

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SUCCESSFUL PREDICTIONS BY COLUMNIST ROBERT S. ALLEN

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, those who write columns, editorials, and articles about government and politics frequently are embarrassed when some of their old predictions are called to mind.

A large number of the so-called pundits have had to eat crow because of forecasts about the Democratic nomination for President. It has not been a good year for prophecy.

Every now and then, however, a writer is able to point with pride to a prediction he has made. A recent instance of this was the column by Robert S. Allen, published in many newspapers on May 23. Mr. Allen has not, so far as I know, tried to take any bows for this column, but a constituent of mine recently called it to my attention.

In his May 23 column, Mr. Allen predicted that former Secretary of the Treasury John Connally would head an organization to gather Democratic support for President Nixon; that Representative WILLIAM RYAN, of New York, would win his primary contest; and that the administration would increase efforts to expand trade with the Soviet Union. This is three out of three, which is a pretty good day.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Allen's column, "No Mystery, Connally To Work for Nixon," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

NO MYSTERY, CONNALLY TO WORK FOR NIXON
(By Robert S. Allen)

WASHINGTON.—Despite the still-continuing flood of rumors, conjectures, hush-hush reports and what-have-you (so typical of Washington), there is no mystery about the sudden resignation of Treasury Secretary John Connally.

The inside story is very simple.

The tall, white-crested former Texas governor quit to be free to organize and actively head a new campaign organization—Democrats for Nixon.

It will be national in scope and operations, and work parallel to and in close conjunction with the Committee for the Re-Election of the President, directed by former Atty. Gen. John Mitchell.

SECOND TERM

Mitchell and Connally and their organizations will be the principal instrumentalities of the President's drive for a second term.

Still undecided is the timing of the formal announcement of the launching of the Democrats for Nixon Committee—whether before or after the Republican national convention in August. Inside opinion favors the former.

The President, Connally and Mitchell discussed the contemplated electioneering set-

up at an unannounced meeting at the Camp David weekend retreat.

SAME PARTNER

Highly significant—while there was no mention of or reference to Vice President Agnew, the whole tenor of their talk held a clear implication that he would again be Nixon's running-mate.

There was quite a bit of conjecture about the most probable Democratic slate.

The President indicated he is still adhering to his long-held belief that the candidate who will oppose him will be Sen. Edward Kennedy.

VIEW OPPOSITION

Mitchell was inclined to view Sen. George McGovern as a very real possibility. This opinion was based chiefly on Mitchell's contention that the Democratic convention will be dominated by militants, activists and extremists of all types, ages and hues—the primary source of McGovern's support.

The President, Connally and Mitchell were agreed that if McGovern is the Democratic standard bearer, there would be widespread defection to the Republicans.

They were also in accord in giving Sen. Humphrey little more than an outside chance of winning renomination.

POLITICALS

Rep. William Ryan, Dem.-Lib., N.Y., appears to have a lead over Rep. Bella Abzug, New Left Democrat, N.Y., in their torrid primary battle in a new district combining parts of both their old ones. Ideologically there is no choice between the two leftists, but polls show six-term Ryan definitely out in front of one-term "Bellowing Bella." Apparently, Ryan's longer record of doing personal services is paying off. Also, seemingly adversely affecting Mrs. Abzug among older ethnic voters is her persistent and vociferous women's lib clamoring. . . . Now you can learn all about how to maneuver and manipulate to get a government job for the insignificant sum of \$2.75. It's all spelled out in a newly published book, "Strategy and Tactics for Getting a Government Job," by two women, Susan Lukowski and Margaret Piton. They are described as holding "well-paying jobs in the areas of their preference"—with no hint of what that is. The book is a serious how-to-do-it guide.

Friends of the FBI, Inc., is holding a "unique conference" in Washington May 30-June 1 on the subject of "Law Enforcement and the Media." Announced participants are prominent Tom Reddin, former Los Angeles police chief, and Gary, Ind., police chief Charles Boone.

Harvard Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith, former head of the New Left-controlled Americans for Democratic Action, wants to run against Sen. Edward Brooke, liberal Republican from Massachusetts, but only if he is sure of an ample campaign kitty. Galbraith, who has made a lot of money with best-selling books, lecturing for fancy fees and an endless stream of well-paid articles, is saying he will make the race only if assured of \$1 million electioneering fund.

MORE RED TRADE

President Nixon is offering the Kremlin rulers concrete concessions to do more large-scale buying in the U.S.

One of these trade lures is designed to produce huge grain and feed sales to the Soviet.

During the President's Moscow visit he is proposing to suspend again the 1963 requirement by President Kennedy that 50 per cent of grain and flour shipments to Communist

countries must be carried by American flag ships—thus considerably increasing the cost. Last year, after President Nixon set that order aside, Russia bought \$140 million in corn, barley and oats.

The basis for another huge commodity sale to the U.S.S.R. was laid by Agriculture Secretary Earl Butz in a trip to Moscow in April. He conferred with agriculture minister Vladimir Matskevich, who expressed interest in purchasing more farm products "if we are treated right."

FAVORABLE BALANCE

Matskevich and other Kremlin officials talked particularly about establishing most-favored trade relations with the U.S. so as to increase exports to this country. They asserted Russia wants particularly to expand its trade in furs, oil and gas, diamonds, tobacco, chrome ore and rare metals.

Last year U.S. exports to the Soviet totalled \$177.2 million as against imports from that country of \$56.8 million. In 1970 the contrasting figures were \$103 million and \$58 million.

Secretary Butz also reported to President Nixon that Russian officials stressed the desire of obtaining credits to increase purchases in this country. No specific figures were mentioned, but it was indicated the Soviet Union was prepared to negotiate arrangements totalling upwards of \$500 million.

FORECASTS PACT

Significantly, following a conference with the President before he flew to Moscow, Commerce Secretary Peter Peterson stated he anticipated that during the President's visit there would be considerable discussion of liberalizing trade and credit arrangements.

"I confidently expect," said Peterson, "that a year from now we will be doing substantially more business with the Soviet. I would say both countries are desirous of doing a lot more trade with each other."

SIXTH ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I am sending my sixth annual questionnaire to postal patrons of the Third Congressional District. So that my colleagues of the Congress may know the substantive content of this mailing, I ask that it be printed at this point in the Record.

PLEASE GIVE ME YOUR VIEWS

Important business remains in the final weeks of the 92nd Congress. Crucial specific questions must still be answered. Other general questions are constantly with us on goals, methods, procedures, priorities, etc. The choices made will determine the course of our country.

In the past, your responses to the annual questionnaire have been extremely helpful in letting me know your thinking on issues and problems.

As your representative in Congress, the ultimate "yes" or "no" vote is mine alone, but insofar as possible I hope that vote accurately reflects the feelings of Third Dis-

strict residents, and is a true echo of the collective majority voice.

I also hope the questionnaire will bring you closer to government in the Jeffersonian tradition: "That government is the strongest of which every man feels himself a part." In answering the questions you will be recommending specific action on matters which concern us all. I recognize that "yes" or "no" answers may not be adequate to express your feelings on particular issues. I welcome your additional views.

