spokesmen in rejecting, for the future, the sort of disparities that we have agreed to, on an interim

basis, in the present agreement. And in so doing I believe that we ought to insist that the principle that was applied in the case of the ABM treaty—the principle of equality on which the Russians insisted—ought to be applied to a treaty on offensive weapons.

I was concerned, Mr. President, that our consent to the interim agreement, containing, as it does, the wide disparities to which I have referred, might be misunderstood as reflecting on the acceptability of such disparities in a follow-on treaty. In order to make the record clear I asked a number of witnesses before the Armed Services Committee to comment on this issue.

On July 18, I ask Ambassador Gerard Smith, the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and head of our SALT Delegation: "Would the present Interim Agreement be acceptable as a permanent agreement?" Ambassador Smith replied: "Not to me." I then directed the same question to other members of the SALT Delegation. Former Deputy Secretary of Defense and now Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for SALT, Mr. Paul Nitze, said: "No." General Royal Allison, a member of the delegation and Assistant to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for Strategic Arms Negotiations, also said "No."

On July 24, I directed a similar question to Secretary Laird, with respect to whether a SALT II agreement should continue the numerical relationships established in the interim agreement. Secretary Laird, speaking for the Administration, said: "I would hope that in these negotiations we could move in the direction of equality as far as numbers and also as far as some of the other important areas dealing with offensive strategic weapon systems. I feel that this should be a very important thrust of our negotiations because this is very basic to the continued support of the obligations that we have undertaken with our friends and allies throughout the world in order to prevent the possibility of a nuclear exchange in the future."

Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Zumwalt, testified:

"It is my view that in SALT II, we must achieve an equality of numbers. Just as the Soviets insisted on symmetry with regard to the ABM treaty, if we are going to go into a permanent treaty on the strategic side, I think we absolutely must insist on symmetry."

I know of no one in a responsible position in the Administration who is in disagreement with this widely expressed view.

My amendment provides the Senate with an opportunity to declare itself in favor of equality in a follow-on agreement and I am certain that in view of the basic good sense of that position and the overwhelming testimony before us we will act to affirm it.

Mr. President, the question of what is to be included in the computation of equal forces in a follow-on agreement is related to the difficult issue of our forward deployments in Europe which are dedicated to the defense of our European allies and which are at sea.

The intent of my amendment as it bears on this matter is, I believe, perfectly clear and straightforward. In stating that "the Congress recognizes the principle of United States-Soviet Union equality reflected in the anti-ballistic missile treaty" and that accordingly "the Congress requests the President to seek a future treaty that, *inter alia*, would not limit the United States to levels of intercontinental strategic forces inferior to the limits provided for the Soviet Union" it is unmistakably clear that so-called forward based systems, which are not intercontinental, should not be included in that calculation of equality. It is my view, and the intent of the pending amendment, that any

eventual treaty must recognize the necessity that the intercontinental strategic forces of the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., by which I mean to include ICBM's, submarine-launched nuclear missiles, and intercontinental range bombers of the two powers, should bear an equal relationship to one another. This says nothing about the eventual role of or disposition of the issue of forward based systems.

With regard to the question of forward based systems it has been my understanding, as clearly set forth by representatives of the Administration in testimony before the Senate, that the U.S. has refused to negotiate the issue of forward based systems in a bilateral U.S.-U.S.S.R. negotiation. I understand that this position was based on the entirely justifiable view that such systems are part and parcel of our alliance defense commitment and could not appropriately be considered without satisfactory alliance participation. I fully support the Administration's views on this matter and there is nothing in my amendment which in any way contradicts that position.

(3) *Research, development, modernization*

My amendment, in its final sentences, simply points to the need for a vigorous program of research, development and modernization leading to a prudent strategic posture. I wish to emphasize that adoption of this language is not intended to bear upon the wisdom of any particular procurement item. Decisions on procurement ought to be taken on a case by case basis. So while it is useful for the Senate to go on record to the effect that we must continue our efforts in the research, development and modernization area, Senators can rest assured that this does not constitute an endorsement of any particular weapons system or any particular research and development effort. I emphasize this, Mr. President, because I would not wish Senators to gain the impression that in voting for my amendment they are committing themselves to any future action on procurement items.

Mr. President, I began my remarks by observing that international agreements always involve unwritten hopes and expectations and reservations. Sometimes it helps to set them down. In the present case I hope, and I am sure my colleagues share this hope, that a follow-on agreement will limit the threat to the survivability of our strategic deterrent forces. It is, in my view, well to underline this hope by language that lets the Soviets know that a failure to achieve this result would jeopardize our supreme national interests. My amendment does that.

I fully expect that our negotiators at SALT II will insist upon equality just as the Soviets insisted upon equality in the ABM treaty. The issue of whether the present agreement adds up to equality is beside the point; and there will be differences of opinion on that. But what I am certain we can agree on is the necessity that we not accept in SALT II levels of intercontinental strategic weapons that are inferior to the levels of intercontinental forces permitted for the Soviet Union. My amendment does that.

Finally, I am confident that the Senate would wish to reaffirm its confidence in the importance of our research and development efforts.

Mr. President, the overriding hope and expectation of all of us is that the SALT deliberations will eventually produce a treaty that will assure the survivability, and therefore the credibility, of our deterrent posture. Such a treaty would be an enormous step toward world peace.

Mr. President, I want to see the Senate of the United States play a full and equal role in the effort to bring about such a treaty. The place to start is by giving our advice as well as our consent to the present agreement. We have an obligation to give direction to the future efforts of the government on SALT

policy. I believe that direction must be toward survivable forces and toward equality. I am confident the Senate shares this view and that it will act to support my amendment.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we in the House will make our contribution toward perfecting this Executive agreement by accepting the amendment being offered by Senator JACKSON.

FOREIGN FISHING ACTIVITIES OFF ALASKA

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, today I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of the monthly summary—July 1972—concerning the foreign fishing activity which is taking place off the coast of Alaska.

As indicated in this report, the number of Japanese vessels engaged in fisheries off Alaska rose to a peak of 470 vessels in early July. This was due to the presence of elements of the annual Japanese high seas salmon gillnet expedition in the Alaska region.

The number of Soviet vessels increased from 25 to 30 during the month of July, and South Korean vessels remained at four stern trawlers. I certainly hope this type of information will be of interest and perhaps helpful, in some instances, to my colleagues:

MONTHLY SUMMARY OF FOREIGN FISHING ACTIVITIES OFF ALASKA, JULY 1972

SOVIET

The number of Soviet vessels engaged in fisheries off Alaska increased from 25 to 30 in July. Twenty-three Soviet vessels were engaged in fisheries off Alaska in July 1971.

Groundfish trawl fishery

The number of trawlers fishing for groundfish along the Continental Shelf edge in the Bering Sea increased slightly from 12 to 14. The fleet was divided with 6 medium trawlers fishing northwest of the Pribilof Islands and 8 medium trawlers fishing north of the Fox Islands in the eastern Aleutian Islands.

Ocean perch fishery

The Soviet ocean perch fishery off Alaska remained at a relatively low level during the month of July. A fleet of 11 stern trawlers fished off Kodiak Island in the central Gulf of Alaska, 2 stern trawlers fished in the far western Aleutians, and 2 stern trawlers fished in the eastern Aleutian Islands.

JAPANESE

The number of Japanese vessels engaged in fisheries off Alaska rose to a peak of 470 vessels in early July. This was due to the presence of elements of the annual Japanese high seas salmon gillnet expedition in the Alaska region, and was similar to the number of vessels present in July 1971.

Pacific Ocean perch fishery

The number of stern trawlers fishing for ocean perch in the Gulf of Alaska varied between 13 and 10, and the fishery was widespread ranging from off southeast Alaska to the Shumagin Islands in the western Gulf. Continuing to fish for ocean perch along the Aleutian Island chain were 15 to 20 stern trawlers. Fishing was centered in the Seguam-Amukta Passes area in the central Aleutians with scattered activity in the far western and eastern Aleutians.

Fish meat, fish meal and oil fishery

Six factory ship fleets composed of a total of 105 trawlers continued to fish primarily for Alaska pollock on the Continental Shelf northwest of the Pribilof Islands in the central Bering Sea.

Groundfish trawl fishery

Fishing for groundfish along the Continental Shelf edge in the Bering Sea were about 15 independent stern trawlers. The vessels fishing primarily for Alaska pollock were scattered from Unimak Pass in the eastern Bering Sea to the northwest of the Pribilof Islands in the central Bering Sea.

Crab fishery

Two Japanese factory ship fleets continued fishing primarily for tanner crab with pots in the Bering Sea. One fleet remained north of the Alaska Peninsula in the eastern Bering Sea, the other fleet shifted from the area to the vicinity of the Pribilof Islands in the central Bering Sea at midmonth.

Approximately five independent processing catcher vessels are fishing for tanner crab with pots far northwest of the Pribilof Islands west of 175 degrees West longitude. This small independent fishery took place in 1971 and is outside of the area covered by the U.S.-Japanese crab treaty.

Longline fishery

The number of longline vessels fishing for sablefish in the Gulf of Alaska remained at 10 throughout July. The fishery was widespread with vessels ranging from off southeast Alaska to south of Kodiak Island in the central Gulf.

Snail fishery

Three vessels fishing with pots for sea snails continued to operate on the Continental Shelf northwest of the Pribilof Islands. The fishery was expected to terminate at the end of July.

Salmon fishery

In early July seven factory ship fleets composed of about 233 gillnet vessels fished for salmon in the Alaskan area. By mid-July four factory ship fleets composed of about 131 gillnetters remained in the Alaskan area in the northern central Bering Sea. By the end of July, the Japanese terminated their high seas salmon fishing expedition as the quota had been reached. The ten fleets fished approximately one week longer this year to reach their assigned catch targets due to rough sea conditions during the early part of the season. The poor weather conditions prevented the Japanese from making good catches of red salmon during the peak period of the run. The small amount of red salmon catch and the extended period of operation will probably result in marginal profits this season.

SOUTH KOREAN

The number of South Korean vessels fishing off Alaska remained at four stern trawlers during July. During the month two trawlers fished for Alaska pollock northwest of the Pribilof Islands in the central Bering Sea and two vessels fished for pollock and ocean perch south of Kodiak Island in the central Gulf of Alaska. By late July, the two vessels fishing south of Kodiak shifted operations to the eastern Aleutian Islands.

SHARKS AND MERCURY

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, in a broadcast heard here this morning, radio Australia newsreel reported that the

State of Victoria has banned the sale of the region's leading seafood—the meat of school sharks—because of high mercury levels.

In American terms, it is the equivalent of banning hamburger, and it is thus worthy of note by those who contend that the Food and Drug Administration is being arbitrary in setting a limit of 0.5 parts per million for mercury in fish sold here.

The school shark, used principally in fish and chips, comprises 70 percent of the seafood consumed in Victoria. The Australian shark catch last year totaled 16 million pounds, of which 6.2 million pounds came from Victoria's waters.

Under the ban, school sharks more than 28 inches long may neither be caught nor sold for human consumption. It is termed a serious blow to a multi-million dollar industry.

Allowing for difficulties of radio reception, it seems from this morning's account that the study of mercury levels in school sharks began in April, and that levels as high as 2 parts per million were found in some of the 480 specimens tested.

Whatever its outcome, the ban on the school shark—*Galeorhinus Australis*—by the Victorian minister of health shows that concern about the possible effect of mercury levels on human health is not confined to a few Swedish scientists and the FDA.

EARLY CHILDHOOD CONFERENCE

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year in Boise, Idaho, I sponsored a conference on early childhood to focus on a timely and important subject by providing information and understanding about the needs of young children.

The day-long conference fulfilled a dream I had had for some time because of my very strong interest in young children and young children's programs. In recent months there has been a good deal of misunderstanding and a fair amount of mythology about young children and about the role we can play in helping to shape their lives in a positive way. Therefore, in order to bring some light into some of these dark corners, in order to build the base of public understanding about how children grow and develop, I felt there was a need for such a forum where we could disseminate some of the results of the growing body of research that is accumulating—a forum where we could examine some of the issues, very real issues that ought to be discussed and debated, and one that perhaps could provide a kind of foundation of knowledge and understanding on which we can build meaningful efforts.

I was particularly honored that Dr. Edward F. Zigler, then director of the Office of Child Development of the Department of Health, Education, and Wel-

fare, accepted my invitation to keynote the symposium. Also featured at the conference was Dr. Bettye M. Caldwell, director of the Center for Early Development and Education in Little Rock, Ark., along with a number of Idahoans who are specialists and experts in the early childhood field.

As part of my remarks, I would like to include excerpts from the first Idaho Early Childhood Conference:

OPENING REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN ORVAL HANSEN OF IDAHO

We are here today to discuss the needs of very young children—those under age six—and who should meet those needs in today's rapidly changing society.

The traditional self-sufficient extended family is today more of a memory or a myth than a reality. Instead, we see that the nuclear family dominates the scene—two parents and their two or three children. They are on their own as far as raising their children is concerned.

Throughout the 1960's and now in the 1970's, we have seen the number of mothers taking full-time jobs outside the home steadily increase. This may be due to a change in values or it may be due to the press of economic conditions. But whatever the cause, we now have to face the fact that a third of all mothers in the U.S. with children younger than age six are in the workforce, and half of all mothers with children younger than eighteen are working. The total numbers involved are staggering. As of a year ago, there were 4,327,000 mothers in the labor force with children younger than age six; they had a total of 5,649,000 children. Most of these children, some 4.8 million, came from families with both mother and father present.

What is happening to these children while their mothers are at work? This is what we are here today to discuss. Labor Department statistics tell us that there are less than a million licensed places in daycare centers and family daycare homes. The rest of the 4.6 million children whose mothers work are cared for in their own homes by relatives or babysitters, in someone else's home, or in an unlicensed group care facility. The quality of services they receive range from dismal to superb. The challenge that this problem raises is a real one. It will not go away just because we do not feel that mothers should not be working. The reality is that they are, and will do so in the future in even greater numbers. Today, therefore, we will address ourselves to the question of what our response to their children should be.

But our concern for the early childhood period goes beyond the obvious problems associated with families with working mothers. Through research, we are coming to realize the vital importance of the early years—from the prenatal period through age six. This concern is evidenced in many ways. Only 8 states, for example, require kindergarten programs, but across the United States, some 82 percent of the 5-year-olds and 29 percent of the 4-year-olds are actually enrolled in such programs. Obviously the parents of these children feel that something important can be gained from early education. The speakers later today will describe in detail the many ways in which these early years are of crucial importance to a child's mental, physical and social growth.

As legislation pertaining to child development programs was debated in Congress, one could not help but notice that a number of speeches were made emphasizing the importance of the family. The implication was that in some way the existence of child development programs would result in a deterioration of the family structure as we know, or imagine, it today.

I think these speakers got things backwards. The family is changing today, regardless of whether or not such programs

are instituted. We have the option of responding, or not responding to this change. I am one of those who believes that we need to take whatever steps are appropriate to make sure that each child has the opportunity to realize his full potential. If his parents can handle this job on their own, fine. But if they need help, if they want advice, if they feel that their children need special services, then we should be ready to respond to these needs.

I have heard it said that child development programs will supplant the family. I believe that we can develop programs that will supplement it. I hope that after today's meeting, we will all have a clearer idea of how this can be done.

I would like to close with an idea expressed by Urie Bronfenbrenner. He asked, "How can we judge the worth of a society?" His answer: by the concern of one generation for the next. "If the children and youth of a nation are afforded opportunity to develop their capacities to the fullest, if they are given the knowledge to understand the world and the wisdom to change it, then the prospects for the future are bright. In contrast, a society which neglects its children, however well it may function in other respects, risks eventual disorganization and demise."

REMARKS BY IDAHO GOVERNOR CECIL D. ANDRUS

Congressman Hansen, Dr. Zigler, and distinguished guests: It is indeed a pleasure to have the opportunity to address you today on one of our most pressing social questions; that of adequate care for our youngest citizens. While this question has always been with us, and to a limited extent we have tried to cope with it, the magnitude of the problems involved appear to only now begin to be recognized and understood.

Undoubtedly, we could present many causes for the increase in problems in providing adequate services to our children. One, which must be a predominant factor, is many parents are no longer in the home. By this I don't just mean we are suffering problems due to one parent households, but 31 percent of the mothers in Idaho with children below the age of six years work.

51 percent of the mothers with children six to seventeen years of age work. Almost 37 percent of the working age females in Idaho were employed in 1970 than in 1960. Women in Idaho now constitute 35 percent of the total work force. This trend indicates a radical social change for our country and presents the problems we now face and to which we must find solutions.

Through our recently created Idaho office of child development, we have been able to gather more accurate data than has ever been compiled before on the problems facing children in our state. I would like to take this opportunity to outline some of those problems.

Of the 77,000 preschoolers in the state, 8,500 live in financially impoverished environments and another 6,200 are handicapped or potentially handicapped. Of those facilities in Idaho offering day care, about 60 percent provide only custodial care; another 33 percent provide custodial and education; and only 7 percent are full developmental programs. Only in those publicly sponsored programs is significant consideration given to the ability of the parents to pay for the services provided.