Please complete the questions below and mail to me in Washington. You do not need an envelope. I shall tabulate the returns and report them in the Congressional Record. Thank you for your help.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT,
Member of Congress.

LIST OF QUESTIONS

(NOTE.—Space provided for "yes" and "no" answers under "his" and "her" categories.)

1. Do you believe wage and price controls are working reasonably well in cutting the rate of inflation and stabilizing the economy?
2. Are stronger laws needed to deal with prolonged strikes which harm the public interest?
3. Do you support the all-volunteer army concept for national defense?
4. Should Congress approve a program to establish government-subsidized day care centers and nursery schools?
5. Do you favor an increase in the minimum wage to \$2.20 per hour?
6. Do you favor the Family Assistance Plan which subsidizes working lower income earners and provides work incentives to replace the present welfare system?
7. Would you favor a "Value Added" tax, in effect, a national sales tax, as a method to reduce property taxes?
8. Do you favor national health insurance for all, with the federal government underwriting the cost for low-income families?
9. Should food stamps be available to persons on strike?
10. Do you favor federal prohibition on the sale of cheap, short-range handguns (so-called "Saturday Night Specials"), not including longer range pistols and revolvers, rifles and shotguns?
11. Do you approve busing children to meet racial quotas in public schools?
12. Do you generally approve the course taken to end the war in Vietnam?
13. Should the federal government reduce penalties for possession and use of marijuana?
14. On programs agreed to by both the executive and legislative branches, when congressional appropriations bills greatly exceed budget recommendations, which would you support? (Choose One) (A) The full appropriation. (B) The budget recommendation.
15. When Congress considers desirable new or expanded programs, how would you vote? (Choose One) (A) For the programs, financed by tax increase. (B) For the programs, financed by debt increase. (C) Against the programs.
16. Congress meets virtually the entire year. When in session, I must be in Washington for committee meetings, to vote, and to handle problems for constituents. Though I return to work in the District most weekends, I cannot attend all meetings which pertain to federal matters. Should my policy be: (Choose One) (A) To return to Arkansas even while the House is in session and some important votes might be missed. (B) To stay in Washington at all times the House is in session.

CXVIII—1802—Part 22

FRENCH BOYCOTT SUCCESSFUL

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, last fall I called for a citizens' boycott of French products until the Government of France takes decisive steps to wipe out the processing and smuggling of heroin.

The outrage of the American people has produced results which were unheard of when our Government relied simply on diplomatic niceties to try to persuade France to cooperate with us in stopping the trafficking of heroin to the United States. In the past few months we have seen increased seizures of narcotics, arrests, and raids on clandestine refining laboratories. At the same time, the French Government has become increasingly aware of its own spreading addiction crisis.

One of the groups most active in the French economic boycott has been the Long Island Restaurant and Caterers Association of New York. This organization has taken a leadership role in awakening its customers and community to the heroin menace. I am pleased to share with my colleagues the statement of the association on this critical issue:

WINE BOYCOTT HAS PROVEN SUCCESSFUL

LONG ISLAND RESTAURANT
AND CATERERS ASSOCIATION,
Hicksville, N.Y., July 24, 1972.

On January 31, 1972, the Long Island Restaurant and Caterers Association launched a boycott of French wines, as a means of impressing the French government that the American people were concerned over the laxity of French officials in cracking down on the processors of heroin, in the Marseilles area of France.

This boycott was adopted by many Restaurant Trade Associations; Federation of Labor Unions; L. I. Federation of Women's Clubs; civic, religious, service organizations, and hundreds of thousands of American people, in fifty states of the Union.

The effect of this effort has reduced the imports of French wine approximately 30%, according to many importers, and this must have created some reaction in the French government official circles. As a result, much action on the part of the French government is now evident, with the reported discovery of the fourth clandestine narcotics manufacturing laboratory in the past four months. This is a great improvement over the previous record of finding only two laboratories in the previous eleven years.

For this great effort on the part of the French police we are greatly appreciative, and we extend our sincere thanks. However, continual effort is absolutely necessary by the French government, to completely terminate all the laboratories in Marseilles, France.

In the meantime, the American people cannot let down the pressure now exerted, because new sources of heroin supplies are now reaching the United States from Burma, Thailand, Laos, China, through Central and South America, Mexico, Canada, and directly by means of ships, air and couriers.

It is now necessary that the many organizations, and hundreds of thousands of the wine boycott supporters, extend their sphere of influence to alert our own public officials—local, state and national—that an all-out ef-

fort must be made by our government, using every available means, physical and financial, to see that the heroin menace that was originally French oriented, does not develop in other areas, and establish a further market in this country.

We, as a nation, may now be turning the corner on the heroin importing problem, and only a strong all-out effort by our own government officials can stop this menace once and for all.

The Long Island Restaurant and Caterers Association, and all its supporters, request that all public officials now seeking office, should make the heroin and drug problem part of their platform, and dedicate their efforts in terminating this menace. All the voters are therefore requested to cast their vote accordingly.

WARREN R. SPELLMAN,
President.

NOTRE DAME COLLEGE DEDICATES NEW BUILDINGS TO EXPAND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES IN CLEVELAND

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on September 23, 1972, I will have the honor of attending the dedication of three new buildings at Notre Dame College in Cleveland, Ohio. The three buildings to be dedicated are Connely Center, Alumnae Hall, and Clara Fritzsche Library.

Connely Center, a dining hall and student center, opened in 1968 and was named after the Connely Family. Daniel S. Connely, a member of the Notre Dame College board of advisers, and his father, who organized the board, and the Connely family in general were foremost benefactors of the Notre Dame College over the past 50 years.

Alumnae Hall, the largest dormitory on the Notre Dame College campus, was also opened in 1968. This facility is capable of housing 160 resident students. It was named after Notre Dame's alumnae because of their loyal, dedicated support to the college since it was founded.

Clara Fritzsche Library, opened in the fall of 1972, was constructed to house 100,000 volumes. It offers many conveniences such as private study and reading units. Clara Fritzsche, the mother of Paul Fritzsche, a member of Notre Dame College board and a benefactor of the college, attended and graduated from the Notre Dame Academy before the college itself was established.

Notre Dame College has served the Greater Cleveland area well during the 50 years of its existence. Among its achievements, it is noteworthy that 2,300 bachelor degrees have been awarded to graduates who will serve the community and the Nation. Notre Dame is a college that has met the challenge of changing times by adapting class hours and courses as the needs arose. For example, today many married women return to the college to enrich their minds or to work toward a degree which circum-

stances forced them to forego some years earlier. In addition, special programs have been arranged for students who feel that they cannot spend 4 years in college but do want education beyond high school; among these are a bio-technician program and a shortened business education program.

Thus, in this golden jubilee year of Notre Dame College, it seems fitting to pay tribute to the Sisters of Notre Dame who operate this school. They have worked in greater Cleveland for almost a century. Their service has been in schools where they have played a strong role in the education of the children of immigrants from many countries: Germans, Irish, Czechs, Slovaks, Poles, Slovenians, Lithuanians, and Italians—for greater Cleveland is a highly cosmopolitan community.

Notre Dame College is a valuable community asset. This institution has consistently maintained high scholastic standards and training for responsible citizenship. The entire community is grateful for what Notre Dame College has achieved for our community and for the Nation.

STALINIST TACTICS IN SAIGON

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of August 13 contained a dispatch from Saigon detailing some of the barbaric, totalitarian policies recently adopted by the Thieu regime. Ruling by decree, Thieu has undertaken to close down all newspapers in Saigon save a few puppet journals faithfully echoing the government's line. Is it for the preservation of this type of democracy that over 55,000 Americans have died in Vietnam?

The Times' correspondent, Sidney Schanberg, provides fresh and shocking details on the torture of political prisoners held by the Thieu government. Revelations of torture come as no great surprise. It will be recalled that Members of this House exposed the tiger cages at Con Son over 2 years ago. Torture of political prisoners has been standard operating procedure under this showcase of democracy in Saigon for years. It is only the outer limits of barbarity achieved by the Thieu apparatus which surprises us. Is it for this too that so many Americans and Indochinese have died or been maimed?

The barbarity of the Saigon Government is matched only by the barbaric results of the endless war in Indochina. Both can be ended only by ending the war.

The article referred to follows:

THIEU'S CRACKDOWN: HE CALLS IT "CLOSING THE GATES TO COMMUNISM"

(By Sidney H. Schanberg)

SAIGON.—Police crackdowns, prison torture and arbitrary government behavior in general are nothing new to the South Vietnamese, but President Nguyen Van Thieu's latest steps to tighten his control over all

aspects of life here have alarmed even his long-suffering countrymen.

Operating under the emergency powers he pushed through the National Assembly in June—on top of the martial law regulations imposed after the start of the North Vietnamese offensive March 30—the President has, among other things, imposed harsh new regulations on the press. Aimed apparently at eliminating all opposition, comment, and criticism, these controls seem certain to force most of the Vietnamese-language newspapers to shut down and leave only pro-Government papers on the streets. One paper closed last week, and several others are in the process of closing.

The new special powers permit Mr. Thieu to legislate by decree, bypassing the National Assembly. In effect, he can now do virtually what he pleases. One of his most recent orders was for "preemptive sweeps" to unearth Communist agents and sympathizers. The police thus far have arrested at least 15,000 persons. About 5,000 of them are said to have been released, but the arrests are continuing, and reports have been filtering out of the prisons of severe and widespread torture.

Needles driven through fingertips, breasts burned with lighted cigarettes, objects shoved up vaginas, relentless beating with wooden rods and forced ingestion of water to bring a person close to drowning are some of the tortures being reported. These reports are based on documents smuggled out of prison and on extensive interviews conducted by The New York Times with prisoners recently released.

Here is part of a typical account, given by a former prisoner who was not herself beaten: "Two women in my cell were pregnant. One was beaten badly. Another woman was beaten mostly on the knees, which became infected and full of pus. One high school student tried to kill herself by cutting both wrists on the metal water taps in the washroom, but she failed."

It is impossible to verify these accounts; the Saigon Government bars journalists from its prisons, which it calls "re-education centers." The United States mission, which provides the bulk of the financial support and expert advice for Saigon's police and prison system, also refuses to discuss the situation on the record, arguing that it is an internal South Vietnamese affair.

Nor can one establish that the scars and other marks one sees on the bodies of former prisoners were inflicted by the police. Yet the weight of the evidence seems to support the allegations of widespread torture. One high American source, who granted an interview but insisted on anonymity, acknowledged that "all kinds of deplorable things may well be going on." However, he emphasized, some of those arrested are known Communist activists charged with terrorism.

The danger of Communism and the argument that the country's survival is at stake is the justification given by the Government for the crackdown on the press. A pro-Government Senator said the decree was aimed at "purifying the press." Mr. Thieu said in a recent speech that the press was one of the "wide-open gates for Communist penetration—if we are not vigilant."

"I will keep abiding by democratic principles," Mr. Thieu said, "but the more wide open are the gates of democracy, the more fissures it will have. The Communists will then be able to enter, not only by the main gate but by the side gates as well, and South Vietnam will be lost politically."

If life for the stoical South Vietnamese has become even more repressive under the Thieu Government, they have also been tyrannized in some districts by their Communist "liberators." For example, in the northern half of Binh Dinh province, which was captured and held for nearly three

months by the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong, allied intelligence officials now report that the Communists installed a regime characterized by heavy taxes, forced labor and the summary execution of several hundred Saigon Government officials.

However, many analysts here do not think that the Binh Dinh experience, though it could foreshadow selective executions, necessarily means that the Communists would engage in a country-wide "bloodbath," as predicted in hawkish American circles, should they take control of all of South Vietnam. These analysts reason that when in full control, the Communists would presumably feel less insecure and could afford to be conciliatory.

Whatever the future for the South Vietnamese, their present—whether under the Thieu regime or Communist occupation—bears little resemblance to the democracy the United States says it is trying to foster here. Until the Communist invasion last spring the Saigon Government was at least observing some of the forms of democracy. Now even this veneer has been discarded.

"If Thieu is smart," said one Vietnamese journalist last week, "he will relax his controls before it is too late. If he doesn't, no matter how many special powers he has, the discontent could explode."

CHILD CARE IN THE 1970'S

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 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 F. Zigler)

I mentioned to you earlier the naive environmentalism which caused Head Start to be oversold in the early days. Would any sane, sensible person that knows anything about child development ever say to this nation: you give me a child for some magic little program for eight weeks, and three years later you'll see the gains and the benefits thereof? Utter nonsense. We were captured by the notion that these kinds of minimal interventions, which are nothing but token programs, would make a difference in children's lives. Even the laymen finally said: you can't inoculate a child in eight weeks, there's all those years before and all those afterwards. You need something more than that.

Thus Head Start evolved into a one-year program, and one year was certainly better. You could do something with the child for one year. Obviously the gains from Head Start are not huge with the one-year program, and the nation became a little bit disenchanted with Head Start. So we began our search for magic periods, with, of course, infancy being the magic period that captured most of our attention. Soon we had the Harvard/MIT group clearly implying in Life magazine that "we're home free if you just put a mobile over the child's crib."

Americans are impatient people, and we too frequently seek simple solutions to complex problems. Ladies and gentlemen, there is no magic period for the simple reason that all of the years of a developing child are magic periods. The President made a step in the right direction when he indicated that what we've got to be concerned about is a block of time in a child's life from zero to five. Those are important years; years of great change. A theorist could argue whether this change is due to maturational readouts or environmental input. That's unimportant, but clearly we're seeing a very rapidly changing organism thru this period in the life cycle and these are very important years.