We have further found that the highest day care demand is for programs containing an educational component. Fifty percent of the existing programs could not supply enough slots to meet this demand, while the demand for merely custodial services exceeded capacity in only 12 percent of the centers.

We have found the median cost for operating day care facilities in Idaho at the present level of development is between 500 and 600 dollars per year. This is about 700 dollars below the Federal estimate necessary to

meet minimal program standards. There are virtually no comprehensive preventative programs for children between the ages of 0 and 3 in the State of Idaho.

Preliminary data gathered by the Office of Child Development indicates only about 3% of our preschool children are receiving any kind of day care center services. Thus, about 10% of the working mothers are able to utilize day care center services. The rest must make other arrangements.

We have found that about one-third of the presently operating facilities would not provide services for special children, such as handicapped children. Thus, the need for the child from the disadvantaged home and children with handicapping conditions is acute. It is estimated that about 3,500 migrant children between the ages of 0 and 6 are in the State during the year. Of these, almost one-half are in families having established residency in the State. We also know that we have in excess of 600 Indian children below 6 years of age in the State, most of whom could utilize developmental day care services. Large sections of the State have no full-time pediatric services at all.

These are some of the problems with which we are confronted in the area of child development, especially early childhood development. Many of these problems have been with us a long time. Many of them generate out of adverse economic circumstances. Others are related to racial prejudice. But all seem to be magnified by this radical social change, this new affluence that has parents out of the home most of the time.

Whether or not we want to admit it, one of the greatest causes of our present problems is the breakdown of the basic, traditional, family unit. We must now rededicate ourselves to the solving of these problems and to the strengthening of the family unit.

In the past year, the State of Idaho has engaged, as many of you are aware, in an effort to cope with our predicament. Through the help of the National Office of Child Development and Dr. Zigler personally, we have created an office of Child Development, which is now in the process of analyzing in detail our problems and developing solutions. The office is additionally attempting to bring about more public recognition and understanding of the situation. The meeting that the Congressman has put together this morning is an outstanding vehicle for just that topic. Those of you that are in attendance here and have been to others, think back five years ago at the meetings you attended and the number in attendance as compared to the number here this morning.

In the last year we have transferred the Mental Retardation and Child Development Centers to the Department of Public Assistance. Under new leadership we will now be able to expand the services delivered by the Child Development Centers immensely.

The Department of Public Assistance has and is continuing to extend and expand social services. All eligible recipient children will soon receive periodic physical and mental examinations.

They will not only receive examinations but they will also receive improved services to meet any deficiencies found by those examinations. Of significant importance here will be a massive effort to provide adequate optometric services, including glasses for all who need them. Public assistance has amended its State plan so as to be able to take advantage of considerably more Federal funds, with a minimum amount of State or local matching money, for expanded services to eligible recipients. This presents us with a new potential in the provision of adequate day care services for a large portion of the children of the State. But it is only a potential until we are able to develop it.

In another area, we have been able to take advantage of funds provided by the Emergency Employment Act and have placed over 100 kindergarten teachers throughout the State of Idaho. While the future of this program is still in question and the legislature has still failed to fund a State supported kindergarten program, this has filled a significant gap in the universe of needs of Idaho children.

But we still must recognize we are only in the beginning stages of dealing with the problem on a statewide level. Your meeting today will present an opportunity to delve more thoroughly into the problems we are facing. I commend you for your involvement and your interest, and thank Orval for putting together this first Idaho Early Childhood Conference. We need your ideas as to how best develop programs to solve our early childhood problems. We need your help in generating the support necessary to provide for adequate federal and state financing of these much-needed services.

I hope your deliberations will bring about these ideas and answers to our problems. I stand ready to help implement any feasible recommendations you develop.

I thank you.

IN RECOGNITION OF JESSE KUHAULUA, HAWAII NATIVE SON, FIRST NON-JAPANESE TO EVER WIN A JAPAN SUMO ASSOCIATION TOURNAMENT

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, of all the sports of Japan, none holds a more honored position in the native culture than the art of sumo wrestling. Those other than native Japanese who have been involved in this art are few, not only because of the special physical requirements, but also because of the desire, determination, and mental fortitude that are necessary.

Eight years ago Jesse Kuhaulua left Happy Valley, Maui, Hawaii, to study the art of sumo under masters in Japan. On August 22, he will return, himself a master of this foreign art. His recent upset victory at the Japan Sumo Association tournament at Nagoya, Japan, has stunned the sumo world and brought joy and honor to the people of Hawaii. Jesse Kuhaulua is the first non-Japanese ever to win a Japan Sumo Association tournament, and we are proud that he calls Hawaii home.

I offer for the RECORD several articles from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin and Advertiser which explain more fully the pride that the people of Hawaii have in this "local boy" who made so very, very good:

THE JESSE KUHAULUA STORY

The story of Jesse Kuhaulua is a story of success through desire and fortitude.

It's a story that should be told and retold in Hawaii to inspire our Island athletes that they, too, can attain national and international success through determination and perseverance.

Too often our Island athletes have failed because they lacked determination.

Jesse Kuhaulua of Happy Valley, Maui, won the championship of the most recent Japan

Sumo Association tournament at Nagoya through guts and dedication.

His victory stunned the sumo world. It was totally unexpected.

The huge Hawaiiian had not done well in the last several tournaments. He had had his ups and downs—more of the latter—and many experts were inclined to believe that he had seen his better days and that he would have to retire before long. But the experts had not figured on Kuhaulua's pride and desire to make good.

It is Jesse's ambition to attain the rank of ohzeki—champion—before bowing out. Ohzeki is only one rank below grand champion.

"It is difficult to become a grand champion, but I think it is possible to become an ohzeki," Jesse said on one of his visits to Honolulu after he graduated from the novice class.

JESSE TURNED TO SUMO WRESTLING TO IMPROVE HIS FOOTBALL PLAYING

(By Robert Johnson)

WAILUKU, MAUI.—The story of Maui is that Jesse Kuhaulua, a frail brood of a lad of 260 pounds, took up sumo wrestling so he could improve his football playing ability.

It was a good move. He not only became a better grid player, but he became one of the greatest sumo wrestlers in the world, a recent winner of one of Japan's biggest sumo tournaments.

"I recommended Jesse for sumo training as part of his training for high school football when he was about 14 or 15 years old," says Isamu Ogasawara of Pukalani, a retired Maui Pine employee. "But he already was a pretty good size, about 260 pounds."

Ogasawara said that by Jesse's third year, "he really was good. He used to practice more than anybody else."

"So I took him to Honolulu to see the sumo there and told him to practice with the professionals from Japan. One of those big sumo managers spotted him and asked if he would like to try out in Japan. At first Jesse said he didn't know if he wanted to, just like a kid."

"But after he practiced with the professionals about a half hour he came to me and said he thought he would go. He already had confidence that when he hit them he could take care of them."

It is now eight years later and Jesse will be coming home soon—the conquering hero from a foreign land.

He has announced he'll be back in Hawaii Aug. 22—and already huge celebrations as being planned for him in Honolulu and on Maui.

Jesse didn't have to go to Japan to become a hero, however. He was that in prep football here.

"He was, of course, the biggest boy in the Maui Interscholastic football League," says Wayne Tanaka, veteran Maui News sports editor.

"He didn't need to know the plays. He just went through the middle. He also was good at running conversions—right through the middle."

Kuhaulua was so big that he has been turned down by the draft twice since he went to Japan.

"Nobody doubted his strength or ability when he went to Japan," said Tanaka. "But they were pessimistic if he'd be able to withstand the hard training and homesickness."

The Maui Sumo Kyokai, along with other community and Hawaiian groups, plans a large reception for Jesse when he returns to Hawaii. Mayor Elmer Cravalho has sent Jesse a message of "deep appreciation for the recognition you have brought our beloved Islands."

When he gets here, Jesse will be mobbed at the Kahului Airport. He has been mobbed here before—and now he's bigger than ever.

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD L. MAHER, DEAN OF OHIO POLITICAL WRITERS

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, on August 10, Richard L. Maher, who was an institution in Cleveland politics and journalism, passed away due to a serious heart ailment. As shown by his 40 years of remarkable service as political editor of the Cleveland Press, Dick Maher loved American politics and understood well the complex processes by which the people of this country choose their leaders. Although he recognized there are many shortcomings in our democratic system, he also knew that our system will serve the needs of the people, and that all of the phonies and the self-seekers in public life would eventually be rooted out. His faith in our people and in our institutions never wavered, and so he was able to perform his task of reporting and analyzing political news with superhuman energy.

Despite the large role of politics in his life, Dick Maher found time to serve his community in yet other ways. He was extremely active in the Catholic Charities Corporation and in other church functions.

But it will be for his contributions to the political affairs of our community that Dick Maher will most be remembered. All of us in public life know a few selfless, generous, and dedicated men who uplift the level of politics and make us proud to be involved in the political activity of this Nation. Dick Maher was such a man, and he will be sorely missed.

I would like to insert into the Record several newspaper articles describing the achievements of Richard Maher:

[From the Cleveland Press, Aug. 11, 1972]

RICHARD L. MAHER

Even though he had not been in The Press office for some time because of illness, it seems difficult to accept the fact that death has taken Richard L. Maher.

For Dick Maher was always possessed of immense energy; his capacity for work was practically boundless. On election days this acknowledged dean of Ohio political writers was a source of wonder to his colleagues.

He would bat out stories all day long, work far into the night and then, with just a catnap, be back at his typewriter turning out his incisive reports of the election news—and what it all meant.

During his nearly 40 years of covering politics for this newspaper, Dick made an army of friends both in and out of the political arena. He was an eminently fair reporter, one who always enjoyed the confidence of those he wrote about.

Whatever his personal politics were, he kept them strictly to himself, not letting them slant or color his objective news reporting. It was this scrupulous fairness that won him the complete trust of those he wrote about and made him the outstanding political reporter he was.

Dick Maher lived and breathed politics. When not working at the job, he loved to sit around with friends and swap stories about the great men and little fishes in the political pond. Younger reporters got an education just listening to Dick spin yarns about the men and events he had covered in a span of four decades.

He was a prominent Catholic layman, at one time president of the Catholic Charities Corp., and he gave to this work much of his indefatigable energy. He was justly proud of the fact that Pope John XXIII had decorated him with the rank of Knight of St. Gregory 10 years ago and that, a few years later, he was granted a private audience with Pope Paul VI.

Dick's friends at The Press—and every one of us here was his friend—extend their sympathies to his family. He was respected by his colleagues for his professional abilities and much loved for his outstanding qualities. All of us will miss him sorely.

[From the Cleveland Press, Aug. 11, 1972]

MAHER SERVICES WILL BE MONDAY

Richard L. Maher, dean of Ohio political writers and for 40 years politics editor of The Press, died at 5:50 p.m. yesterday at St. John Hospital.

Mr. Maher had a heart attack last Thanksgiving Day, and had been disabled since then. He returned Wednesday to the hospital after being at home for some months.

To the last Mr. Maher held the hope that he could return to his job at The Press and to his many other interests, civic and church. His family was visiting him when his death came.

Services will be held at 11:30 a.m. Monday in St. Raphael Catholic Church, 525 Dover Rd., Bay Village.

Friends may call from 2 to 5 and 7 to 9 p.m. tomorrow and Sunday at Corrigan funeral home, 20820 Lorain Rd., Fairview Park.

Mr. Maher astonished younger reporters with his prolific reporting and writing, his unbounded enthusiasm for his job.

Considered an elder statesman among political writers through his four decades on the beat, he appeared always busy but never too occupied to assist fellow staff members with their writing problems. His contacts with important people were unlimited.

He traveled the campaign trails with Presidential nominees Herbert Hoover, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Alf Landon, Wendell Wilkie, Thomas E. Dewey, Harry S. Truman, Adlai Stevenson, Dwight D. Eisenhower, Richard M. Nixon, John F. Kennedy, Barry Goldwater, Lyndon B. Johnson, Hubert H. Humphrey and George Wallace.

He covered every major national political convention from 1936.

He knew and wrote about every Ohio governor from time of Vic Donahey, every U.S. Senator from Ohio beginning with Atlee Pomerene and all Cleveland mayors starting with Ray T. Miller.

His personal acquaintances include literally hundreds of other politicians, including councilmen, ward leaders and precinct committeemen.

In a world of political smoke-filled back rooms, Dick Maher did not smoke. He did not drink either, and many of the politicians who did both thought he was unusual when, in joining a toast with them, he chose tomato juice. And no one ever heard him use profanity.

Mr. Maher was widely praised by members of all factions for his unbiased reporting. One of his fondest recollections was his unusual relationship with the late Harry L. Davis when Davis was mayor.

"I could always walk into his office, even when The Press was blasting him," he recalled.

In 1964, the Ohio Legislature passed a resolution naming Dick Maher dean of correspondents in Columbus and citing him for "forecasting election results with an uncanny accuracy."

The resolution further stated, "His unprejudiced and analytical writing . . . has won for him an enviable national reputation." He was a life member of the Ohio Legislature Correspondent Assn.

A prominent Catholic layman, Mr. Maher was a founder of St. Raphael Catholic Church

in Bay Village and later served as co-chairman of the parish administration board.

He was president of the Catholic Charities Corp. from 1966 through 1968 and later served as a member of the executive committee.

In 1948 he was named "Catholic Man of the Year" by the Knights of Columbus, at that time the youngest man ever to be chosen for the award. In 1965 he was honored at a dinner of the Knights for 40 years of service to that organization.

Pope John XXIII decorated him with the rank of Knight of St. Gregory in 1962 and three years later he was among a select few granted a private audience with Pope Paul VI.

Among his numerous other honors were the Award of Merit from the Ripon Club, oldest Republican organization in Greater Cleveland, and the Duo Decim Award bestowed by the Catholic Youth organization.

Mr. Maher was a board member of the Cleveland chapter, National Conference of Christians and Jews, and a past president of the Downtown Catholic Club, a non-profit trust fund. He served a year as chairman of the Teen-Agers March for St. Jude Children's Research Center.

Born Jan. 27, 1903, in Kane, Pa., Mr. Maher came to Cleveland with his family in 1913. He attended West High School, graduating in 1921 as class valedictorian. He later studied at Cleveland Law School.

His newspaper career began in 1924 as an office boy with the old Cleveland News. He left to be a general assignment reporter for the Lima Republican Gazette and returned to the News to serve as assistant city editor.

He left that paper in 1928 to join The Press, serving as a rewrite man for two years before becoming an assistant city editor. He was named politics editor in 1932.

Among Mr. Maher's political souvenirs are a copy of "Profiles in Courage" autographed by the then Sen. John F. Kennedy and an original volume of Tom L. Johnson's "My Story."

At Christmas of 1968, Mrs. Robert F. Kennedy sent copies of her favorite RFK photograph to newsmen who had traveled with him before his assassination during the primaries. Mr. Maher's copy read, "For Richard Maher with Christmas wishes from Ethel."

The following year Mr. Maher and Press photographer Bernie Noble traveled to Gettysburg, Pa. to do an article on Gen. Eisenhower. The interview turned out to be the last any Cleveland newsman would have with the ex-President. One of the pictures Noble took on that occasion became Mrs. Eisenhower's favorite portrait of her husband and it is used on a U.S. postage stamp.

On June 16 Mr. Maher was signally honored by Cleveland chapter of Sigma Delta Chi, professional journalistic society, which presented him its Distinguished Service Award for his outstanding contributions to journalism and also to the community through church and civic service.

Mr. Maher and his wife Lucile observed their 42d wedding anniversary on Jan. 27.

He is survived by his wife and their four children, Lucille, Helen, Francis R., Thomas P., and Edward J., and seven grandchildren. Also surviving him are a brother, James J. Maher, and two sisters—Mary Elizabeth Smith and Dorothy Rose Dremann.

The family residence is at 26826 Bruce Rd., Bay Village.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Aug. 14, 1972]

RICHARD L. MAHER

Over the years that Richard L. Maher worked as politics editor of the Cleveland Press he won the respect of politicians and newsmen not only for his ability as a journalist but also for his high principles.

Mr. Maher, who died Thursday evening, deservedly was considered the dean of Ohio politics writers. Until this year he had covered every major national political conven-

tion since 1936. Mr. Maher was almost as much of a political figure in Ohio as the politicians themselves.

Despite the long hours Mr. Maher spent on the campaign trail, he always managed to find spare time to volunteer to church and charitable organizations. With his death the Press lost a good reporter and Cleveland a good citizen.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Aug. 11, 1972]

RICHARD L. MAHER DIES; PRESS POLITICS WRITER FOR 40 YEARS

Richard Leo Maher, 69, political writer for the Cleveland Press for 40 years, died yesterday at St. John's Hospital.

Mr. Maher was taken to the hospital Wednesday and died at 5:50 p.m. yesterday. He had suffered a heart attack last November.

The short, soft-spoken Mr. Maher was known, respected and sometimes feared by several generations of politicians. He never drank, smoked or cursed and therefore was considered odd by the politicians who did all of those things.

Mr. Maher was born Jan. 27, 1903, in Kane, Pa., and came to Cleveland's West Side when he was still very young. He was graduated from West High School and studied briefly at the old Marshall Law School.