I would gladly go on record with you today and say that this is not enough either. If you do everything that you can for a child between zero and five, you will wind up with a better human being, but that will not result in what I consider to be the optimal development of the child. One has to read nothing but Piaget to appreciate the stage-like progression, even in the cognitive system, which takes place at least to the fourteenth year of life. These stages each are built upon the other, and the fact that the first stage got there at the right time because of the right interweave of the biological factors in growth and the environmental factors, doesn't guarantee very much about the next stage. This is true of social as well as cognitive development. When you see our adolescents pursuing a life course that is self destructive, you begin to appreciate that if one cares about children, one needs concentrated efforts that take place, not from birth, but at minus nine months—from conception, where growth began—through the high school years at least. I am simply asserting that there is a basic continuity to all aspects of life, and our efforts for children must respect this fundamental fact of human development.

I believe that, early in its history, Head Start made another mistake. Its very name created a backlash because it served only the poor. I wish we could have named it something else. What we really meant when we coined the name was that these children would have a head start over themselves. Unfortunately, the way most people read it was: "Those children are getting a head start over my children. Just because I'm \$50 above this income, and someone else is \$50 below it, they get all these services and their children get this and that, usually with my tax dollars, and they are paying nothing." There was a backlash against Head Start, not because it was bad, but because it was good and because all people wanted it for their children. It's clear that programs in the future are going to have to employ realistic fee schedules which will permit the participation of children from all income groups.

There are three reasons for this and I shan't go into them at great length. The first is the reason I mentioned. Programs that are mounted just for poor children will always remain vulnerable for a very simple reason. Poor people have little political clout. When we begin developing programs that serve all of the nation's children, with fees charged to those families who are able to pay, we will have programs that will have wide appeal for our citizenry and therefore for our Congress.

There are other reasons that are a little bit more salient to my own thinking about such programs. One is developmental. Basically, I still don't conceive of myself as a politician as much as a developmentalist. Again my reading of developmental literature tells me that children grow best when they have many models to interact with. While all research findings are not in, I believe we will discover that we should be mixing children across economic class lines. It isn't just that a middle-class child can give something to a child in impoverished circumstances, but the middle-class child can receive something

as well. Research that I personally am still engaged in with my colleague Dr. Yando in the Boston area, has indicated that our poor children have certain qualities that our more affluent children could well model themselves after: greater creativity, greater earlier independence. I am pretty much convinced that if we mount programs that allow children to mix with each other, there will be great gains to all of our children in terms of their development.

Finally, and this is, of course, a very touchy issue, I think such mixing is necessary for social-psychological reasons as well. The nation cannot continue to segregate very young children across socioeconomic class lines and expect the kind of tolerance and interaction, one with the other, that makes this country what it is supposed to be. When you fractionate people into groups, you do develop in-group feelings, but you invariably develop out-group hostilities, and, ladies and gentlemen, I don't know how much more out-group hostility our society can stand. It is for this reason that we must develop programs, at least for our very young children, that do everything they can to promote interaction between children of different backgrounds.

One final problem with Head Start is that it did not remain true to its own experimental nature, but instead became a new orthodoxy. What started as an experimental program and, by congressional fiat, remains an experimental program, in many cases is not treated as an experimental program at all. It has become a new orthodoxy to be defended against its critics, at all cost never to be changed to provide different services or better services as we gain more knowledge.

Head Start should return to its experimental orientation—not get smaller, but get bigger and more experimental. Let us be the kind of pioneers with Head Start in 1972 that we were in 1965. Let us try new forms, let us discard the rigid concepts that we started with which are now out-moded. Does every child need Head Start simply because his family makes X number of dollars? I think we've downgraded the poor with that kind of concept. Many of these children do but many do not. Let's not confuse economic criteria with the nature of the child rearing that a child receives.

Of those children whom we serve in Head Start, who do not need Head Start, who do need preventive or compensatory programs, does every one of them need five half days a week? What's magic about that? We must use what we know, and one thing we know is that there are many ways to help families and children, and we should begin packaging a variety of services in Head Start centers and take a more individualized approach to the needs of families and children. Let's save the expensive, intensive programs for children who need them, and provide different programs for children with different needs.

I see a Head Start of the future in which something like Family and Child Centers will provide a variety of programs that will help children and families. These programs will include care of pregnant mothers and Home Start programs where, instead of bringing children into centers, trained individuals will go into the home and help parents in raising their own children, upon the request of the parents. I see Health Start programs for children. I see two or three day programs. I see five day programs and intensive programs, beginning much earlier than the age of five, or four, or even three, for handicapped children and children whose development is at high risk. Let's see how good a prognosticator I turn out to be.

Let's move to the last area that I wanted to discuss with you this morning, and that is probably the most pressing child care need in the nation today; day care for the children of working mothers. It's not accidental that

this was named as the number one priority of the 1970 White House Conference on Children. Working mothers, as the Governor pointed out to you, have now become almost the majority in terms of the mothers of this country. Approximately 50 percent of mothers with preschool and school age children do, indeed, work. I think the question of what to do with their children has become a problem of tragic proportions. There are today one and one-half million children who are latch-key children. No one cares for them. They have a latch key about their neck, they let themselves in and out, they're uncared for. It is very surprising that this is the pool of children from which we draw so many of our juvenile delinquents? We're getting about what we pay for.

We have another group of children, three quarter million in this nation, cared for by a sibling under 16, much too young to have such responsibility for children. Not only are we denying the very young child the kind of socializing experiences he should have, we're also denying the caretaker child that most precious commodity, his own childhood.

Finally, what about the quality of day care that is available? The centers in this country are not splendiferous centers mounted by the Bettye Caldwell, or Susan Grays or the Spriggles. Day Care in this country is 80 percent noncenter: 40 percent in home, 40 percent in family group homes. There is a recent report on the quality of this day care in this nation prepared by Mary Keyserling for the National Council of Jewish Women, in which the description of family group care reads like a horror story. Children are being cared for by alcoholics, children are being cared for by women too senile to care for themselves, children are tied to chairs so they won't cause trouble for the caretaker.

The problem of day care for the children of working mothers must and will be met in this nation. The real issue is not whether we're going to have day care: we already have day care. The real issue is what the quality of the day care in the new legislative initiatives is going to look like. Is it going to be custodial, which in many cases is little more than a euphemism for stultifying care that destroys children? Or is it going to be developmental with a health component, an educational component, a nutritional component, a parental involvement component?

There is a major new source of funds on the horizon in the day care provisions of HR 1, the Administration's welfare reform plan. I want to take this opportunity to tell you how troubled I have become by the pronouncements that have been made both in the Congress of the United States and upon the part of many experts in the area of child development. These pronouncements assert that the quality of day care in HR 1 that is being planned by the Administration, of which I am a part, will be custodial in nature. This is not true. The President of the United States' commitment to the quality of this day care, which is contained in his message introducing welfare reform legislation, makes it abundantly clear that it will be not custodial and that it will be developmental in nature. I've had several discussions with Secretary Richardson on this point, who is just as troubled as I am, but somehow or other this myth is abroad in the land. I promise you that OGD's role, and my most important commitment, will be to see that when the welfare reform plan is passed, the day care provided under that piece of legislation will be of a developmental sort that will be conducive to the growth of children. If this is not the case, we will be sacrificing a very important segment of the next generation of America's population. We cannot go in this direction. I will be disclosing in the next few weeks the 1972 Federal Day Care Standards. I hope that it will be clear, by the amount of money we will pay for the different kinds of day care, that we will indeed

provide day care far superior to the \$500 or \$700 day care which the Governor reported to you as being so common in our nation.

I want to say one final thing, and it underlines a point that Governor Andrus made. I'd like to end this talk on a note of caution. I do not think that the solution to the nation's problems is to provide every child age three with a preschool education or to place every child from a certain age on in child care centers. I believe that we should do everything in our power to strengthen and support family life rather than supplant it in any way. We must provide good substitute socializing settings for children of mothers who choose to work. Obviously that's how you support that family's life. But we should be wary of those who suggest that centers or experts are intrinsically superior to home settings.

The Governor is correct in pointing out to us that we must be aware that the nature of the family has changed. The ability of our society to provide a child with a good family and good child rearing experiences is not what it once was. We must be aware of this and begin developing social institutions that are not just centers for children, but also institutions that work directly at supporting family life.

What's happened to the family? Well, the decline of the extended family is one case in point. Once a grandparent and uncle and many other relatives were involved in raising the child, and that was great for a parent. That was the kind of support parents need and children need. That's no longer with us. We now have typically the nuclear family.

We also see a lessening of community support for child rearing. Let me use myself as an example. I don't even know who lives three doors from me. I'm not too atypical; people move in, people move out, I'm busy, they're busy, I commute, I do this, I do that. I don't know their children and they don't know my children. I wouldn't mix in how these parents are raising their children.

I remember when I was a boy, under much less affluent circumstances than I'm living under now, there was a woman that was the bane of my existence. If I ever smoked behind a barn, that woman would invariably show up at my house that evening and report to my parents. There was no hiding from her, and I hated that woman with a passion. I'm very fond of that woman today because she cared about me. Her acceptance of a share of responsibility for children in the neighborhood is what I mean by community support for parents. We don't provide that support any more. We're in our own little homes and we worry about our own. The mobility in our society, doesn't give us a chance to become involved in a community to that extent.

Urie Bronfenbrenner puts it very well when he says that, in so many homes, the children's hour has become the cocktail hour. We must strengthen family life. How? By doing a number of specific things. First, I think women deserve a real choice. Women have made the decision to work. Fine. They should have a choice, but we should also support those women who would like to raise a family, and we should also do much more than we are doing today to help those women who would like to do both. Remember, most of the children who need day care are school-aged children. Why is it that, in an industrial society that can move towards a ten hour day, four-day week, we can't have the vision to move to a day which is exactly the same length of a school day?

We must do much more in the area of Home Start programs for the parents who have children. This cuts across economic class. We must train helpers, outreach people, who will go into homes and help parents, upon their request in understanding child rearing. We must begin using T.V. to

support family life much more than we do. With cable television imminent, we must see that in every city where there's cable television, a channel is reserved for family life in which interesting, entertaining and informative programs are provided to help parents be parents.

Finally, one of the cheapest things that we can do, cheap in terms of dollars spent, but rich in terms of outcome, would be to realize what's happened to family life. We should say: why wait for young people to be parents and then try to help them? Why doesn't every high school in this nation have an interesting course in parenthood? There are some courses in some schools, but in many of these places what we call family and child life are rather transparent efforts to inculcate middle class values and little more. We must develop interesting courses loaded with knowledge, and these courses should be an integral part in the overall curriculum. Students should not just passively receive didactic information. Our adolescents should work with younger children in day care and Head Start Centers, so that what they learn becomes the material of this course. I'm pleased to report to you that the Educational Development Center, in Cambridge, Massachusetts is developing just such a course. Over the next year or two, we will bring in education people, show them the course, help pay for teacher training, and see if we cannot induce large numbers of the high schools of this country to begin teaching our young people about what is going to be the most important role that they are going to assume in our society: the role of a parent.

In conclusion, I would say that much has been done; much remains to be done; and I certainly do agree that this is an exciting time. We are at a critical juncture in deciding what we are going to do about our nation's children. It's going to take all of us to provide the kind of care that the Governor was talking about, and that your Congressman has been working so hard to bring about at a national level. Certainly if there is any group of people I would expect to really roll up their sleeves and get with it, it is the people of Idaho.

MISS SOFTBALL AMERICA

HON. ALAN CRANSTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, during a time when so many are concentrating on what is wrong with America, I should like to take a few moments to point out an event that shows what is right with America.

The week of August 22 to August 26 will be highlighted by the Miss Softball America Tournament of Champions in Anaheim, Calif. During this week, girls ages 9 to 15 from all over the country—California's winning team is from Covina—will come to Anaheim to participate in the efforts of their teams to win this national tournament. They will have the opportunity to form friendships with girls from other States. They will have a chance to play a healthy and invigorating sport. They will work with their team toward a mutual goal. They will utilize skills which they have worked long hours to develop. They will display sportsmanlike behavior.

I commend all the girls who are participating for their accomplishments in winning their States' championships. A special mention is due Dr. Bill Smith through whose efforts the tournament is being made possible. I wish the best of luck to all of the participants—may the best ladies win.

PUBLIC BROADCASTING AUTHORIZATION

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I voted against authorizing legislation for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. I felt it necessary to express my dissatisfaction in this way and would like to take this opportunity to explain my action.

I think that there are some very fundamental issues involved in the debate over public broadcasting, not all of which have been made explicit.

It seems unnecessary at this point to restate the arguments that have been made, except possibly to point to the excellent comments made yesterday by my distinguished colleague from California (Mr. VAN DEERLIN). What I think his remarks point to, and what I know to be true, is that the administration's motives were not related to the protection of local broadcasters from centralized authority. The arguments made in the veto message, indeed throughout the debate by the administration, were simply too easily refuted.

This view has been confirmed by officials in the President's Office of Telecommunications Policy. Their real concerns, they say, were the following: First, Victory in the power struggle with the House Subcommittee on Communications and Power. After their testimony before the subcommittee, OTP policymakers determined to let the Congress know that they would be listened to on questions of telecommunications policy. A veto was the mechanism chosen to make Congress sit up and listen to what they had to say;

Second, The emasculation of NPACT—the National Public Affairs Center for Television. The Republicans did not want aggressive public affairs reporting by public television in an election year, particularly by newsmen with an alleged "liberal bias."

I think there are lessons to be learned from this experience. The first is that we cannot allow officials in the White House who are not accountable to Congress or the people to manipulate congressional authority for their own purposes. We should identify the phony issues created by OTP to advance its own interests and expose them for what they are. We should not sit idly by while the White House staff grows and takes over the functions of legislatively created agencies like the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and the Federal Communications Commission. A good example that this is happening is the fact that

neither CPB nor the overwhelming majority of local public broadcasters who supported H.R. 13918 were consulted by OTP in the formulation of their policies. At issue is nothing less than the question of who shall rule: Constitutionally elected representatives and their appointees or faceless bureaucrats.