He began his newspaper career in 1921 on the staff of the Cleveland News and worked as a reporter there for several years before becoming an assistant city editor.

In 1928, Mr. Maher went to the Press and was named that paper's political writer in 1932.

Over the course of his 50-year career Mr. Maher had received many journalistic honors. He received a Cleveland Newspaper Guild award in 1940 for coverage of the presidential campaign and won another Guild award in 1959 in the best-single-news-story category. Two months ago, Sigma Delta Chi gave him its outstanding journalist award.

Mr. Maher, a Catholic, was a member of the Knights of Columbus for nearly 45 years and served two years in the 1930s as grand knight of the Cleveland Council. He also served for several years as a district deputy, in charge of several East Side K of C councils.

Mr. Maher was a fourth degree knight, the highest possible, and a member of their Order of the Alhambra.

He served for many years on the Catholic Charities Board of the Diocese of Cleveland. In 1965 and 1966 he was general chairman of the fund drive.

For his services to the church, Mr. Maher was named a Knight of St. Gregory by Pope John XXIII on April 28, 1963.

In 1948, Mr. Maher had been named Catholic Man of the Year in Cleveland.

Mr. Maher also was a charter member of St. Raphael Catholic Church in Bay Village.

He is survived by his wife of 40 years, the former Lucile T. Thompson, a daughter, Lucile H. of Nashville, Tenn.; sons, Francis R., Thomas P. and Edward J., all of Cleveland; a brother James J.; and sisters, Dorothy Dremann of Meadville, Pa., and Mary Smith.

Funeral arrangements are to be announced.

THE ARMY CAREER OF STAN SMITH

HON. OTIS G. PIKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I indicated to you that I would have some further remarks on the Army's famed tennis player Stanley R. Smith. Today I wish to present my views on the role

permitted Specialist Smith by the Secretary of the Army.

Maj. Willis Johnson, chief of the Army's sports office, has said:

Stan Smith is unique. He isn't a soldier in the original concept of soldiering. Smith is a national asset.

Mr. Speaker, it burns me to hear the Army refer to Stan Smith as "unique" when other men drafted with him in December of 1970 went into the service of their country prepared to risk their life and limb in Southeast Asia. It is a sad occasion when the Secretary of the Army permits a "national asset" to spend his Army career flying around the world playing in international tennis tournaments designed to benefit his outside income and standing as a professional tennis player while other men are dying.

For the U.S. Army to have a professional tennis player on its payroll is a grave disservice to both the armed services and the people of this Nation. Stan Smith's Army career as a world tournament tennis player has done nothing for a sports program designed to improve the physical conditioning of the Army's forces by individual participation in athletic competition.

SEVENTY PERCENT OF VIETNAM GI'S BACK NIXON

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago when I was home, I visited with my nephew who is just a plain enlisted GI flying helicopters in Vietnam.

This is the first time I had seen him since graduation from high school. He had appeared to me then just a gawky, stringy, and rather awkward 18-year-old. I was amazed at the transformation that had come about in his physical appearance in 2 years. I will have to admit I was simply amazed at his increased ability to think for himself and to come to some logical conclusion based on the facts as he saw them.

As I was leaving, he said to me:

Uncle Bill, if you leave Vietnam without getting some kind of a settlement under which those people can live in South Vietnam, the two million who fought there, including myself, will never forget it nor ever forgive you.

He further said:

I know there are ex-Vietnam veterans throwing away medals and marching in anti-Vietnam parades, but I can assure you they do not speak for the average guy who went to Vietnam. We don't want any of that, "going to Hanoi to beg" for the return of our prisoners. In any final settlement, we expect them to be honorably returned and any President who tries to do less than that will be losing a lot of mileage at the next polls.

Mr. Speaker, I have been turning those words over in my mind for 2 weeks and some way or other I could not forget them. I kept wondering if my nephew was an unusual Vietnam soldier or was mis-

taking the trend of the times. But one thing I have seen gives some significance to my nephew's words. This is the report in today's Washington Post from the Associated Press, "70 Percent of Saigon GI's Back Nixon in Poll." I do not know whether this is significant or not, but at least I think my colleagues will want to read it with some interest. It shows that 70 percent of the votes in a straw poll at the USO headquarters at Saigon were for President Nixon. Senator McGovern got 16 percent; 11 percent were undecided, and there was a 3-percent write-in vote mostly for George Wallace. The significant part of this poll indicates that those both over and under 25 overwhelmingly supported the President. I herewith attach the poll as given in this morning's Washington Post:

SEVENTY PERCENT OF SAIGON GI'S BACK NIXON IN POLL

SAIGON, August 13.—President Nixon was the overwhelming election choice of 1,051 American servicemen who visited the Saigon downtown USO club July 16-30.

The USO said its straw poll gave Nixon 70 per cent of the votes and the Democratic candidate, Sen. George McGovern, 16 per cent. Eleven per cent were undecided and a 3 per cent written vote went mostly to Gov. George Wallace of Alabama. As of July 27, there were 46,000 U.S. servicemen in Vietnam.

Nixon ran strongest with voters over 25, winning 79 per cent of their votes against McGovern's 10 per cent, with 8 per cent undecided and 3 per cent write-ins.

THE OTHER SIDE OF NIXONOMIC

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, an administration always runs on its record. Republicans welcome examination of the Nixon administration's record on the issue of prosperity, whether the opposition sneeringly refers to the administration's economic policy as "Nixonomics" or not. In that connection, Mr. Speaker, I commend to all of my House colleagues a reading of an editorial which appeared in the August 8 edition of the Detroit News. The editorial follows:

THE OTHER SIDE OF NIXONOMICS

Now that Senator George McGovern has finally put his own political house in order, he is attacking the structure of "Nixonomics," the term Democrats sneeringly apply to the economic policies of the Nixon administration. So, it might be interesting to look at the charges and the facts and see who sneers last.

Nixonomics, says McGovern, is deliberately throwing people out of work.

This issue ends in a draw. True, more people are out of work; unemployment is up by 2 million. However, the Nixon administration has also presided over an economy in which some 5 million more people are working than in 1968. This increase in the numbers working has occurred despite the Vietnam and defense spending cutbacks.

The fact that unemployment has also increased is undeniably unfortunate. The combination of recession and rapid growth in the numbers of people seeking work for the first time was not completely offset. Yet, the

unemployment rate during the Nixon years hit a peak of only 5.9 percent, which is not bad for recessions, especially when contrasted with unemployment rates of 6.7 percent, 5.5 percent and 5.7 percent during the Democratic years 1961-63. While no one can point with pride to the current unemployment rate, it does not smack of "deliberate" attempts to "throw" people out of work. And demagoguery won't put anyone back to work.

Nixonomics, says McGovern, sees the American worker as an enemy.

Although this is the "popular" concept, the facts refute it. In 1968, average weekly earnings in manufacturing (expressed in 1967 dollars) were \$117.57. In April, 1972, the figure was \$122.84 (also in 1967 dollars). Today, the real purchasing power of the factory worker's paycheck is about 5 percent better than it was four years ago, despite recession. Under the Democrats, these wages increased less than 2 percent from 1966 through 1968 because real gains of the early 1960's were dissipated by the skyrocketing inflation of the Democratic administration. It is just this kind of inflation the Democrats promise again.

Time and time again, the nation has been lured by Democratic promises that end up punishing the economy and the American worker with it. They promised both guns and butter. But we couldn't have it, at least not without inflation and an income tax surcharge that came too late. Now McGovern gloats about a higher minimum wage and promises a job for everyone. We can't have that either, not without finding hundreds of thousands of new jobs for those displaced by higher wage laws and not without inflation that robs the purchasing power of higher wages or large tax increases to pay people in government projects.

The fulfillment of this promise is years away and then only if the economy is run properly in the meantime.

Nixonomics is not a sugar coated pill. Neither is reality. Demonomics, on the other hand, always promises cherry-tasting medicine but leaves the patient with side-effects worse than the disease.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE L. S. "SLIM" JOHNSTON, SHERIFF IN RANDALL COUNTY, TEX.

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, Slim Johnston, "Mr. Law and Order" for 20 years in Randall County, Tex., passed away Monday. With his death the people of Randall County—as well as the entire Texas Panhandle—lost a friend and a strong warrior for the cause of justice.

Sheriff Johnston, a tall man in stature, stood even taller in the eyes of the people he served. His integrity and devotion to duty earned him respect and admiration. His compassion blended with firm authority made him a sheriff whose fame was nationwide. "Slim" Johnston loved his job.

Northwest Texas will mourn his passing, Mr. Speaker, but let us pay tribute to his achievements and give thanks for his passing along our way.

As the attached article from the Amarillo Daily News indicates, "Slim" Johnston was able to accomplish what oth-

ers have only aspired toward—he left the world a better place for his having been here.

The article follows:

RANDALL SHERIFF IS DEAD

(By Ann Marcy)

CANYON.—The tall, soft-spoken sheriff who won more friends than enemies in 20 years in Randall County office is dead.

L. S. "Slim" Johnston, 65, of Canyon, died of lung cancer shortly after noon today at Neblett Memorial Hospital.

He ran for office three times before unseating the incumbent, the late M. E. Cantrell, in 1952 and never faced another opponent at the ballot box.

"It would be a waste of time," commented a member of the opposing political party.

He had gotten the idea of running for sheriff while serving a two-year term on the commissioners court between 1946 and 1948.

Johnston and his wife, the former Miss Flossie Hale who had been his high school sweetheart, came to the Panhandle in 1927 from Eskota, 10 miles east of Sweetwater where he had worked at training polo ponies.

The sheriff made the trip alone, with all his farming household goods and livestock, in a 40-foot immigrant car on the Texas and Pacific Railroad and the Santa Fe Railway, settling initially near Happy.

Although sheriff, he never forgot his love of horses and at one time raised registered Appaloosas, Quarter Horses and thoroughbreds on a "little place" near Umbarger. Racks of trophies represented his success in the area.

He was instrumental in forming the Randall Sheriff's Posse and was the traditional parade master on every parade occasion.

Not long after moving to the Happy area, he acquired the nickname "Slim" even before his neighbors knew his name.

Times became so hard on the dry-land farm during the Depression that he began commuting daily to work at the zinc smelter in Amarillo—swearing, he once said, that one good crop and he would move to town.

The good crop came in '42 and he became a farmer on the side and a blacksmith and welder primarily.

When he was elected sheriff, he wasted no time before he started learning the job.

Even before taking office Jan. 1, 1963, he attended the Department of Public Safety School at Austin. Later he was invited to attend the Federal Bureau of Investigation Academy, where he also graduated, and he regularly attended retraining sessions.

Two incidents among many stand out in his career.

In 1956, he backtracked Robert Floyd Chapman, whose slashed unidentified body had been found in the county, to Phoenix, Ariz., and built a murder case against Clarence Edward Young—and gave away the \$1,000 reward.

And on Christmas morning in 1960, he faced three armed suspects in the murder of Robert Potter, assistant chief of police in Tulia, on a lonely country road—in what he later called "a Mexican standoff that just doesn't happen in real life," and won without a fight when deputies arrived.

For that, he was awarded the Six-Gun Award of the Panhandle Press Association.

That was one of the few occasions he later recalled when he drew a gun on a suspect. He never had to fire it at a person and neither have his deputies ever shot any one, he said recently.

"I don't hire men who have to use force to get people to do like they say," he once said, in explanation. "There's always a way to slip around and get people to do like you want."

"A law enforcement officer has got to be in control of himself and he's got to know what is right," he said.

When he filed for re-election in December,

1971, he claimed for Randall County one of the lowest crime rates in the State and attributed success in the field to cooperation of all officers and the backing of the people. He had also stressed inter agency cooperation as a necessity in law enforcement.

Johnston had served as president of the United Peace Officers of America, which supports Boys Ranch, and as a vice president of the Sheriffs Association of Texas.

He was unopposed as a candidate for re-election in November, having won the Democratic primary also without an opponent.

Survivors includes his wife, Flossie of Canyon; two sons, Lowell and Harold.

DIFFERENT INTEREST RATE FOR NATURAL DISASTERS

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday as the House considered the conference report on H.R. 15692, legislation to reduce the interest rate on Small Business Administration disaster loans, I cast the only dissenting vote. My decision to vote against adoption of the conference report was based on the unfairness of a flat forgiveness.

The provisions of the Disaster Relief Act of 1970 call for a forgiveness clause of \$2,500. H.R. 15692 contains a two-step forgiveness feature. For victims of 1971 natural disasters the forgiveness is \$2,500 with an interest rate of 3 percent. A different scale has been established for those who suffer from natural disasters in 1972: a forgiveness clause of \$5,000 with an interest rate of 1 percent.

The flat forgiveness is unrealistic, unfair and much too expensive. SBA officials have estimated the total incremental cost of H.R. 15692 to be \$831,248,000. It is to be noted however that Congressman Flood estimates the damage in his district alone at \$1 billion. It is shocking that the administration has proposed that we not only double the forgiveness clause and eliminate the first \$500 of repayment. The first step toward equitable treatment for all should be the elimination of the basic forgiveness provision.

The proposed forgiveness arrangement does not address itself to the differing amounts of damage suffered by disaster victims. Irrespective of the amount of damage suffered, everyone is now eligible to receive the same \$5,000 grant. Under the provisions of this legislation a person with \$50,000 in damages receives the same amount forgiven as the person who has had \$5,000 in damages.

It would seem to me that this legislation could be far more equitable by adjusting the amount of forgiveness according to the amount of damage sustained. The person with a verifiable \$5,000 loss should not be handed the same across-the-board benefits as those who suffered \$50,000 in damages. Further, such a proposal would reduce the incentive for fraud.

It is hard to control a program like this. The amount of damage to the house or loss of personal property is difficult to check. The generous provisions contained

in Public Law 91-606 have, in the past, encouraged homeowners to inflate their estimates of property damage and seek Government assistance when they have little or no valid claim. It is human nature for people to claim damages up to the amount of the current forgiveness. Often they are aided and abetted by contractors who want to perform the work on their homes. Obviously, if one suffers any damage at all, it is to his advantage to get \$5,000 worth of repair to his home.

The 1971 California earthquake demonstrated that the disaster relief program handles disasters with the maximum of inefficiency and a modicum of fairness. The nightmarish problems my constituents had in obtaining loans showed me that the 1970 Disaster Relief Act is particularly unworkable in the case of a major disaster.

In some instances immediately following the California earthquake people 60 and 70 years old could not borrow money from the Small Business Administration to repair their homes because they could not demonstrate an ability to repay. The demand for a credit rating in an emergency like this is shocking. Nature does not choose according to income level whom it will devastate.

I share the feelings of my colleagues that it is desirable to take a hard look at the question of disaster relief. H.R. 15692 perpetuates the deficiencies in the present law and creates some additional ones. The present law, Public Law 91-606, is inadequate and unfair, but compounding the errors of the law is totally unreasonable.

**"A GIFT OF HOPE, LOVE AND LIFE"—
A NOTEWORTHY PROJECT SPONSORED AT CUBBERLEY HIGH SCHOOL, PALO ALTO, CALIF.**

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, at Cubberley High School in Palo Alto, Calif., shortly before the end of last year's school term, a great leader, Coach Bob Peters, submitted to a public haircut and shave. This was significant not as a means of turning against long hair and beards but for a much more important reason. It was the beginning of a great movement which I hope will spread nationally. It was the beginning of a positive expressive by young people of an attitude against war in the form of a gift to Children's Medical Relief International, an organization which specializes in the rehabilitation of disabled Vietnamese war children.

Coach Peters had conducted a vote among students as to whether he should shed his hair and beard or should not. Those who favored a visit to the school by the local barber won by a small margin but in the meantime the fee for casting votes raised more than \$1,500.

Since then the group has conducted a series of car washes, maintained carni-

val booths, held a dance, and a weight lifting contest, all of which collected money for a very worthwhile cause.

Coach Bob Peters has written me as follows:

... We are tired of self-defeating, destructive kinds of protest which serve only to antagonize and alienate the very people who are in a position to do something about that which we are so deeply concerned. We are only hoping that our "Gift" will bring vivid realization to all the world the fact that innocent children are maimed and disfigured from the indiscriminate consequences of war. Political beliefs regarding whether or not we should be in Vietnam are not of a major concern in relation to this "protest," for it is only war itself and the unutterable consequences of it that we are challenging.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I have been privileged to make a very small contribution to this worthwhile cause and I sincerely hope that others across the country will support the movement, help it spread, and contribute to it. I believe Coach Bob Peters is entitled to great commendation for the guidance he has provided young people. Through his efforts the intense feeling against all kinds of war is channeled into constructive activity.