Second, we cannot allow an administration out to turn the electronic media to its own ends to control the programming and personnel policies of public broadcasting. This is what they want to do and Congress must respond with a resounding "No." Men like John Macy who are essential to public broadcasting's success cannot be sacrificed to political and bureaucratic opportunism. Aggressive, important public affairs programming like "Banks and the Poor" must not be done away with because campaign contributors do not like it.

As I have said time and time again, the way to do this is through a system of permanent financing which will insulate public broadcasting from control by the political operatives at the White House.

THE GEORGE G. HOBERG VISTA POINT

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, in late June I had the privilege of participating in a unique dedication ceremony in Lake County, Calif., which was only recently made a part the First Congressional District which I am privileged to represent.

Dedication of the George C. Hoberg Vista Point is unique because it represents the first roadside rest on a California freeway featuring a full-time tourist information office that has been financially supported by the Department of Public Works, California Division of Highways. This "first of its kind" project in the State of California is named in memory of George C. Hoberg, 1904-70, dynamic civic leader and pioneer Lake County resort owner.

The Vista Point, is, indeed, a living memorial to a great American who, like the point itself, was dedicated to serving the traveling public at the Hoberg Resort on Cobb Mountain in Lake County which he developed and successfully managed from 1928 until his untimely passing in 1970. George Hoberg's many contributions to his community and the area he loved so much are chronicled in the information which I am inserting in the RECORD at this point:

THE GEORGE G. HOBERG VISTA POINT

(By Marion Geoble)

The George G. Hoberg Vista Point is the first roadside rest offering full-time information service for the traveling public, on a State Highway. This project was completed through the joint efforts of the State of California, the County of Lake and the City of Lakeport, at a cost of \$100,000. Site preparation was done by the Department of

Public Works, the County of Lake provided the funds for the construction of the building and the underground utilities installation, and the City of Lakeport furnished the 2.8 acres of land. Much of the material and labor was donated by the citizens of Lake County, in this, the first project of its kind, in the State today.

A Senate Concurrent Resolution named the Vista Point in memory of George Hoberg, Sr., was introduced by Senator Randolph Collier of the First Senatorial District, a long time friend of the Hoberg family.

George G. Hoberg, Sr., known as "Mr. Lake County" for his unflagging promotion of Lake County, was born January 29, 1904 at his parents home, and died July 19, 1970, at his home, just a few hundred feet distance from the place of his birth at Hoberg's Resort on Cobb Mountain.

He attended and graduated from the county schools and attended Cogswell Technical College in San Francisco from 1919 to 1923 where he graduated with honors.

On November 16, 1927 he was married to his beautiful and gracious wife, the former Gertrude Suhr, and two children, a son George, Jr., and daughter Marilyn Angelley were born of this union.

In 1928 he and his 2 brothers, Paul and Frank took over Hoberg's Resort enterprise from their parents Max and Theresa Hoberg, and under their regime (the third generation of Hobergs), the resort business was perfected and developed into the largest privately owned resort in the state, as well as being one of the first convention centers, with facilities for more than 1,000 guests, including display rooms and a vast auditorium.

He was president of the Lake County Chamber of Commerce from 1938 to 1941; the Redwood Empire Association from 1944 to 1947 (the only person to serve in the office of president for 3 terms); district chairman of the California State Chamber of Commerce from 1939 to 1944; director of the California Safety Council; past president of the Resort-Hotel Committee of the American Hotel Association; past president of the Western America Convention and Travel Institute and a member of many fraternal and civic organizations including the Shriners, Masons, Native Sons, Footprinters Association, Lions, Elks and Moose Lodge.

He was completely dedicated to the advancement and betterment of the entire county, and gave wholly of his time, talents and money to achieve these goals. He was a crusader for better highways throughout California and proponent of the Federal System of Highways throughout the United States, and was known as the "Father" of the Highway System working closely with the State Highway Commission for more than a quarter of a century. He was a volunteer weather observer for the U.S. Weather Bureau from 1939 to 1969 (so he could spread the word about "beautiful Lake County") besides serving as director, chairman, aide, assistant or advisor to practically every county or state-wide program, project or activity.

A brass plaque at the Vista Point reads: George G. Hoberg—1904-1970.

Born, lived and died at Hoberg's the largest privately owned Resort in California (founded in 1885) which he developed and successfully managed from 1928 until his death.

A proud and respected citizen, dynamic Civic leader, consistent supporter of good State Highways, he never tired of extolling the merits of Lake County and California.

Served as President of the Redwood Empire Association and the Lake County Chamber of Commerce.

A giant among men, his prophetic foresight guided the development of the area he loved and served so well.

ABORTION PROBLEM IS WITH US

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, many individuals, from all walks of life, have spoken out against abortion. As one concerned about every person's right to life, I was deeply moved by the words of Washington's Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle at St. Matthew's Cathedral on August 6, 1972. Cardinal O'Boyle, a leader in the fight for life, said in part:

The abortion problem is with us and it presents the basic options of human existence: life or death. Let us choose life. Let us reaffirm its inviolability and its value. Let us oppose fear with hope. Let us replace escapism with responsible action.

Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues, I place Cardinal O'Boyle's address into the RECORD.

HOMILY GIVEN BY PATRICK CARDINAL O'BOYLE AT SAINT MATTHEW'S CATHEDRAL, AUGUST 6, 1972

"The thief comes only to steal and kill and destroy", Christ says. "I have come so that they may have life and have it to the full." (St. John, 10: 9-10)

During the past few months, there has been considerable public discussion concerning the performance of abortion in the District of Columbia. This discussion has been generated by the efforts of the District of Columbia to formulate regulations that would control the abortion procedures in non-hospital related clinics. Unfortunately, these regulations, which were passed unanimously by the members of our city government, give an aspect of legitimacy to an immoral and inhumane procedure that is responsible for the death of 20,000 unborn children in the District of Columbia during 1971.

Prior to the City Council's action, upwards of 10,000 signatures requesting public hearings were placed before the City Council. These were the signatures of blacks and whites, of Protestants and Catholics. The City Council ignored them. Because we have been ignored, and because these regulations deal with procedures that deprive the unborn child of a basic human right—the right to life—I am prompted to speak again on the matter of abortion.

I speak to you today as the Bishop of the Catholic community of Washington, D.C. But I do not feel that I speak alone. I join my voice to that of the Rabbinical Alliance of America, the Black Baptist Conference of Washington, to the leadership of many other Christian churches in condemning abortion. I find basis for my position, as they do, in the biblical command, "Thou shalt not kill," and in the reasoned arguments of contemporary moralists, Catholic and non-Catholic. And I address my remarks not only to Catholics, but to the entire community because abortion is a moral problem transcending any particular religious belief. I speak for the millions who honor and respect human life and for the thousands who will die if this horrendous practice is allowed to continue. Abortion is totally and absolutely unacceptable because it is the killing of human beings and because it marks the precipitous end of civilized society.

The Nuremberg war crimes tribunals called abortion promoted among the Jews in Germany a "crime against humanity." Can it be that what was a crime in Germany thirty

years ago has become a civilized action in Washington today? Or is it that history is repeating itself? Surely not so soon again, not so very soon.

Let us see what we have been asked to accept. First of all, abortion is a procedure that kills the developing human infant in the womb of its mother. Medical science has provided us with accurate information on the beginning of human life. At the moment of fertilization, there comes into existence a new and unique human life in the microscopically tiny egg cell. Contained in this cell is the blueprint for the development of the whole human person, including the temperament, physique, eye, hair and skin color, and other characteristics of human nature. From microscopic beginnings, already stamped with molecular uniqueness, the human being grows, develops normally to the time of birth. Birth marks a new mode of existence, but the new-born baby is the same unique individual that has been maturing in the mother's womb during the long months since conception.

Abortion puts an end to this marvelous process of human development. Abortion, whether performed in the hospital, the clinic or a clandestine place, is the killing of a developing human being, and it is morally wrong. Regardless of the reasons that lead to abortion, or the circumstances where the act is performed, abortion is evil, and nothing can make it good. The anti-life mentality which is rampant in our society today is a disease—a disease which has infected some doctors—even some ministers of religion are not immune. If it were merely a private mental attitude, we could ignore it. But it is not a private attitude. It is an attitude which affects everyone who believes in the innate dignity of human life.

It is imperative that we address ourselves seriously to the problems that women sometime face attendant on pregnancy. Patience and understanding are required of all of us in the face of these real problems.

But the present propaganda effort in the District of Columbia is not founded on compassion for women with difficult pregnancies. Abortion is now being forced upon us as a spurious solution to social problems and as a means of family planning. In a city that is 71% black and that includes a measurable amount of poor people, no one can ignore the implications of genocide.

Those who work for a more permissive abortion climate and seek to increase the already shocking number of abortions, use delusive arguments to justify their stand.

Some attempt to justify abortion by denying the humanity of the fetus in its early life. For them, human life begins at some magic moment during pregnancy. This is scientifically untenable.

Others try to ignore the humanity of the fetus altogether or they consider it a matter for religious belief only. While we understand the psychology behind this position it is nevertheless dishonest and wrong. The humanity of abortion's victims cannot be ignored. Abortion at ten weeks is the killing of a tiny baby with all of its vital organs already present. It looks like a little baby—it is a little baby. And it is not religious belief that makes it so. It simply is so in fact.

There are others still, and these are many, indeed, who do not deny the humanity of the fetus. They readily admit that abortion kills human beings. They justify this killing on the basis of three principles of what is called the new morality. The three principles are: (1) only wanted children should be born; (2) a woman has the right to control her body, and (3) the survival of mankind is at stake.

On the basis of the first of these principles, namely, that only wanted children should be born, it is argued that death is preferable to being born into miserable poverty, or into overcrowded conditions, or with a mental or

physical defect. The decision in each case is left to the mother or the doctor, or to overzealous social engineers. The victim, of course, cannot be consulted and is not considered. This is a shocking rejection of civil rights and due process. It is also a social policy fraught with dire consequences. Professor Leo Alexander, an expert at Nuremberg, speaking of the war-time atrocities in Germany, says: "It started with the acceptance of the attitude, basic in the euthanasia movement that there is such a thing as life not worthy to be lived." This attitude started in Germany, among the intellectuals, before 1900.

The argument based on the second principle, namely the woman's right to control her body, runs like this: the fetus is within the woman's body and is totally dependent on her for survival—hence in practice it can be considered part of her, and so she can dispose of it as she chooses. This argument has no validity. First, the fetus is in no way a part of the woman's body. It is a genetically different human life. It is alive because it has the ability to reproduce dying cells. It is human because it can be distinguished from other non-human species, and once implanted in the uterine wall it requires only nutrition and time to develop its whole potential. The fetus's dependence on the mother for continued life does not make the fetus subservient to her—else we are all slaves of the air we breathe. Secondly, although pregnancy involves great inconvenience, one simply cannot justify killing on the basis of inconvenience. Whatever the rights of privacy may entail, we must insist that the right cannot include the killing of another human being. It was Albert Camus who said: "the existence of another individual places a limit on my freedom."

The third principle used by the anti-life crusaders to justify abortion is the survival of the species. The human race, they say, is quickly overpopulating this finite planet. Pollution is already a critical problem. For the good of humanity we must stop this rush toward overpopulation, for humanity's sake we must kill human beings. For the good of our grandchildren we must kill our children. This line of reasoning is morbid, and it is brutally and woefully misguided. It is cruel to pretend that the quality of our national life will be in any way improved by the slaughter of babies. The killing of babies will not clear pollution, or improve our cities, or relieve the real suffering of our people. To suggest that it will is only to distract from the real causes of our national and world problems.

Even if abortion helped solve a real overpopulation problem, it still would not be acceptable—because it involves the subordination of the individual man to society. It is total subordination because it involves the forced death of the individual for the benefit of society. And that is an inversion of values. Society is for man, not man for society. If the subordination of the individual is accepted in principle, no man is safe. Any class of people can become unwanted and be listed as victims, simply by extending a definition.

Such a society is unacceptable in principle. It is alien to the American spirit. A society whose citizens depend for existence on the fact that someone else "wants" them is already a society of slaves. A society which struggles for its survival through the mangled bodies of its young is ugly and brutal. Such a society has lost its meaning, its purpose and its dignity.

My dear people, I share my thoughts and worries with you today for a very good reason. As Catholics, we have a special commitment to the dignity of man. We believe that man has a special sacredness because he lives his life in God's presence and is the recipient of God's special care. Jesus did not die for an abstraction like "humanity" or "mankind." On His own admission, He died for His

friends—and His friendship extends to every person. He emphasized the special personal character of His love. He is the Good Shepherd who will leave the ninety-nine in the desert to go in search of the one that was lost. And so we are reinforced in our conviction that the value of the human person transcends all other values—a value which cannot be price-tagged and traded or bartered in the market place.

Let me address myself specifically and briefly to the legal situation in the District of Columbia. The District Code prohibits abortion except by a physician and only when necessary to preserve the life or health of the mother. This law is not an adequate statement on the morality of abortion. But the current practice of abortion in the District goes far beyond what the law allows. Those who argue for even greater permissiveness ignore the intent of the law that has been promulgated by the Congress and upheld as constitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States. Justice Byron White in his concurring opinion in the *Vuitch* case which decided the statute's constitutionality wrote: "It should be absolutely clear that a doctor is not free to perform an abortion on request without considering whether the patient's health requires it. No one of average intelligence could believe that under this statute abortions not dictated by health considerations are legal." Are we to believe then that the 20,000 abortions performed last year in abortion clinics in the District were possibly operating within the limits of the criminal statutes?

The recently-formulated Regulations for the abortion clinics also fail to consider the intent of the law. The Regulations exhibit no concern that abortions be done only for *bona fide* health reasons. The overall effect of these Regulations, then, will be to encourage the performance of abortion on a wide scale.

In Section 13 the Regulations imply that abortion is but another method of birth-control. They direct the District government, with public funds, to advertise the private abortion clinics to all the District's residents, with the youth of the District singled out as a target group. This is contrary to the intent of the Congress expressed in the Family Planning Act of 1970, which prohibits abortion as a means of birth control.