LAETRILE: THE CANCER FIGHTER WASHINGTON WILL NOT TEST

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, a letter to Congressman LOUIS FREY, Jr., from Dr. Dean Burk, head of the cytochemistry section, National Cancer Institute, May 30, 1972, said:

In spite of the aforementioned Food and Drug Administration (FDA) prohibition of Laetrile in interstate commerce, there are well over 1000 cancer-afflicted persons in this country using Laetrile for cancer treatment and amelioration, and a goodly number of noncancer persons using it merely with prevention of development of cancer in view, and these various persons include M.D. physicians as well as laity. I have had considerable personal experience in this regard, for in the past year alone at least 750 persons, including more than 50 physicians, have contacted me for information on the use and availability of Laetrile, and I know of others with approximately the same quantitative extent of similar experience. In over 20 countries of the world, well over 5000 cancer patients have been treated with Laetrile, with, significantly, no demonstrable noteworthy clinical contraindication of its use either alone or in conjunction with virtually any other anticancer agents, chemotherapeutic, radiological, or surgical. Laetrile at physician-prescribed dosages is nontoxic by a factor of 100-1000 times when compared to essentially all anticancer drugs now used with FDA approval...

Although the foregoing Laetrile utilization

in this country is proceeding, as indicated, in spite of FDA prohibition, it is even more so because of unwarranted FDA procedures, and lack of FDA scientific and medical justification for its stand, extending to probably unconstitutionality, concerning which many thousands of cancer-afflicted persons and their relatives and physicians are rapidly becoming aware.

In the case of other drugs and medicines removed from the market, as discussed in my newsletter of July 26, 1972, at least some medical tests were cited to show "ineffectiveness." But in the case of the anticancer agent Laetrile, the Food and Drug Administration refuses even to make clinical tests. They have ruled Laetrile out because it does not fall within an arbitrary definition that any anticancer drug must be toxic—that is, to some extent poisonous to healthy cells as well as cancer cells. Incredible as it may seem, some medical bureaucrats have simply decided that no nontoxic substance can ever help cancer patients, and therefore all such substances are to be automatically excluded from the market and no medical evidence in their favor is even to be considered.

If there had been an equivalent of the Food and Drug Administration a century or more ago, it might well have banned, at an enormous cost in human suffering and mortality, both antiseptics and anesthetics, which were strongly opposed by influential elements in the medical community of that day.

This is not a matter of "quackery," panaceas or "secret remedies." The head of the cytochemistry section of the National Cancer Institute is hardly a quack. Far from objecting to testing, or blocking it, this is what Laetrile advocates are asking for, while the supposedly "scientific" medical establishment is refusing to make the experiments which are the very basis of the scientific method.

I have introduced H.R. 12092 which would override the arbitrary FDA dictat against testing nontoxic anticancer agents and require that this testing be undertaken. This would seem the least that should be done in light of the evidence that Dr. Burk and others have assembled showing that Laetrile can prolong and in some cases save the lives of cancer victims, and the generally agreed upon fact that it does no harm to the patient, while conventional toxic anticancer drugs often have serious side effects precisely because they are toxic.

Millions of dollars are to be spent under the authority of recently passed legislation to search for better treatment or cures for cancer. It would seem that a little of all that money ought to be allotted to find out if Laetrile might be what they are looking for.

DIPLOMACY PROS GRADE AGNEW AS AN ASSET

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, with vice-presidential candidates so

much in the news lately, it is interesting to learn what people of other countries think of the men proposed as candidates as well as the opinions of the American people. For this reason I thought my colleagues might be interested in reading Richard Wilson's column from the Washington Evening Star and Daily News for Monday, August 14, 1972, "Diplomacy Pros Grade Agnew as an Asset."

As a member of the world family of nations, it is important that the No. 2 man in our country be a man who commands respect and admiration from representatives of other sovereign states with whom he must work. We are fortunate to have such a man in the office of Vice President today.

The article follows:

DIPLOMACY PROS GRADE AGNEW AS AN ASSET
(By Richard Wilson)

An assessment of Vice President Agnew by the New York Times, as a dunce who had learned nothing in the vice presidency, and who as an emissary abroad was a "jet-propelled embarrassment," is of special interest. The interest grows out of the fact that vice presidential candidates are prominent this year and Senator McGovern has finally put over as his choice a cultivated fellow-Marylander, Sargent Shriver, who was ambassador to France and is thus presumed to be able to give a good account of himself in world affairs.

If Agnew were in fact a jet-propelled embarrassment to this country, that should certainly be taken into account in judging whether he ought to remain in direct succession to the presidency. Who would know better than some of the hardened career foreign service types in the State Department who are traditionally sensitive to the intrusion of bungling politicians in their delicate affairs? They do not agree with the harsh judgment on Agnew.

Such people did not successfully hide their distaste for gauche behavior by Lyndon B. Johnson on his travels abroad. Nor did they withhold criticism of Nixon on similar missions when they thought he deserved it.

The showmanship quality (Nixon's kitchen debate with Khrushchev, Johnson's Pakistani camel driver) annoyed and embarrassed some. The absence of showmanship in Agnew's travels is all the more noteworthy.

On two occasions, one of the highest ranking and most respected of foreign service officers, whose career extends back through six administrations, wrote to Agnew to commend him on his behavior and actions abroad. This officer has never previously been moved to write to a traveling vice president.

Another foreign service officer of 15 years experience, who has been involved in eight presidential or vice presidential visits to foreign countries, had nothing but praise for Agnew. This praise was confined not merely to Agnew's ceremonial functions, which he conducted with reserve, dignity and aplomb, but included matters of substance.

An example of the latter was Agnew's scheduled 45-minute conference with President Chung Hee Park of Korea which extended into a six-hour session reflecting fears that the Pueblo incident and the current withdrawal of an American division reflected the hidden U.S. intention to leave Korea in the lurch. Agnew got on the phone to Washington and before he left Korea matters were straightened out to Park's satisfaction.

The criticism of Agnew as a jet-propelled embarrassment evidently grows in part from two or three incidents which may have embarrassed his critics but did not similarly affect President Nixon and Secretary of State William P. Rogers. One was Agnew's visit in 1971 to his father's homeland, Greece,

where he identified himself with the "overriding importance" of continued military support to the regime of Premier George Papadopoulos. This may have been contrary to the foreign policy of the New York Times, but not to the established foreign policy of the United States.

On another occasion, after visiting Africa, Agnew said that querulous and complaining American black leaders could learn much from the dynamic leadership of three heads of state he met in Africa, including Congo President Joseph D. Mobuto. This offended the Rev. Jesse Jackson of Chicago, the man who ousted Mayor Daley from the Democratic national convention, but it did not upset President Mobuto or Secretary Rogers. It also contended that Agnew went out to a game preserve in Africa to witness love-making among the rhinos. The foreign service types at the State Department are not much interested in whether or not that is true.

They are more interested in the fact that Agnew actually reads and studies the voluminous reports and analyses they supply him, and that he is particularly sensitive to nuances of behavior in a foreign land which might unwittingly offend. They stress that Agnew listens attentively, respectfully and responsively to foreign leaders and can cite no instance of the blunt saying of the unsayable that makes Agnew so popular in some quarters at home and unpopular in others.

This is not to say that nearly four years in the Vice Presidency and some extensive world travel have made this former county executive and governor into a foreign affairs genius. But it can be said that Agnew's missions abroad, on balance, have gratified the foreign service professionals. He has been tested in some very delicate and difficult situations, such as Japan's reaction to American policy, and, on the whole, is considered by the professionals to have made a constructive contribution to the improvement of America's world relationships. Secretary Rogers is also highly favorable in his assessment of Agnew's performance.

**NEW TRADE RELATIONSHIP WITH
THE SOVIET UNION**

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, on May 18, I introduced legislation (H.R. 15075) designed to normalize and expand our trade relations with the Soviet Union. The purpose was twofold—to bring mutual benefit to both our economies and to pave the way for new understandings for a more peaceful world.

The Soviets have made significant overtures to the United States for a closer economic relationship. The following article from the August 10 edition of the Washington Evening Star and Daily News describes the most recent developments in agricultural trade which I think are of major importance:

**SOVIET GRAIN DEAL NOW ESTIMATED AT \$1
BILLION**

(By Bernard Gwertzman)

The Agriculture Department estimates that the Soviet Union will purchase \$1 billion worth of farm products over the next 12 months. That far exceeds previous estimates, and would boost Soviet-American trade to unprecedented heights.

The latest forecast was compiled by top department officials on the basis of talks in recent days with private commercial dealers negotiating with the Russians, as well as from reports from Moscow indicating that the Soviet Union will suffer from a second bad harvest this fall. The spring harvest also was not good.

HALT IN WHEAT

The projection of a billion dollars in sales over the next year goes far beyond the \$200 million in grains which Moscow committed itself to purchase as part of a \$750 million, three-year deal announced by the White House on July 8.

Agriculture Department officials said that about \$500 million of the total billion-dollar sales will probably be in wheat. The rest probably will be in corn, sorghum, rye, barley, oats and soybeans, the Agriculture Department estimated.

Department officials said that an American company, Cook Grains of Memphis, Tenn., has just about wrapped up the first soybean sale to the Russians—one million tons—valued approximately at \$100 million.

These products are used in producing animal feeds; soybeans in particular are valued for their high protein content, useful for the growth of cattle.

Under the current Soviet five-year economic plan, Moscow is committed to a 25 percent increase in protein consumption, to be achieved principally through an increase in the amount of meat and dairy products in the Soviet diet.

The large sales to the Soviet Union will cause a severe imbalance in trade between the two countries. Some officials here believe that the Russians may have to sell gold on the world market to cover the heavy agricultural purchases.

**THE HERALD-NEWS REPORTS ON
ANTI-U.S. PROPAGANDA FILMS**

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, the following series of news articles by the distinguished newspaper correspondent Phillip Chen which recently appeared in one of New Jersey's most prestigious newspapers, the Herald-News, brings public focus on firms selling anti-U.S. propaganda films. The revelations of this series of startling news articles received considerable attention and reaction from constituents in my congressional district.

The newspaper reporter's job is not an easy task and is, as we all know, a great public trust. Correspondent Phillip Chen's own personal crusade in the objectivity of his reporting is most stimulating in that he is always seeking to ferret out that fine line between propaganda and the truth. The Herald-News of Passaic, N.J., is, indeed, performing a great public service in their ever constant vigil to keep our citizenry alerted and informed in a most constructive responsible way.

Their publication of Phil Chen's excellent series of news articles alerting the Nation's conscience and resolve to the threat of anti-U.S. propaganda sources helps to insure the full disclosure of all facts, so necessary to achieving unbiased, unslanted news coverage—all

responding to the ideals and responsibilities of a representative democracy which has historically made America the great country of refuge and promise that she has symbolized throughout the centuries for all peoples—and particularly the oppressed and needy—of all nations of the world.

It gives me great pleasure to join with the Herald-News in bringing these writings of Mr. Chen to your attention for your review and consideration.

The news articles are as follow:

[From the Passaic (N.J.) Herald-News, May 8, 1972]

FIRM SELLS ANTI-U.S. FILMS
(By Philip Chen)

For \$35, a viewer can get a kick out of seeing the military ridiculed in "The Selling of the Pentagon," a 54-minute film put together in 1971 by CBS.

"Time Is Running Out," a film which condemns "U.S. atrocities" in Indochina, can be seen for \$25.

"But Inside North Vietnam," a color film shot by Felix Greene, the British left-wing journalist, costs \$125, and "China!" another Greene production, goes for \$135.

All these so-called documentary films, plus scores of other short-subject films, can be rented (or bought for a higher price) from a little-known company called the American Documentary Films Inc. in New York.

ADF films, which propagandize radical and leftist causes, are viewed nationally, according to company officials. "Churches and colleges are our largest groups," one said.

An investigation of American Documentary Films by The Herald-News disclosed a number of facts, including the finding that it is doing business with organizations heavily dominated by Communists.

Its films, most of which are produced by independents and ADF cameramen, include a few network products.

PURE PROPAGANDA

A source familiar with the ADF operation told The Herald-News these so-called "documentary films" are pure "propaganda" serving radical, anti-establishment and revolutionary causes.

"They're very subtle about it, but they're in it to express a point of view. They try to influence the young people, who I think, are poorly equipped to recognize propaganda when they see it," the source said.

Some of the ADG films are being shown in New Jersey, mostly by radical groups that include the Peace Education Association of New Jersey. Colleges generally shun ADF products, although several, including William Paterson College, have heard about the film.

The Communist within ADF management ranks is Michael Myerson, 32, a member of the ADF board of directors and coordinator of a Cuban film festival ADF recently sponsored in New York.

The festival was shut down when Treasury men raided the theater and seized the film the firm was showing.

A rebel and an agitator, Myerson has been involved in radical student movements in California and has held the post of international secretary of the W.E.B. DuBois Club, a Marxist study group.

Sworn testimony before the House Committee on Internal Security identified Myerson as a member of the Peace Commission of the New York State Communist Party, USA. He visited North Vietnam in 1965 and was made an "honorary nephew" of Ho Chi Minh, the North Vietnam Communist chief-tain.

Repeated attempts by The Herald-News to reach Myerson for an interview have been unsuccessful.

Jerry Stoll, a 45-year-old activist who heads the ADF board of directors, is also not available for an interview.

Founded in San Francisco in 1966, American Documentary Films opened its New York office in 1968. The ADF 1972 catalogue advances the firm as a non-profit organization, but the non-profit status seems to be largely self-proclaimed.

The Internal Revenue Service in New York and in Washington, D.C. could find no record of ever granting the firm tax-exempt status. An IRS spokesman said all ADF receipts are subject to federal taxation.

NEW YORK STARTS PROBE

The New York State Attorney General's Office has begun an investigation into ADF for failing to file annual financial statements.

Herbert Wallenstein, who heads the charitable fraud bureau, said ADF is required by law to file annual reports because it is soliciting funds from the public. ADF has not filed a report since it opened for business in New York, Wallenstein said.

In its 1972 catalogue, ADF lists more than 20 political organizations, which it said, are involved in the production of ADF films.

Two of them are the New Mobilization Committee for Peace in Vietnam and the People's Coalition for Peace and Justice. Both have been identified by the House Committee on Internal Security as being under Communist influence.

According to testimony before the committee in 1970-71, the New Mobilization Committee has operated from its inception with "significant Communist support."

"The national leadership of the New Mobilization Committee includes several key activists who have been shown either by public source data or by committee investigation to be or to have been members of such diverse Communist groups as the Communist Party, USA; W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America; Labor Youth League; Revolutionary Workers Party; Young Socialist Alliance, and Student Mobilization Committee."

As to the Peoples Coalition group, Rep. Richard H. Ichord, D-Mo., who heads the house committee, had this to say:

"... the committee received considerable documentary evidence and testimony establishing the significant presence of Communist Party, USA, in PCPJ ..."

The Cuban Film Festival, an ADF project, opened April 24 at the Olympia Theater, New York City.

It closed down the next day, after agents from the Treasury Department seized a Cuban film, "Days of Water," on grounds that ADF had failed to obtain a license to bring the film into the U.S.

NO LICENSE

"We saw an ad in the paper, checked our files and realized we had not licensed it. We then went and seized the film," a spokesman for the department's Foreign Assets Control in Washington, D.C. said.

The spokesman said failing to obtain a permit constituted a violation of the Trading with the Enemy Act, which is punishable by a 10-year prison term and a \$10,000 fine, and the Anti-Smuggling Act, which carries a penalty of five years in jail and a \$10,000 fine, both upon conviction.

The spokesman declined to go into specifics of the case, but he gave indication that the department wanted to know how ADF got the film into the country and what kind of financial arrangements it made with the Cuban producer.

"They don't seem to be very cooperative," he stated. "We're now after all of their films."

In a release issued from his New York office, Myerson called the seizure "illegal" and a "harassment." ADF president Stoll claimed his firm has cooperated with the Treasury Department and opened its files to

"demonstrate the absence of financial ties to Cuba."

[From the Passaic (N.J.) Herald News, May 9, 1972]

MYERSON "HONORARY NEPHEW" OF HO
(By Philip Chen)

Michael Eugene Myerson, a director of the American Documentary Films, has served rebel causes for at least a decade, government records indicate.

Myerson, 32, was an agitator, an organizer, a writer and a world traveler.

A 1965 trip to North Vietnam brought him an unexpected bonus: he was made honorary nephew of Ho Chi Minh, the North Vietnam Communist boss. Since his return, he has sported a Viet Cong cap and carried a Viet Cong flag at demonstrations protesting the war in Vietnam.

The specific date of Myerson's joining American Documentary Films could not be ascertained.

Myerson, however, was not among the original officers when ADF filed its incorporation papers in New York in 1968. His name turned up in recent ADF letterheads as the third-ranked director in the nine-member board of directors, after Jerry Stoll, president and chairman, and Miss Kay Anderson, who runs the New York film distribution center.

Myerson, according to testimony given at a 1968 hearing before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, was born in Washington, D.C. The committee reports gave the following biographical sketch.

"He (Myerson) gained his first solid experience at agitation as a member and later chairman of SLATE, a radical student organization at the University of California. From organizing protests against ROTC and the House Committee on Un-American Activities, Myerson graduated to the leadership of the U.S. delegation to the 1962 Communist World Youth Festival.

"After the festival, Myerson filed a number of reports on it from abroad. No information is available on his whereabouts or activities from then until the fall of 1963, when he turned up in San Francisco.

"On Nov. 3, 1963, Myerson was arrested at a demonstration at Mel's Drive-In. He was charged with disturbing the peace and trespassing. Myerson identified himself as co-chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee Against Discrimination.

"In 1964, Myerson was busy helping organize the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs. The People's World reported that Myerson was a leading participant in the coastwide conference of socialist-oriented young people sponsored by the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of San Francisco, San Francisco State College, Berkeley, West Los Angeles, and the Youth Action Union of Los Angeles, held March 21-22, 1964.

"The national founding convention for the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs was held in June, 1964. Myerson was a member of the national coordinating committee for the convention and a staff member of The Convener, official newsletter for the national coordinating committee.

"He was subsequently appointed West Coast Representative for the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America (DCA).

"In Jan. 1965, the DCA published a pamphlet by Myerson entitled 'The United States War in Vietnam.' It was reviewed in the CPUSA's (Communist Party, USA) monthly propaganda organ New World Review as a 'useful account of our aggressive war in Vietnam.'

"In May 1965, Myerson was given the post of international secretary for the DCA. In July, he attended the Communist World Peace Congress at Helsinki, Finland.

"He and DCA member Harold Supriano, with Chris Koch, an announcer for radio station WBAI, and freelance writer Richard Ward, sought out members of the North Vietnamese Peace Committee at the congress and requested permission to visit North Vietnam.

"The invitation from North Vietnam was extended and the four spent the last week of August and the first week in September in North Vietnam.

"Myerson was made a honorary nephew of Ho Chi Minh and since he returned to the United States, he has sported a Viet Cong cap and carried a Viet Cong flag at demonstrations protesting the war in Vietnam.

"In 1966, Michael Myerson joined the staff of the Communist Party publishing house, International Publishers.

"Mike Myerson is currently director of the Tri-Continental Information Center in New York City. He has held that post since the formation of the center was announced in the spring of 1967.

"The declared intention of the Tri-Continental is to propagandize on behalf of national liberation movements fighting throughout the world against U.S. colonialism and neo-colonialism."

In a study of a radical group called the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, the House Internal Security Committee further identified Myerson as a member of the Peace Commission of the New York State Communist Party.

The house staff study said Myerson attended a meeting in Cambridge, Mass., on Oct. 13, 1968, called by the New Mobilization group to discuss, among other things, the house hearings on the involvement of New Mobilization in the Democratic National Convention disruptions, the presidential election and proposed activities in Washington during inauguration.

The Herald-News has made several attempts to reach Myerson for an interview, but none proved successful.

[From the Passaic (N.J.) Herald News, May 10, 1972]

HOUSE ON 84TH STREET: PROPAGANDA STOREHOUSE

(By Philip Chen)

Secreted in the basement of a weather-beaten building at 336 W. 84th St., New York, is the headquarters of the American Documentary Films, Inc.—a well stocked film lab.

Here, hundreds of 16 mm films are stored, their subject matter curving from the left to the far left.

For a price, the films can be rented or bought.

ADF officials are poor conversationalists. The president, Jerry Stoll, and a member of its board of directors, Michael Myerson, refused to meet with a Herald-News reporter.

Miss Kay Anderson, who said she heads the ADF East Coast distribution network, refused to discuss company finances or answer questions about ADF film sources or to reveal its customers list.

"Are you a Communist organization?" she was asked.

"We are a non-profit organization," she answered.

Miss Anderson, a shapely 28-year-old brunette, was asked the question again. After a moment of hesitation, she replied: "No."

"Do you draw funds from Communist sources?" Miss Anderson was asked.

"Not that I know of," she said.

Records obtained by The Herald-News indicated that the firm is doing business with organizations that have been identified by the House Committee on Internal Security as being dominated by Communists and that Myerson in fact has been a member of the Peace Communist of the New York State Communist Party.

American Documentary Films got its start in San Francisco in 1966. Its first production was "Sons and Daughters," a 90-minute film assailing the U.S. involvement in Indochina. Its New York office began operation in 1968.

According to available data the firm spent \$120,000 in film production, all of which except for \$16,000 came from small contributions, community fund-raising efforts and film rental and sales incomes.

Of the \$16,000, the Episcopal Church contributed \$7,000 in 1969 for the shooting of a film about "Huey Newton," the militant Black Panther Party chieftain.

The United Church of Christ gave \$4,000 in 1968, but its officers in New York could find no record of the grant. Jim Richards, who heads the Office of Communications, said the grant could have been made by any of the 50 church conferences throughout the country.

The same answer was provided by the American Friends Service Committee, a Quaker group that gave ADF a \$3,500 grant in 1966.

The Rev. Richard R. Fernandez of the Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, on anti-war organizations confirmed a 1968 grant of \$1,500. He said it was for the making of a film about a CBS correspondent, David Schoenbrun.

Promotional literature put out by ADF claimed that its films have been viewed by more than 1 million persons in the U.S. and a minimum of 7 million persons have seen its films overseas, both in theaters and on television.

The assets of ADF as of 1971 were listed at \$41,000 and its liabilities, \$40,562.

As of 1971, ADF's New York office booked \$1,400 worth of films a week and its San Francisco office, \$550 a week. ADF officials estimated that it cost the firm \$9,692.30 for every million viewers.

Currently, ADF film inventory carries 190 titles, according to Miss Anderson. Rental fees start at \$15, but they go as high as \$115.

Outright sales price range from \$70 to \$650.

Sample titles include "Listen Whitey," which claims to represent the black community's response to the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King; "Dr. Spock and his Babies," an antiwar picture, and "Defense vs. Domestic Needs," which depicts the military-industrial complex.

Asked why ADF films follow a leftist line, Miss Anderson denied the firm follows a radical dogma. "We have no political lines," she claimed.

A 1966 graduate of Oregon State University, Miss Anderson explained the firm tries to provide an "alternate media" for the distribution of films that are shunned by the commercial media.

She conceded that most of the ADF films are "controversial," but she insisted that the public should have access to "something other than those offered in theaters and by commercial television networks.

"I think it's a very good idea. An alternate media is very important," she said.

THE ADMINISTRATION AND ISRAEL

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the gallant people of the State of Israel have fought and have died for their right to exist in a hostile world. Their deter-

mination and courage serve as a beacon to freedom-loving nations around the globe. All too often the American people forget the crisis situation which daily faces the inhabitants of this tiny nation. Fear of invasion, attack, and embargo are a constant threat to the peace and security of the State of Israel.

Since Israel's creation in 1948, it has had close ties with the United States. As a Congressman, I strongly support the administration's actions in the Middle East and its efforts to preserve the sovereignty of the State of Israel. Recently I came across an excellent article in Newsweek magazine by columnist Stewart Alsop, summarizing U.S. policy toward Israel during the past few years.

I commend this article to my colleagues.

[From the Newsweek magazine, July 10, 1972]

ISRAEL

(By Stewart Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—It has been reported that most of the Israeli leadership including Prime Minister Golda Meir, favors the re-election of President Nixon. This report has, of course, been denied. It is, of course, true.

It has also been reported that the pro-Nixon views of the Israeli leaders have been explicitly conveyed to important members of the U.S. Jewish community. This report has also been denied. It is also true.

The interesting question is: Why?

The best way to answer that question is to go back to September 1970. In that month, though very few Americans were aware of it, there occurred the most dangerous crisis of the Nixon Presidency. On Saturday and Sunday, Sept. 19 and 20, a Syrian force of 250 Soviet-made tanks poured across the border into Jordan.

There was no doubt at all that the invasion was masterminded by the Russians—Russian advisers controlled the Syrian Army down to battalion level, though the advisers prudently left the tank force at the border. There was no doubt, either, about the object of the invasion. It was to dethrone Jordan's moderate King Hussein, and replace him with a fedayeen-dominated, pro-Soviet regime dedicated to the destruction of Israel.

On Monday, Sept. 21, Israel's Ambassador Rabin got a call from the White House. What could the Israelis do to halt the invasion, and what would they be willing to do? Rabin replied that he thought he knew the answer to both questions, but that he would check to make sure, and call back.

DEEDS, NOT WORDS

He did so shortly, with both answers. The Israelis were absolutely confident that their own forces, operating from the Golan Heights, could capture or destroy the entire Syrian invading force. As for the second question, the Israelis were entirely willing to take the risks involved, on condition only that the American Government make it clear to the Soviets that the U.S. would vigorously oppose any Soviet-sponsored counteraction, at the Suez Canal or elsewhere.

President Nixon unhesitatingly made this commitment. It was then mutually agreed that, if the Syrian invading force crossed a line between Irbid and Amman, thus threatening the Jordanian capital, the Israelis would move.

At this point a nervous State Department urged immediate diplomatic approaches to Moscow, the major NATO powers, and Cairo. The President issued a stern order—absolutely no communication with Moscow or any other capital. There would be, not words, but deeds.

One of the five U.S. divisions stationed

in Germany was ordered on full alert, and so was the elite 82nd Airborne Division in the United States. Secret arrangements were made with the Greek Government to provide staging areas and base support in case of a move by U.S. troops.

A FLEET MOVES EAST

At the same time, the U.S. Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean was heavily reinforced with aircraft carriers and their attendant task forces. The Sixth Fleet was rapidly built up from its normal on-station strength to no less than five carrier task forces. This very formidable naval force began to redeploy toward the eastern Mediterranean.

The eyes of Soviet intelligence, watching from Tangiers and Gibraltar, saw the ships funneling through the Straits. Ambassador Dobrynin being absent, Soviet minister counselor Vorontsov hurried round to the State Department. On White House orders, he was coolly informed that the Syrian invasion endangered world peace, and that if the Syrian tank force failed to turn back, the danger would become acute.

On Sept. 22, after a Jordanian counter-attack, the lead tanks in the Syrian force made a 180-degree turn. Within the next few days, the whole Syrian invading force scuttled back across the border. Thus ended the most dangerous crisis of recent years. Like the Cuban missile crisis, it involved the risk of direct confrontation between the nuclear giants. But the decisions were made in total secrecy, and there was no public drama like President Kennedy's address to the nation. So most Americans were—and still are—blissfully unaware that an immensely dangerous crisis had taken place.

The Israeli leaders, of course, were very much aware of the crisis, and of how President Nixon had responded to it. That awareness largely explains Ambassador Rabin's recent undiplomatic statement on Israeli radio: "While we appreciate support in the form of words we are getting from one camp, we must prefer the support in the form of deeds we are getting from the other camp." Consider the lessons of the crisis, as they must appear through Israeli eyes, and it is not hard to see what Rabin had in mind.

The 1970 crisis underlined an unpleasant fact. Almost all the bases and staging areas that used to be open to American forces, in the 1958 Lebanon crisis, for example, are now closed—Turkey, Malta, Libya, Spain, Lebanon itself. The Italian ports might have been used, but only in *extremis*, without the permission and against the wishes of the Italian Government. "Greece is our last filling station," one policymaker has remarked. Senator McGovern would close the last filling station. He has said that he would immediately withdraw all aid from the present reactionary Greek regime. The Greeks would, of course, retaliate.

Under the McGovern defense program, there would be, not five, but two U.S. divisions left in Europe, with only eight divisions at home. Moreover, McGovern plans to reduce the U.S. carrier task forces from fourteen to six. Only half the carriers are on station at any one time, so a President McGovern could not possibly put five task forces into the Mediterranean on short notice. Under the McGovern naval program, in fact, the Soviet Mediterranean fleet, already challenging the Sixth Fleet, would unquestionably become the dominant force in the Mediterranean. In such circumstances—as the Israelis are well aware—the United States would be capable of words, but precious few deeds.

THE ISSUE OF EXISTENCE

President Nixon certainly took a hair-raising risk in 1970, and it is at least debatable whether the risk was worth taking in the coldly calculated U.S. national interest. Mr. Nixon made an enormous commit-

ment to Israel and gained no comparable commitment in return. But it does not require much perception to see why the Israelis would much prefer a re-elected President Nixon to a President McGovern.

The Israelis have one single-minded preoccupation—the continued existence of Israel. To that end, as Rabin said, American deeds are much to be preferred to American words. This understandable preoccupation may be one reason—and a not unimportant one—for the last-minute revolt against the nomination of George McGovern.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES ACT

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to advise our colleagues that when H.R. 13915, the so-called Equal Educational Opportunities Act, is brought to the floor this week I will offer an amendment aimed at providing quality integrated education by removing unfair barriers to equal housing opportunities.

The amendment will be offered to title IV of this legislation, which deals with the remedies a Federal court, department or agency may employ to alleviate a denial of equal educational opportunity. To the list of remedies enunciated in title IV, my amendment would add two:

First. The removal of land-use barriers, such as zoning and building codes, to development of low- and moderate-income housing; and

Second. The actual construction of low- and moderate-income housing.

The rationale for this amendment is clear. It is no secret that a major underlying cause of segregation in our schools is the segregation in housing patterns—a segregation caused primarily by the discriminatory use of zoning codes, building codes and other land-use devices to prevent development of housing for lower income families.

A bill which talks of equal educational opportunity without addressing itself to equal housing opportunity is a fraud and particularly so when it so drastically restricts the Federal courts, departments, and agencies from moving effectively to alleviate segregation as H.R. 13915 does.

So that our colleagues may be fully informed as to the arguments I shall present in support of this amendment, I include herewith the text of my separate views on H.R. 13915, as well as a timely and enlightening article on the success of housing integration and its impact on education in Shaker Heights, Ohio. This article appeared in the New York Times of last Sunday and I strongly commend it to the attention of our colleagues.

The material follows:

SEPARATE VIEWS OF MR. BADILLO TO H.R. 13915

It is well documented that one of the major underlying causes of unequal educational opportunity in the United States is segregation in housing and the continued existence of land-use barriers to equal oppor-

tunity in housing. Any legislation that attempts to deal with one problem without coming to grips with the other is bound to be an exercise in futility. As the 1966 Coleman Report on Equality of Educational Opportunity observed, the home and neighborhood environment of the student—as well as the racial and economic mix of his classmates—has more effect on his educational achievement than the quality of the school he attends.

The Congress has the moral and legal obligation to take the initiative to end the perpetuation of segregation in education by eliminating those factors contributing to it. As one witness very pointedly testified during hearings on this measure:

"... The segregated communities which produce segregated neighborhood schools are not the result of private actions alone, but are also the result of public laws... which help to keep Blacks out of some communities, thus effectively locking them into others. Because communities segregated are the creation of public law, it is important that Congress recognize its responsibility to correct the existing state of *de jure* residential segregation."

Thus, during consideration of H.R. 13915, I offered an amendment which provided that the removal of land-use barriers, such as planning, zoning, subdivision control, building codes or permits, to the development of low and moderate income housing and the construction of new low and moderate income housing should be utilized as remedies for the denial of equal educational opportunities. The committee had an opportunity to give real meaning to the vast amount of rhetoric we have heard about equal opportunity. Had the majority of my colleagues on the committee believed in integrated education and simply opposed busing on some other grounds, they should have supported my amendment as it would remove those housing barriers which have prevented the integration of our schools. Regrettably, this did not occur.

Nevertheless, the fact that segregated education is a direct and undeniable consequence of segregated housing still remains. In supporting my amendment our very able colleague from New York, Mrs. Chisholm, discussed a summary of all court cases on zoning from 1965 through 1971. As Mrs. Chisholm pointed out, it was clearly shown in all cases, with one exception, that one of the barriers which exist in our educational institutions had to do with the deliberate segregation practices in urban housing. Certainly, the argument that the desegregation in housing is one of the most important remedies to bring about equal educational opportunity is still very valid.

There is no question but that desegregation in schools must be accomplished without further delay—we have already delayed a century or so too long! Either this segregation must be overcome by busing or redistricting or by making possible the construction of low and moderate income houses in communities which currently exclude such housing. By supporting the proposal I have presented the Congress has the opportunity to make a meaningful commitment for equality of educational opportunities as well as that to the neighborhood school.

Unless some affirmative and substantive steps are taken to insure and guarantee without equivocation that all children have truly equal educational opportunities this country will proceed toward a policy of educational apartheid and deny a large segment of the student population an education which will prepare them to participate in our society on a fair and equal basis with their peers. By relegating these youngsters to second-class educations, they are doomed to second-class citizenship and an existence outside the mainstream of American life.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 13, 1972]
INTEGRATION: ONE WAY TO AVOID BUSING
 (By Richard J. Margolis)

Busing schoolchildren across racial boundaries is now a standard weapon in the desegregationists' meager arsenal. But for all the rhetoric it has inspired on both sides, busing does not challenge traditional patterns of neighborhood segregation. In fact, as fair-housing partisans have observed, by accepting such neighborhood divisions as fixed features on the social landscape, busing programs tend to ratify segregationist custom.

What are the viable alternatives to busing? Authorities in Shaker Heights, Ohio, have come up with one that seems to be working. Some time ago they decided to concentrate not on busing but on integrating neighborhoods. Integrated neighborhoods would mean, of course, integrated neighborhood elementary schools.

A decade ago, Shaker Heights, an attractive, affluent suburb of Cleveland, was almost entirely white. Today, 15 per cent of the 36,000 residents and about 25 per cent of the public school population are black. A large segment of the community has been and is Jewish.

Unlike many other communities that have experienced racial strife in their integration efforts, Shaker Heights has had relatively little bitterness or disruption—probably because the transformation has been carefully shaped and encouraged by community leaders. The town may be the only one in America that spends a sizable sum—\$100,000 each year—to promote racial integration within its neighborhoods.

An unusual aspect of the program is that the Board of Education contributes \$35,000 of the total sum; the remaining \$65,000 comes from the City Council. The money goes toward support of the town's official fair-housing enterprise, known as the Shaker Communities Office.

The reasoning for the Board of Education's participation was explained recently by John H. Lawson, Superintendent of Schools:

"We want quality education, and that includes preparing children for life in a multi-racial society. You can't do that until your schools are integrated, and you can't integrate the schools until you've integrated the housing."

Much of the money goes to the Shaker Communities' staff—one full-time executive and 12 part-time "coordinators." The agency is essentially a placement operation: The staff helps to locate black families in homes in predominantly white neighborhoods, and white families in neighborhoods that would otherwise be heavily, perhaps totally, black. Most residents of Shaker Heights, both white and black, think this latter function is crucial.

Many black families from Cleveland began moving into sections of Shaker Heights bordering the city in the mid-1960's. In one neighborhood, for example, the number of house sales to black families climbed from 13 one year to 65 three years later. It soon became obvious that if no one interfered, several large sections of Shaker Heights would be entirely black within a decade.

"Let's face it," Mayor Paul Jones told the citizenry at the time, "integration is here to stay. We had better deal with it properly."

So the community integration program was begun. The town banned the use of "for sale" signs on houses, hoping thereby to quell activities among blockbusting realtors and panic among white residents. Various neighborhood associations were organized to work on the problem. And in 1967 the town officially made its first appropriation toward the continuing stabilization effort.

The "natural," or neighborhood, integra-

tion is reflected, of course, in the trend toward a more equitable racial mix in the schools. Only in Moreland, where the neighborhood population is mostly black, has the school board felt compelled to fall back on a busing plan—which is voluntary—to achieve the objective.

Not everyone in Shaker Heights is hooked on integration, but the opposition has been weak and unorganized. For instance, the opposition has not prevented integrationists on the City Council and the Board of Education from being re-elected regularly by thumping majorities.

Some parents complain, however, that the schools display greater zeal for integration than for education. To which School Superintendent Lawson replies: "We've been accused of lowering our standards. That just isn't true. Before we started integrating, only 80 per cent of our graduates went on to college; now, it's 90 per cent. And last year we had more National Merit Scholarship finalists than any other public high school in the nation."

What little real resentment the housing program has drawn seems to have come mainly from real estate agents who feel that Shaker Communities is robbing them of their rightful commissions. "Basically," Armin Guggenheim, a realtor, said recently of the agency and its staff, "they are a publicly subsidized agency in competition with private business. They are also non-licensed. I think they will soon go out of business."

Lucille Anderson, the program's director, replies: "We try to bring friendly brokers into the picture, and of course we don't take commissions ourselves. But I realize it's a delicate matter."

A more serious criticism, perhaps comes from blacks who think Shaker Communities concentrates too much on stabilization efforts in neighborhoods like Moreland and too little on integrating neighborhoods that remain overwhelmingly white. Mrs. Anderson agrees. "The trouble is," she says, "those houses cost more than most black families can afford. The real solution is to get other suburbs to open up." (Prices in Shaker Heights range from \$17,000 to \$120,000; the more expensive the housing, the whiter the neighborhood.)

JOE BARTLETT REFLECTS ON CONVENTIONS

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, following the 1968 national conventions, and in the wake of the wide public debate that ensued, *The Hatchet Encounter*, a publication of George Washington University, devoted a special issue to the discussion of the American political scene.

The October 1968, edition carried contributions of national leaders of both political parties, and provided an interesting commentary on matters politic.

Our own House Minority Clerk, Joe Bartlett, even then a veteran of 20 years of service to Republican national conventions, was invited to reflect on this process of posturing our national political contests.

In light of the continuing controversy about the convention system, Mr. Bartlett's observations provide an interesting perspective which I commend to your consideration:

SYSTEM REFLECTS FERVOR, APATHY (By Joseph Bartlett)

Political conventions have been the target of pronounced criticism in this campaign year of 1968. The essence of frequent charges is that conventions do not serve the ends of democracy; that they do not result in the selection of the most popular candidates.

Perhaps there is a better way to arrive at a choice of nominees. Certainly, the convention process is not perfect.

However, before we trade it for some other process, we ought to at least know what we are giving up.

Much of the faultfinding concerning political conventions arises, it seems to me, from a misunderstanding of the very nature and purpose of such occasions.

Let us seek a focus by first conceding what a party convention is not: it is not a free-for-all public-wide popularity contest, as a preliminary to the general election.

Many Americans apparently have the notion that a convention is such a contest. Others have argued that it ought to be.

Before we conclude what we might wish a convention to be, let us consider what it probably is intended to be, within the framework of our political party system, and its contribution to representative government.

Is not a political convention, in fact, a caucus for the rather exclusive participation of party leaders and representative party members, to determine the policies and principles (i.e.: platform) which shall characterize that party, and to select the standard-bearers (nominees) who will personify that party in the ensuing general election?

A convention is, then, necessarily a gathering of the "pros" of a political party.

The general public has been such an intimate onlooker in recent years, thanks to modern communications, that many have presumed a proprietary interest in the business of a political party to which they claim no affiliation and to which they offer no allegiance.

To a lesser degree, it is charged, that, these "pros" do not even represent the rank and file of their own party faithful. Certainly, they should. However, the charge of inordinate influence by certain party "prime movers," does not deny the fact that almost all party leaders are chosen by an elective process among the members of the party, to whom they must, in turn, be responsible. If what they do in the name of the party is not pleasing to a majority of those they represent, they will not long remain in a position of influence.

"Hogwash!" the cynics would cry, and point to some political "boss" who seems to contradict such "idealistic naivete." But they would beg to argue the validity of the whole doctrine of "elected representation," of which political conventions are only one part. A convention is a caucus of leaders who are, more or less, realistically representative, or it is nothing. In whatever places this thesis may be imperfect in practices, here should the remedy come first!

For our entire concept of electing representatives to perform in behalf of the electorate, relies upon the free flow of favor from the people, to their leaders, and back again.

Accordingly, we would accept that political conventions are conducted by "pros," possessed of the aggregate power of the sum of their followers.

If we understand, then, that this is the nature and purpose of political conventions, we can go on to examine some of the specific criticisms in a more realistic context.

Many of the faults we hear arise directly from the very size of these conclaves. The Republican convention at Miami this year seated 1,333 delegates and alternates. The

Democrats meeting in Chicago gave similar credentials to 5,134!

If the U.S. Congress can manage with 435 Representatives, is it not reasonable to suppose that a party convention might get along with, say, twice that number? At most, 1000.

One reason for increasing the ranks at a convention is to reward those states which have performed effectively on behalf of the party. Allowing relatively larger delegations to those states is consistent with the convention concept, and is as it should be.

However, a loss defensible (if no less political) reason for the growth in numbers within the delegations, has been the insatiable demand to "balance" the delegations between the sexes, the factions, the fictions, and the follies. A case could be made that this has, instead, produced imbalance. Unquestionably, it has produced big conventions.

If we are to hope to decrease the number of delegates, it will be all the more important that each be chosen primarily because of his qualifications to best represent the interests of all his constituent party members, not some special grouping.

Many criticisms may be heard concerning various aspects of convention programming. Much of it, too, is attributable to misunderstanding. All activities should, of course, be oriented to the important fundamental purpose of the convention.

Entertainment is an enjoyable, and sometimes invaluable, part of programming. However, needless to say, it is not the purpose of a political convention to entertain!

The importance of the media, especially television, to the portrayal of convention events can hardly be over-emphasized. It is as vital to these significant events, as a well-informed electorate to democracy. As such, it bears an awesome responsibility to the public. At very great expense to their own industry, the TV networks provided imaginative programming of the conventions which the public demonstrated, by listener ratings, they wanted to witness. How well those of TV lived up to their awesome responsibilities has been the subject of endless criticisms, in which I choose not to engage.

The "live" TV camera is a relatively recent entry into the convention scene. Even in my brief convention experience of two decades, I have watched it grow from an infant to a giant; from an awkward intruder to a sophisticated partner.

To those who would point to its undeniable shortcomings, I would remind of its growth.

One problem not peculiar to any medium, any more than any other segment of such a huge organization, is that of continuity of subsequent conventions. That is: profiting from mistakes once made, rather than just repeating them every four years.

In some respects, four years is quite a long time. Few party national chairmen survive to manage a second convention. The turnover among officialdom is remarkable (may I remind you of our earlier thesis!) And man's memory is fallible.

Records of precedents retained by staff employees of the committees must surely be invaluable in prescribing the planning for such an event. The party chairman puts the myriad matters of convention machinery together, and just as we approach the climax of circumstances, he steps to the side and hands the reins of responsibility over to the convention chairman. Yet, neither chairman can really take command of events, but must respond, as he should, to conform to the will of the convention.

Part of the chairman's problem is identifying that "will." As is part of that problem, the identifying of the legitimate delegates.

In the pandemonium of present conventions, one hardly knows for sure whether he is hearing from the duly constituted delegates or from some extraneous encroachers.

I ask you: would not demonstrations on the floor of the convention, for instance, be more meaningful and reflective, if such activities were limited to the delegates themselves? Would this not help preserve the real purpose of the convention? Would this not serve the ends of representative democracy?

Some will, I suppose, say "no." Some will remember a Wendell Willkie. Some will hold that a McCarthy or a Rockefeller was denied his due of democracy.

Of them, I would ask a re-thinking of the nature, the purpose and even the recent history of political events.

Those who have prevailed are seldom critics of the convention system. Those who have failed are, as a rule, equally unobjective.

Changes will come, as they always do. If those changes are to be improvements, we must understand what we are changing and why we want to change it.

In our time, the strong two-party system has appeared to serve our Republic well. The political convention has seemed to serve the purposes of each political party in its roll and responsibilities within our representative society.

It is a flexible system; it is an accommodating arrangement among free men. That it may reflect indifference as faithfully as it does public fervor, is not necessarily to its discredit, is it? So let us work to perfect it to achieve our ends within that framework of democratic interaction, but let us grant to none a license to do injury to these traditions just because they feel that they have been frustrated in their ideas of what ought to be.

Imperfect as it is, it is still the best system yet devised by man—and, I sincerely believe, well worth our patriotic patience and loyal service.

TELEPHONE PRIVACY XXXIII

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I reintroduced the telephone privacy bill on May 10, 1972, with a total of 48 cosponsors.

This bill would give individuals the right to indicate to the telephone company if they do not wish to be commercially solicited over the telephone. Commercial firms wanting to solicit business over the phone would then be required to obtain from the phone company a list of customers who opted for the commercial prohibition. The FCC would also be given the option of requiring the phone company, instead of supplying a list, to put an asterisk by the name of those individuals in the phone book who have chosen to invoke the commercial solicitation ban.

Those not covered by the legislation would be charities and other nonprofit groups, political candidates or organizations, and opinion pollsters. Also not covered would be debt collection agencies or any other individual or companies with whom the individual has an existing contract or debt.

I have received an enormous amount of correspondence on this legislation from all over the country. Today, I am placing a 31st sampling of these letters into the RECORD, since they describe far

more vividly than I possibly could, the need for this legislation.

These letters follow—the names have been omitted:

WILMETTE, ILL.

DEAR MR. ASPIN: Your bill, HR 14884, is a most welcome sight. Nuisance phone calls have become an increasing aggravation and going "unlisted" seemed like the only alternative. That is a nuisance to everyone else, however. My husband and I heartily support your efforts.

St. CHARLES, ILL., July 25, 1972.

Re: H.R.—14884

HON. LES ASPIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ASPIN: Rather recently I heard that you and several cosponsors introduced the above captioned to keep nuisances off our phones. By now the bill may either be defeated or passed. However, if it will do any good, I would like to have you know that I feel such a bill is long overdue.

There are many of my friends who have "unlisted" numbers in order to avoid these obnoxious invasions by telephone solicitors. But these rascals (the solicitors) have another method of approach. In order that they not miss a single listing in a given area, they dial the prefix numbers and then start with 0001 and go all the way through to 9999. Of course, they don't know the name of the person who answers so they immediately ask "to whom am I speaking" after determining that they have reached the number previously dialed. I have heard many complaints about this.

Now I would like to make a suggestion—not in solving the above mentioned problem but about broadening this bill. As you know, mail advertising has reached ridiculous proportions. Before bringing in the mail each day, I find it necessary to first stop by the garbage can and dispose of about half of it. I would like to see your bill include the same limitations on mail pollsters as it would on phone pollsters.

Respectfully,

WINNETKA, ILL., July 23, 1972.

SIR: Please support bill # HR-14884 preventing unwanted telephone solicitation. Thank you,

TYLER, TEX., August 27, 1972.

Congressman LES ASPIN,
Washington, D.C.

CONGRESSMAN ASPIN: I fully support your Telephone Privacy Act and I hope you will do everything in your power to get it passed. Sincerely,

NORTHBROOK, ILL., July 27, 1972.

MR. LES ASPIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ASPIN: Illinois Bell Telephone Company gave me your name in connection with a bill that is in the House about telephone solicitations.

If I may, I'd like to voice an opinion that I'm sure is a prominent problem to all telephone owners . . . that of the annoyance of telephone solicitors. I can honestly say that I am anti-solicitation minded!

For example, yesterday evening, some young representative called . . . after informing her that I was not interested, she called back 8 times, not once or twice, mind you, but 8 times. Not only is this annoying, but it is absolutely uncalled for. I did call the Northbrook Police because I thought it was possibly a prankster. Well, they really have their hands tied in such a situation and could

be of no immediate help. So, early this morning, I called the Illinois Bell Telephone Company and they informed me that they were aware of some of the solicitors and what areas they are working in, but could not give out any names. However, in the future, I was told that I should try to get the name of the company and then report it to Illinois Bell. Well, Mr. Aspin, who wants to listen to a lousy sales pitch over the phone at 8:30 at night, (or at any time for that matter)? Certainly not I!

I am very interested in your bill involving anti-solicitation and if there are any questionnaires, personal viewpoint statements, or a way in which I might help, please do not hesitate to write to me. If you have any literature on this subject, I would be most happy to receive it.

Thanks again for listening . . . I'm so furiously mad at these people that it's hard for me to write without using four-letter words.

Sincerely,

ARLAND PARK, ILL., July 21, 1972.

HON. LES ASPIN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ASPIN: I wish to commend you on your sponsorship of H.R. 14884 which would give me a chance to be rid of nuisance telephone calls. I sincerely hope it passes.

Sincerely,

CHILD CARE IN THE 1970'S

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, keynoting the Early Childhood Conference I sponsored in Idaho this spring was Dr. Edward F. Zigler, then Director of the Office of Child Development of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Dr. Zigler is one of the Nation's most articulate spokesmen and respected authorities on young children, and his very direct and thought-provoking address set the tone for a stimulating and informative conference. I would like to include portions of Dr. Zigler's remarks in the RECORD:

CHILD CARE IN THE 1970'S

(By Dr. Edward Zigler)

Thank you Congressman. So many people have mentioned my coming to Idaho as though it were the last thing that a person would want to do. Actually, it's a beautiful state and the people here are lovely, and I've had a wonderful time. However, I must confess that this is an invitation that I probably would have sought out had it not been offered to me. I'd like to tell you why.

At the White House Conference on Children in 1970, a rather bleak picture was painted of our nation's treatment of children; and in all candor, I must say that that picture is in many ways the truth. We do not treat the children of this nation as well as we should. In fact, one of the forums came up with a statement which is unfortunately too true: namely, in our nation, too often, children come last.

However, in this generally pessimistic picture there are bright spots, and in my estimation one of the brightest spots is in Idaho. I met with your Governor in Washington. We had a very productive meeting, and it

was clear to me that he is a man who cares about children. I was delighted to have the opportunity to talk with him. I've had meetings, too, with your Congressman, Orval Hansen, and I know from personal experience the stellar role that he has played, both in his official capacity on the Education and Labor Committee, and in his public utterances and in the energy that he is willing to expend in behalf of all of the nation's children. When I meet men such as these, I say to myself "There's hope. These are the elected officials of the state of Idaho; these are people who care. If these two men represent the will of the people of the state of Idaho, then I am perfectly convinced that in this state, children will come first."

I want to talk to you today about two major types of programs that I see to be most relevant for our children's needs in the 70's. The first type of program can be classified as preventive or compensatory education programs for those children who can be helped by them. While I would cite the Head Start program in terms of a national effort, I would also allude to the many experimental programs, such as Bettye Caldwell's important effort in Arkansas, and others around the country.

The second type of program that I think our nation is going to emphasize is day care programs for children of working mothers. The children of such mothers may or may not be in need of the type of compensatory, remedial, or preventive efforts that are needed by the children in the first category.

It must be noted, in discussing early childhood intervention programs, that the value of such efforts is being seriously questioned. This questioning goes well beyond Jensen's blanket indictment that compensatory education has failed. The criticisms are being raised as a result of some rather fine-grained analyses of compensatory education programs by learned investigators who can hardly be considered hostile towards preschool intervention efforts. I refer to the paper by Carl Bereiter, himself one of the early leaders in the area of early childhood education. My old friend and colleague at Harvard, Larry Kohlberg, has analyzed the value of compensatory education and comes down somewhat on the negative side. Sheldon White, also at Harvard, has also assessed early childhood compensatory programs and we find in his paper a questioning attitude toward the value of such programs.

Since the single largest compensatory program in the country is Head Start, much of the discussion about the value of compensatory education centers about the question of whether Head Start has succeeded or failed. This is an important question to answer, because we have looked to Head Start for guidance as to the direction that future efforts should take.

There is little question that the early euphoria has given way to a rather pessimistic view in many quarters concerning the value of Head Start. It was only seven years ago that Head Start was the "Sesame Street" of 1965 and not enough good things could be said about it. However since then, we had a very damaging evaluation study with which I'm sure many of you are familiar, the Westinghouse Report, which was used in many quarters as evidence that no lasting benefits are achieved by the Head Start effort. We've seen this negativism concerning the program reflected in the popular press. I remember addressing an NAEYC meeting shortly after coming to Washington 2 years ago, and somebody handed me a "U.S. News and World Report" story. It said an unnamed White House official states that "Head Start is clearly a failure. It is nothing but a babysitting service for welfare mothers." Needless to say, I could never track down that particular White House source but there it was in the "U.S. News and World Report."

It's interesting to me that people who

attack intervention efforts in general cite Head Start now by name. The recent book "The I.Q. Question," and liberal segments of the intellectual community, have come down pretty hard on Head Start. In a recent issue of "The New Republic," hardly a rightwing enemy of liberal efforts, Martin Mayer, the well-known author and social critic, passes off Head Start in a word or two as clearly a failure.

I would like to go on record as stating that Head Start is certainly the largest and most important social action experiment mounted in behalf of needy children in the history of our nation. There can be little question that it has produced real benefits. The problem is that we treat so many of our social action programs as fads: we love them too much when they are young, and we despise them too much when they get old. (Although it's hard to think of a program seven years old as very ancient).

But let's look at the record. A central part of Head Start is its health and nutrition components—never touched upon in the Westinghouse Report, never mentioned by its critics. When you talk about preventive education, about compensatory education, about developmental education, you're talking about the total development of the child. What is more important to the learning of the child, to the quality of his life, to determining what he can become, than his physical health and well being?

Over the years, we have discovered some 35 percent of the Head Start children suffer from an identifiable physical defect. We also know that 75 percent of these children are provided with the kind of follow-up medical treatment required to correct these deficiencies. We are talking about taking care of literally hundreds of thousands of children. Head Start continues to be the single largest delivery system of health services to poor children in this nation.

In addition, Head Start has pioneered a unique phenomenon which is instrumental in correcting the cognitive and social problems of our nation's children that interfere with their optimal development. I am referring to parent involvement. Experts alone will not make our children whole and well. The most important source determining the development of the child continues to be the nature of the home. Programs conducted in isolation from the home, and without the involvement of the parents, will inevitably fail.

Who pioneered the entire concept of parent involvement? Who ever heard of parent involvement before 1965? Head Start made parent involvement a reality, and it is that impetus that has led to the spread of this concept to other programs, such as Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and other national and state programs. The thing that I have noticed, which is important to both the quality of family life and to the child itself, is the sense of integrity that is gained by the parent who has a real role in Head Start, or the school program, or any other program that deals with his or her children. Taking parents into our confidence, making partners of them rather than beating them as an alien force, gives these parents a new sense of dignity, a sense of worth, convincing them that we "experts" appreciate their importance. Many of these parents never had a sense that what they did made a difference in their child's life. Once we show that we take seriously their role in helping their own children and in the policy making of our programs, we see in these parents a new-found sense of dignity and worth. I cannot stress too highly what this means to the developing child. The early years are indeed important, and the child who is surrounded by a parent or parents who feel that they are worthless, soon gets the notion that he too, is worthless. Parents who feel they have a sense of worth, a sense

of dignity, a sense of being able to impact their children's environment, produce children who also have this same sense of worth and capability.

Another aspect of Head Start which has gone unnoticed by its critics is the fact that it has been an important social force in our society. While everybody quotes the Westinghouse Report, I have yet to see the popular press pick up an account of one of the most important social evaluations of the last ten years, namely the Kirschner Report. This report clearly indicates that in communities where there is a Head Start Center, the entire community is becoming mobilized around the needs of children. We discovered that, in 58 cities where there was a Head Start program, over 1500 identifiable changes for the better could be found in the educational and health care of children in those cities.

Another aspect of the Head Start program in which we should take great pride is the fact that we took many thousands—9,000 to be correct—people from the ghettos, from the barrios, from the impoverished areas of this nation, and from Indian reservations and we placed these people in college training. Right now there are 9,000 people who have either completed or will complete AA degrees or BA degrees in the area of early childhood education. At the same time, by pulling themselves up, they will also provide a resource that this nation badly needs, namely, individuals who are trained to work with young children.

Another aspect of the program which often seems to be overshadowed by the Westinghouse Report is the unassailable fact that Head Start children, as compared to children who have not experienced the program, are superior on cognitive measures as well as personality and motivational measures by the end of the Head Start experience. This evidence has appeared in 95 out of 100 studies. It is true that once the two groups enter elementary school there is often a loss in the superiority of the Head Start children. To my mind, one clear reading of this type of evidence is that it represents more of an indictment of the elementary schools of this nation than it does of the Head Start program.

I am pleased to have something new to unveil to you this morning. I haven't mentioned it yet, although word has crept up to the Hill, and unfortunately an old friend of mine in Congress accused me of sitting on some data when actually all I have been doing is making sure that we do not report anything without having it carefully criticized by people who hold alternative points of view. But I can tell you this morning that we will release to the nation within the next six weeks or so, a compendium of longitudinal studies of Head Start. (You must remember that the Westinghouse Report was not a longitudinal study. It did not follow Head Start and comparable non-Head Start children for three years.)

We went around the country and found investigators who themselves had followed Head Start children for several years. We found eight such projects from which I think we can draw certain conclusions. First of all, these reports, taken *in toto*, indicate that the picture is not nearly as dark as the Westinghouse Report indicated in terms of the lasting gains of the Head Start program. Many of these programs found that the superiority of the Head Start children was maintained over the comparable children into the third and even the fourth grade. The gains were not huge and I'm not going to tell you that if we just "inoculate" a child for a year in Head Start, we can forget the rest of his life. But it certainly paints a different picture from the one painted by the Westinghouse Report.

Furthermore, there are two clear findings in these reports that make good common sense, fit all the developmental theories I know anything about, and also show us how we must move in the future. They show that the magnitude of the gain that was maintained rested upon two factors. One was the involvement of the parents in the program. Did the parents on their own do something with their own children that build upon what was happening to the children in the centers? It makes good sense that if a child had one set of experiences for three or four hours a day, and a totally different set for the other ten or twelve waking hours, you're not going to get much impact. But if the parent learns how to interact with the child in the same constructive way that is being carried out in the child care center you begin getting impact because the child has continuous support and interactions of a sort that produce optimal growth and development.

There was a second factor that we could have all predicted back in 1965. The maximal payoff in the Head Start program comes if the school follows up the Head Start program with another compensatory effort that builds upon the skills of the child, rather than simply dumping him back into the conventional type of educational program.

After telling you about this essentially positive view that I have of Head Start, I think that it is appropriate for me to point out to you that Head Start does have some important practical and conceptual problems. I point this out because I think it's important that we learn from experimental efforts such as Head Start. It's important that we be honest in telling Congressmen and Governors and Presidents what we can do and what we cannot do, and most importantly what we have learned. Only in this way can we make efforts in behalf of children in the future that will be even more effective. One thing that we have learned from our own monitoring reports, is that Head Start around the nation continues to be a very mixed bag. In certain communities, it's very good, in many communities it's mediocre, and in some communities around this nation, it is extremely poor. In my estimation, in terms of the quality of what we're delivering, Head Start continues to be a dream unrealized.

One of the factors our monitoring efforts indicated was that many of the Head Start teachers who actually take care of children day in and day out are not knowledgeable concerning the nature of the developing child. Stated most bluntly, many people taking care of children in Head Start centers simply do not know what they are doing.

This evidence tells me which way we have to move in the future. The rock upon which we must build all early childhood programs in the center rests on the nature of the relationship between the important adults in that center and the child, and the nature of their interaction. If you have adults, women and men, who understand child development, who have had some training and some sensitivity to what a child is all about, you will get results, and it's that simple.

There were other problems with Head Start and I'm afraid they continue to plague us. The whole program got caught up in cognitive emphasis very, very quickly. The idea became that Head Start is intended to make everybody brilliant, we have to have I.Q. measures all over the place, and we'd better get in there and measure those quotients. Head Start was set up to improve the cognition of children. Cognition is important. But it became over-emphasized in my estimation, and to make the matter even worse, it became wedded to what I can only refer to as the naive environmentalism which was particularly rampant in 1965 and which is declining today.

It would appear that we held Piaget and Werner and other European cognitive theorists at arms' length for decades, but in the good old American tradition, once we discovered Piaget, we discovered him with a vengeance! There are a number of historical strands that all came together in 1965 making improved cognition the thing to aim for. It seemed as if we forgot the rest of the child that is really very important in determining what that child is to become.

Ladies and gentlemen, children are not equivalent to I.Q. scores. Nor is their everyday social competence equivalent to their I.Q. scores. Unfortunately we have state hospitals, penitentiaries, welfare rolls, still peopled with individuals of quite high intelligence. However, partially because of the cognitive emphasis and measurement problems, as well, the I.Q. score became the primary indicator of success or failure. It appeared that the goal of Head Start was the production of a cadre of geniuses to eventually man the professorial posts at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton. We must never get into that bag again. It is my opinion that what we are doing in this country is continually crucifying our children on a cross of I.Q. There are bright children. There are less than bright children. There are some children that are not bright at all. They're all worthy children, they're all deserving of our love, they're all deserving of our best efforts to ensure their healthy development.

The goal of Head Start programs and all remedial programs should be to produce socially competent human beings. We should begin appreciating the fact that the entire range of cognitive abilities is represented in every socioeconomic group. Furthermore, we must be aware that we are not going to repeal the biological law of human variability. What we must remember is that just about every child in our society, with the exception of the very severely handicapped, can adapt to our society, can contribute to our society. Our problem is not so much in making everyone brilliant as it is in making everyone use the intelligence that they have.

In my own reviews, my own research, my own analysis of the problem, I have at least convinced myself, and hopefully a few others, that one of the most serious problems with our economically disadvantaged children is not in the sphere of cognitive development at all, but rather in the sphere of social and emotional development. My own research has certainly indicated that most of these children suffer not so much from stupidity as from the fact that they don't have the motivational structure that permits them to use the intelligence that they have. These children have motivational needs which simply get in the way of their cognitive performance, their school performance, and their job performance later in life; until we can teach these children to relate to others, to view themselves and others in a positive way and to begin setting up certain goals for themselves that are realistic and productive and positive, all of the cognitive training that moves them to the Piaget stages are not going to have the effects that we would like them to have.

Again, I'm not opposed to cognitive development; it is a very critical factor in social competence, but let us rediscover the whole child; let's begin establishing programs for young children in this country that work just as seriously on the motivational and social structure of these children as it now does on developing their cognition and their I.Q. scores.

We have to approach these children honestly. Let's say that we are never going to ensure that every child's score on any measure is above the mean as a result of our programs. We must, therefore, approach decision makers honestly with what we can honestly do, and one of the reasons that I

emphasize the social and motivational system so much is because all of my reading of the literature leads me to believe that that system, which is so important in determining social competence, is much more malleable, is much more changeable, than is the cognitive system which does also reflect a variety of biological and environmental experiences. It is very difficult to raise permanently the rate of cognitive development of individuals. I'm not saying that it can't be done, but I am saying that it is much easier to change a child's attitudes, motives, goals, and affective features—which are just as important in determining what that child is going to become—as to change his cognitive features.

MAPLE HEIGHTS, OHIO, CITY COUNCIL CALLS FOR ACTION ON FOOD PRICES

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, in establishing the phase II economic policy, President Nixon stated that the program could be successful only with the cooperation and vigilance of all citizens. The city council of Maple Heights, Ohio, has complied with this request by calling attention to the serious problem of rising food prices, and the difficulties encountered by consumers in attempting to check base prices.

I urge the Cost of Living Council to act to alleviate these conditions, and should the administration fail to act, the appropriate committees of Congress should seriously consider enacting legislation in this area.

The text of the resolution of the Maple Heights City Council, and an article on it which appeared in the Maple Heights Press, follow:

A RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, AND OTHERS, TO CREATE GREATER AWARENESS TO CURRENT PRICE INFORMATION BY EXTENDING PRICE CRITERIA TO FOOD PRODUCTS, AND REQUIRING BASE PRICE INFORMATION POSTED ADJACENT TO CURRENT PRICES

Whereas, the Wage Price Freeze set out to relieve the working man of the erosion of his income caused by inflation; and

Whereas, the Wage Price Freeze brought about stabilization for a period of time; and

Whereas, since the Wage Price Freeze has been in effect, prices of some commodities are still out of hand and prices are still increasing at a highly inflationary rate and

Whereas, specifically, this includes food prices which have never been subject to control and as a result have skyrocketed beyond the bounds of what the seasonal fluctuations of the marketplace would be; and

Whereas, since the law relative to posting price lists has caused them to be posted in remote or inconspicuous places thereby not permitting our people to be readily aware of what the base prices are, so that complaints to the Federal Office of Stabilization are not being made in the volume that they should be, due to the lack of awareness on the part of the people. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of the City of Maple Heights, State of Ohio:

Section 1. It is requested that base price information be required to be posted ad-

jacent to the current price information in an effort to create greater awareness among our citizenry and better permit our citizens to report noncompliance with Price Stabilization Laws.

Section 2. Be it further **resolved**, that the price stabilization criteria be further extended to food products (meats, vegetables, etc.) since these prices mostly affect all citizens, especially the middle and lower income; and since they have risen far beyond the two and one-half percent objective established for increased prices.

Section 3. The Clerk of Council is hereby instructed to forward certified copies of this Resolution to the President of the United States, Senator Robert Taft, Senator William B. Saxbe, Congressman James V. Stanton, Ralph Nader and the Directors of Economic Stabilization in Cleveland and Washington, D.C.

Section 4. This Resolution shall be in full force immediately upon passage.

Passed: August 2, 1972.

[From the Maple Heights Press, Aug. 10, 1972]

FOOD PRICES RISE; COUNCIL ASKS NIXON TO TAKE STEPS

Because they don't believe the objectives of Phase II's Wage Price Freeze are being uniformly enforced and because they feel the public should be made more aware of food prices, Maple Heights Council has forwarded a resolution to that affect to President Nixon.

Councilman James Timko, noting that the federal government has the controls and not the city, cited "food prices skyrocketing out of control" as one reason for this legislation.

He hoped that a federal government regulation requiring posting of base food prices next to—instead of "remote or inconspicuous places"—current prices would create an awareness of the "highly inflationary rate" in the public which could pressure for food prices to be subject to the same 2½ percent guidelines as other products.

Copies of the resolution were sent to the President, Senators Robert Taft and William Saxbe, Congressman James Stanton, Ralph Nader and the directors of Economic Stabilization in Cleveland and Washington, D.C.

David Roth, 5524 Elmwood, had his own answer. "The only reason prices are high is because people are willing to pay these amounts. It's not the fault of anyone, but everyone," he told city council.

Wholesale food prices went up last month and have risen up 3.2 percent last month and have risen 12.9 percent in the last 12 months.

ALASKA STATE FAIR FOR 1972

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, an annual fair for Alaska has been designated the official Alaska State Fair for 1972. This fair, at Tanana, will communicate the diversity of Alaska; its culture, history, resources, and attractions. Since the fair plays such a vital role in the lives of Alaskan citizens, this year's theme will be "Alaskans All." I enclose the recent proclamation of Alaska State Gov. William A. Egan commemorating the Alaska State Fair:

PROCLAMATION: ALASKA STATE FAIR FOR 1972

By legislative direction, the Governor of Alaska annually designates one of the State's

regional agricultural and industrial fairs as the official "Alaska State Fair."

"Alaskans All" has been chosen as the theme for the 1972 Alaska State Fair. This theme communicates the diversity of Alaska; its culture, history, resources, attractions, as it recognizes the common bond that unites us all—our dedication to the future of the great State of Alaska.

Exhibit entry in the fair is open to all the people of Alaska. Exhibit divisions are offered in agriculture, livestock, homemaking arts, 4-H Club work, handicrafts, Alaskan native arts and crafts, wild mushrooms, berries, youth, and education. Substantial prize premiums and awards are offered for winning exhibits.

Modern day fairs are great communicators for individual interests and pride of accomplishment. Based on the traditional farm and home skills of an agricultural nation, fairs have expanded to reflect wider community and educational issues.

Two out of every three Alaskans take part in fair activities annually, thus indicating the vital role played by fairs in the lives of our citizens.

Therefore, I, William A. Egan, Governor of Alaska, officially designate the Tanana Fair as the Alaska State Fair for 1972 and invite all citizens and visitors to "come to the Fair."

Dated this 27th day of July, 1972.

THE CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF THE CATHOLIC KOLPING SOCIETY OF AMERICA

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Catholic Kolping Society of America will hold its national convention in Chicago from September 1 to 4. At this time the society will mark its 100th year.

The Kolping Society is dedicated to making this "a better world through better people." Many charitable works and community projects are assisted by the Kolping Society. During its earliest days, the Kolping Society of America served a huge number of immigrants—often providing shelter, jobs, and opportunities to learn English. Today, the same spirit of helping those in need guides the Kolping Society.

Mr. Speaker, in order that other Members of Congress may be made aware of their significant contributions during the last 100 years, I provide the following history of the Catholic Kolping Society of America.

THE CATHOLIC KOLPING SOCIETY

Adolph Kolping was born in Germany in 1813. He was ordained a priest in 1845. In 1849 he founded the Kolping Society to help young journeymen. At this time Germany was the process of transformation into the age of industrialization.

He went about Germany, writing, preaching and organizing. Society after Society was established. Kolping Houses were his way of shaping and molding young men to become good Christians, good citizens and respectable family men. Kolping knew that the family was the most important foundation for a good society. His work spread. Today there are Kolping Societies, not only in Germany, but in twelve cities of the United States, many cities in Canada and in countries throughout the world.

In 1872 a Kolping Society was founded in Chicago. It is the oldest Kolping Society in the United States. This year at the National Convention of the Catholic Kolping Societies of America, September 1-2-3-4 in Chicago, we will celebrate the hundredth Anniversary Centennial of the Chicago Kolping Society. The motto of this Convention is "A Better World Through Better People".

In its early years the Chicago Kolping Society served the great numbers of immigrants newly arrived in the United States. It provided homes for these young men, where the ideals of Father Kolping were instilled. It helped them to find jobs in their new land. Classes in English were taught.

After World War II, the Chicago Kolping Society was actively involved in work with the Refugees and Displaced Persons. The Society worked closely with the Catholic Charities to help solve this monumental task. After World War II, there was another period of time which saw many immigrants from all over the world arriving in the United States. Many who settled in Chicago were helped by the Society.

After the Hungarian Revolution the Chicago Kolping Society opened its doors to hundreds of young Hungarian boys who had fled their native land to freedom in America. Once again the Society went quietly about its work of helping the new arrivals become established in their new land. This process was repeated again after the Cuban revolution, when once again hundreds of Cuban Refugees found a helping hand through the Chicago Kolping Society.

In 1938 the Chicago Kolping Society moved from its location on Oakdale Avenue to the present location at 5826 N. Elston Avenue, Chicago. No longer does the Kolping House serve as a boarding house for young men, but during the years 1872-1968, over 25,000 young men lived in the Chicago Kolping House.

Now the Kolping work consists primarily of various charitable works and community projects. We are very proud to be the sponsors of a Boy Scout Troop for Handicapped Boys. Kolping Societies sponsor 4-H Groups, work with orphanages and others in need.

And the work which Father Kolping so strongly advocated, the strengthening of family life, through Christian Brotherhood, is carried out through our various programs. Instilled with the ideals of Father Kolping, a Kolping Member is a good Christian, a useful, production member of his community, and a good citizen of his country.

Kolping members indeed are endeavoring to create "a better world through better people."

NATURAL BEAUTY OF HAWAIIAN ORCHIDS REFLECTS PAINSTAKING EFFORTS BY MAN

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the Hawaiian orchid is, by its very nature, a symbol of beauty which has captured the imagination of floral fanciers throughout the world. Its special radiance and attendant mystique are qualities which bespeak of an extraordinary creation of nature.

Yet the common vision of beautiful orchids growing wild in the State of Hawaii greatly belies man's personal con-

tribution to nature's handiwork through experimentation with new hybrids and years of painstaking labor. The magnificent panoply of velvety colors and textures which characterize the Hawaiian orchid reflects a level of human care almost unknown in this modern age. Some of the famous cattleyas, for example, will not flower until their ninth year after planting of the seed. Preparation for the germination of these seeds is an art in itself.

For a highly interesting account of the process of orchid-growing in Hawaii, I recommend to my colleagues a reading of the following article, which appeared in a recent issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin.

The article follows:

AN ORCHID IS AN ORCHID IS—

(By Loretta Robinson)

Orchids may grow wild in the state of Hawaii, but the riot of velvet colors produced in the hybrids happens only after years of painstaking labor.

Some of the cattleyas, grown from seed, won't flower until the plant is well into its ninth year.

Neither is the process of getting them started a simple one.

On their Wai'anae orchid farm, Helen and Masatoshi Miyamoto include in their orchid-growing equipment pressure cookers, agar (a gelatinous substance made from seaweed), beakers, Chlorox bottles and tiny one-inch clay pots.

Contamination of the seeds is avoided at all costs.

The beakers in which they are grown are put through the pressure-cooked process, then covered and stored in a sterilized cabinet. Mrs. Miyamoto also sterilizes her hands and the glass box in which she works.

For nourishment during this sterile start, the orchids feed on an agar base which Mrs. Miyamoto cooks herself. Working from a recipe that might almost look like a human dessert—without the fertilizer—she includes coconut milk, tomato juice, Japanese katen and sugar.

After planting, the parentage of each bottle is recorded as carefully as it might be for any pure-bred race horse. The beakers are then corked with cotton and covered with aluminum foil, not to be opened for the next 10 months.

They are, however, still checked every day for possible contamination. If any mold appears the contents of the whole beaker is discarded.

When the test-tube phase is over, the plants, rarely larger than an inch in height, are transferred either to three-inch community pots or individual one-inch pots. Working with a long wire hook like a ship-in-a-bottle builder, Mrs. Miyamoto handles each plant separately.

Only when the orchids finally bloom can the results of their work be assessed.

"Each seed pod is supposed to be the same genetically," Mr. Miyamoto explained, "but the genes of all the seeds can make over a million combinations."

In spite of the amount of expertise they have accumulated, Mrs. Miyamoto admitted that when they first started a nursery—as a hobby—"We were just collecting, buying and killing plants."

They were living in Honolulu then and Mr. Miyamoto who was working as an automobile mechanic.

The way his wife tells it, growing orchids was her hobby and he got involved. The way he tells it, he picked up the interest from his

father who was a gardener on the Damon Estate in Moanalua Valley.

A short course in orchid culture at the University of Hawaii taught him the basic techniques he uses now. "That's where I learned to plant seed by the symbiotic method on sterile media," he recalled. "I also read the different publications available. They were very limited then."

"When we started germinating our own plants we were forced to sell," Mrs. Miyamoto said and laughed.

That was about when her husband began working only part-time as a mechanic to devote more time to orchids.

Mr. Miyamoto, in addition to handling his own business, became the official photographer for the Honolulu Orchid Society, and then for the American Orchid Society Awards Committee.

He has since dropped that because he "doesn't have enough time" after spending 10 or 12 hours a day watering, potting, tending and mailing his plants.

"It is not a profitable business," he said, "but the friends we have made make it worth it." In his guest book there are signatures from Israel, Egypt, Germany, Japan, Thailand, Africa and Canada and even New Jersey.

"Orchid-growing is all over, in parts we wouldn't believe it would be possible, including Alaska. They have to have heated houses in all temperate climates," he said.

Miyamoto is generous with his advice, which could be why even the experts make regular visits to his farm.

This week he'll be displaying 50 of his plants in the HIC orchid show, and he'll also be working in the sales booth.

For amateur orchid-growers he offered a few solid tips for plant shopping:

For one, although "you can grow almost any orchids grown on the Islands, the dendrobiums and cattleyas would do much better in drier areas."

On the other hand, members of the vandaceous family—vanda, ascocenda and phalaenopsis—will grow in hot areas, but will do better at higher elevations or cooler parts of the Islands.

The reason is that "dendrobiums cannot take too much water," Mr. Miyamoto explained. "Any plants with pseudo-bulbs as they have store water. The vandaceous group has no bulbs."

As far as sunshine is concerned, he said, most varieties of dendrobiums prefer full sunshine. Vandas and cattleyas like partial shade and the phalaenopsis even more shade.

For the shade-lovers, the early morning sun is best, he advised. "Mid-afternoon sun is much hotter and burns the plants. If a plant is heated gradually all day it is not so bad."

Although the cattleyas with their lush blossoms are Miyamoto's favorites, he admitted that they do have the disadvantage of blooming only once a year. The same is true of dendrobiums.

A new development, the ascocenda, a fairly new hybrid, does make it possible to have blooming orchids almost all year around.

"It is also suitable for small growing areas. It does not grow into a huge plant," Miyamoto said.

COMMON CAUSE

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, in light of my colleagues discussion of Common

Cause on Tuesday, July 18, on page 24139, I would like to bring to their attention part I of three parts of an article on the same subject:

CAUSE WITHOUT A REBEL
(By Robert Sherrill)

It isn't the apocalyptic sales pitch that guarantees success. It's the aroma of something special—a kind of sweatless sincerity—that exudes from the salesman. Your ordinary evangelist may say the same thing, but he just doesn't get the results that Billy Graham commands when he shouts, "Today the whole world is on fire! . . . The flames are licking all around our world—the roof is about to cave in . . ." etc. And when Ralph Nader warns, "This is not the time to fool around, wasting countless hours watching television or chitchatting . . . not when the future of civilization is at stake," he draws a much more universal and much more profound response than virtually the same admonition does when it comes from Lester Maddox.

Whatever singular quality it is that accounts for the difference, John W. Gardner certainly has it. If he had been an actor back in the days when Hollywood considered a potted palm in a hotel lobby the height of elegance, Gardner would have been cast as a don, an Episcopal minister or a banker. His voice and manner are right. And even though the idea packaged by his voice and manner may be stunningly naive ("Why, the peace movement alone is as hard a political force as the oil lobby!"), the people believe in him.

So he is a first-rate apocalyptic salesman. "The nation is in deep trouble," he intoned in 1970, and nearly a quarter of a million people trembled and began sending in their \$15 to join his organization. Common Cause—called a people's lobby and dedicated to promoting "housing, employment, education, health, consumer protection, environment, law enforcement, administration of justice [and the] reordering of national priorities and Governmental reform." A pretty big order for Common Cause's two full-time professional lobbyists to handle, you must admit, but for the moment let's not talk critically.

Common Cause is remarkable for a number of reasons. For one thing, its size. Even if nothing great emerges from it, Gardner will have put his tidy mark on history, for in slightly more than a year he pulled together an organization exceeded in size by only two dozen labor unions. Each person who paid his \$15 hoped that it would be used to save his Government's soul, and the fact that even one 800th of the citizenry—fresh from five years of L.B.J. and four years of R.M.N.—believed salvation possible is also truly remarkable.

The third remarkable thing about Common Cause is that despite its many absurdities it's still quite appealing. Common Cause propagandists are uncommonly pious and windy and boastful about their work, and they are also quite inaccurate. They claim to have done much more than they really have done; they claim to be much more powerful than they really are; they offer as their very own ideas that were old long before Common Cause came into existence. In short, like all politico-evangelistic movements, Common Cause has its share of quackery and deceit. Yet, on balance, the nation is better off because Gardner goes around chanting his doleful quasi sermons, and it's probably also accurate to say that Common Cause has girded the loins of the timid taxpaying citizen in a fashion no other organization has done in recent years.

The worst mistake that one could possibly make would be to think of Gardner as a radical reformer. His philosophy has received

the seal of approval of *Reader's Digest*, where nine of his speeches and essays have appeared in the past decade—seven more times than J. Edgar Hoover was chosen—and of *Fortune* magazine, which once admiringly published excerpts from two Gardner books it quite accurately described as "moral tracts."

The idea that the public should seize certain corporations horrifies him. Having been kept by the largess of the Carnegie riches for 19 years, Gardner puts much trust in America's "great families." He apparently believes in spreading political power evenly over the people (although he once said of the political process, "It is not essential that everyone participate. As a matter of fact, if everyone suddenly did, the society would fly apart") as long as democracy is not equated with a more equitable distribution of money. When I suggested to him that the most necessary reform needed in this country is a redistribution of wealth, he became quite angry, ridiculed this as "one of those big round phrases that sound great" and eventually broke off our discussion by calling me "arrogant—and, if you don't mind my saying so, snotty."

One of Gardner's aides later explained that Gardner avoids talking about redistribution of wealth because "it does scare off some people who aren't sure if it's their wealth you're talking about."

There are certain people of considerable wealth whom he has indeed taken great pains not to frighten away, for they have helped keep him in business as a modest reformer since 1968. The two major do-gooding operations Gardner has headed are the Urban Coalition (along with its lobbying counterpart, the Urban Coalition Action Council) and Common Cause.

The Urban Coalition was generously bankrolled by corporations such as those whose executives have served on the Urban Coalition board: Litton Industries, the Aluminum Company of America, the Chase Manhattan Bank, A. T. & T., Boise Cascade Corporation, General Motors Corporation.

And when he started Common Cause, he tapped the same kind of personal and corporate pockets—John D. Rockefeller III, John Hay Whitney, Arthur Krim, Sol Linowitz, the Watsons of IBM, Time Inc., Ford Motor Company, Norton Simon.

Like the true reformer, Gardner thinks he has a stronger character and purer heart than other men. He has said that politicians who seek an "alliance with the masses" may be just "power-hungry men"; but of course he wouldn't misuse Common Cause's mass alliance. Likewise, though he believes the corporate dollar corrupts politics, he also believes Common Cause is immune from such corruption. I asked how he can be so sure, but he didn't like the question. And when I asked if he did not in fact represent "the establishment," he became so irritated he refused to discuss it.

Of course, he does represent the establishment. He's sort of the lay chaplain of *Fortune's* 500. "Businessmen respect him, especially big businessmen," a close friend of Gardner's once said. "Maybe it's because the bigger the businessman is, the more idealistic he's apt to be." Maybe. And maybe they like him because they are convinced Gardner will never let his reform movement get out of hand. After all, he has always mingled easily and worked closely and sympathetically with the corporate world. He has served as a consultant to the Pentagon, helped put together the Rand Corporation's nonprofit System Development Corporation, served on the board of directors of such corporations as Shell Oil, American Airlines, Time Inc. and the New York Telephone Company.

Understandably, *Time* considered Gard-

ner's sentiments worthy of being published as an essay in 1969 when he wrote of the Top People: "Contemporary critics often appear to believe that the smothering of individuality is a consequence of intentional decisions by people at the top. Right-wingers blame Government leaders, left-wingers blame corporate leaders. But the modern leader is always in some measure caught in the system. To a considerable degree, the system determines how and when he will exercise power. The queen bee is as much a prisoner of the system as is any other in the hive."

It wasn't clear, as is often the case with Gardner's essays and speeches, just what he was getting at. What system outside Government and the corporate world did he have in mind as the villain? Could it be some mysterious system originating with the Lower Classes?

If one were to judge Common Cause only from the list of "sample" members distributed by the organization's publicity office, one would have to conclude that nobody can get in unless his name has appeared frequently on the front page, society page, movie page or financial page. Everyone on the list is somebody: Mrs. Dean Acheson, Winthrop Aldrich, Hugh Auchincloss, Ralph Bellamy, S. I. Hayakawa, Fredric March, Gregory Peck, Dr. Jonas Salk. Well, you get the idea.

And from some of the names, one might wonder just how common a cause can get. There is Thomas ("Tommy the Cork") Corcoran, for example, one of Washington's best wheeler-dealer lobbyists, whose career reached a high point of sorts a few years back when a Congressional committee investigated the way he went about getting a natural-gas rate increase through the Federal Power Commission. And there is the gentleman so well remembered at Attica prison, Governor Nelson Rockefeller, whose idea of democracy is sometimes illustrated by running a highway through your front room and sometimes by withholding money from needy insane asylums. And there is Robert McNamara, whose efforts on behalf of international peace need no explanation here. (Remember, please, the officials of Common Cause—not I—have singled out these names for your special attention.)

But in fact the membership, like the hierarchy, is a mixture of the middle class and up. Balancing chairman Gardner at the top is president Jack Conway, an assistant to Walther Reuther for many years, and old labor organizer and a crafty lobbyist. And if the establishment-oriented membership is not exactly balanced by honest progressives, at least it is diluted, as will be shown later on.

No effort is made to disguise the elitist atmosphere that surrounds Gardner, an atmosphere to which he contributes with little anecdotes, such as one he told an admiring audience in Washington. It started out like this: "I remember once when I was walking down the waterfront in San Francisco—not something I normally do—and a limousine [not just a plain car] coming in my direction slowed down and a lady stuck her head out the window and said, 'Keep up the good work, Mr. Gardner!'"

Nice members appreciate those subtle assurances of good taste.

The Common Cause staff contributes its share to this atmosphere. In a press release about the visit of Wheelock Whitney, a prominent liberal Republican from Minnesota, to the Washington offices, the note of *noblesse oblige* was right on top: "[Whitney] was tremendously impressed. He did not have an appointment with Mr. Gardner, but Mr. Gardner met him and even gave him a personal tour of the office."