By passing these Regulations, the District government has demonstrated neither imagination or leadership. The District government must reconsider its action. Therefore, I urge continued activity from all concerned citizens to bring to the attention of the D.C. Council and the public at large the abuses and violations of the D.C. law which are not effectively offset by the recent adopted regulations.

The abortion problem is with us and it presents the basic options of human existence: life or death. Let us choose life. Let us reaffirm its inviolability and its value. Let us oppose fear with hope. Let us replace escapism with responsible action.

To this end, and in the name of the Archdiocese of Washington, the following commitment is made to any woman living in the Archdiocese, who is looking for an alternative to abortion. The Birthright organization is prepared to help such a person with counseling and, if necessary, with financial assistance so that she may give birth to her baby.

As of today, a Defense for Life Fund is hereby established with the help of generous friends to assist such women in need. It is my earnest hope that our faithful people, anxious to defend the rights of the unborn to life, will contribute to the fund. Contributions may be mailed to Defense for Life Fund, 2800 Otis Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20018.

Birthright may be contacted, day or night, at the following telephone number, 526-3333.

I, indeed, would be remiss if I failed to take this occasion to commend everyone who

has taken a stand in defense of human life, especially Birthright and the Right to Life groups in our Archdiocese. I urge them and all of you to greater efforts to preserve the innate dignity of human life. We face the great option: life or death. Let us choose life so that God may be served and all people may rediscover their purpose, their courage and their honor.

YANKEE ON OLYMPUS

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that I am not alone in missing our former colleague from Massachusetts, F. Bradford Morse. Some months ago, of course, Brad left us to assume new responsibilities as United Nations Under Secretary General for Political and General Assembly Affairs. In the July/August issue of *Vista* magazine, Tristram Coffin has written a perceptive and sympathetic article on Brad Morse at the United Nations and has entitled it—appropriately enough—“Yankee on Olympus.” I share it now with my colleagues, because of their continuing affection for one of the finest men in American public life. The article follows:

YANKEE ON OLYMPUS

(By Tristram Coffin)

Washington watches with fascination what may turn out to be one of the miracles of the year. This is a brave try by an uncommon matchmaker to revive an old love affair. On the surface the odds are against him, but no one who knows Brad Morse discounts any of his projects.

Bradford Morse, new UN Under-Secretary-General for Political and General Assembly Affairs, wants to restore the romance that bloomed a quarter century ago between the American political establishment and the world organization. This faded away during the Cold War and America's ambitious and costly try at playing world gendarme. But with the Cold War breached by President Nixon's journeys to Peking and Moscow, and the United States eager to take off its policeman's suit, this may be exactly the right hour for Morse's mission.

He is the former Republican Congressman from Massachusetts, and in his new job is responsible for political and General Assembly affairs in the U.N. The important fact is: Brad Morse is one of the saviest politicians ever to hit Washington. He is a brilliant backstage maneuverer whose name rarely finds the headlines. He has a quiet but evangelical zeal about world peace and the UN.

Morse has one great asset in trying to patch up the old love affair. He talks the language of the American politician, and he enjoys practical politics. In the past, most Americans affiliated with the UN, either as Ambassador or in the Secretariat, preferred the role of statesman to politician. The American politician, whether Harry Truman or the Congressman from Muncie, Indiana, wants to be talked to in his own language and in terms of his own realities. He resents high-hat treatment, whether real or imagined.

Morse has what counts with the American politician and the leaders of the Establishment. One associate remarks, “Brad is the best natural politician I've ever known.” This is proven by his own record. He is a Republican, but was consistently sent to office by a district with a 70-75 percent Democratic

registration. It is one of the most diverse of House districts, from the broad lawns of Concord to the mill towns of Lowell and Lawrence. It has an ethnic mix of old Yankees and those whose fathers and grandfathers came from Poland, Greece and the Arab Middle East. He has been able to get along famously with all of his electorate.

He has an amazingly wide acceptance in the political community. When he was nominated for the UN post by President Nixon, Senator George McGovern told him, “Brad, you're the only person I know that Nixon and I could agree upon.” Charles W. Yost, the scholarly former U.S. Ambassador to the UN (1969-71) wrote: “Few appointments could give more encouragement to those concerned with the future of the United Nations than that of Representative Morse. . . . President Nixon is to be congratulated for nominating, and Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim for appointing, so able and well-qualified a man for this important post.”

The question arises—can a man who has spent his life in the nitty gritty of American politics adjust to a wider arena and the tough problem of world peace?

Morse brings to the job a zeal for the job, a good basic understanding of the problems, and an extraordinary adaptability. When he joined Members of Congress for Peace Through Law (a bipartisan group who would like to move American policy closer to a concept of world law), his spirit was evident. One associate there comments: “What surprised a lot of us was that Brad really cared. This wasn't a game or a luncheon conversation with him. He wanted to get on with peace and world law.” He has constantly moved from one world to another, adapting himself without any apparent hitch. An old ally on Capitol Hill told me, “He can go to a Polish picnic in his district, drink beer and dance, then catch a plane for Washington, sit down with a dozen Ph.D.'s at Brookings Institution for a discussion of world problems, and put on a display of intellect and knowledge that grabs you.”

As far back as 1969, Morse spotted the major dislocation in the world. He told a graduating class at Worcester: “Around the world nations are uneasy because they no longer control, as they once could, their ultimate destiny. They exist in a world environment which is dominated by two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, and they know that their future is inextricably bound up with the actions of those two countries.”

“The Cuban missile crisis of 1962 demonstrated this fact in compelling terms. President Kennedy and Chairman Khrushchev confronted each other, and for a moment the world literally held its breath. And in that moment nations around the world realized not only that their own future hung in the balance, but that they were powerless to affect the outcome. For nations as well as individuals, this is a frightening proposition.”

He believes honestly that the big-power control of events is unwise and impractical, and that the UN offers a chance for all countries to get into the act and so modify the risks of big-power strategy.

Brad Morse has taken to the UN two other traits that should help him as a matchmaker. He is one of those rare individuals in public life who is content to work in the background and let others take the bows in the spotlight. He does not have an itch for histrionics or headlines. He has none of the William Jennings Bryan look, manner or rhetoric. And he has what seems to be limitless energy. He moves and talks at so fast a pace few have been able to keep up with him, even in the superheated atmosphere of American politics.

At first glance, Morse is deceiving. He looks rather like a rumpled bureaucrat in the second or third tier of, say, the Department of Agriculture. He has none of the strut of the ordinary politician. Once he is accepted as

a politician, it is easy to put him in the category of a cautious tory who votes with party and spends his time getting dams and military contracts for the home district. Nothing could be further from the actual facts. In the House he led fight after fight to cut the Pentagon budget, although his own district was heavily endowed with military contracts. In terms of the realities of American politics, this could be called “heroic.” Yet it worked. He was the only Republican in the House to come from a district with such a heavy Democratic registration.

His congressional operations show a mix of the pragmatist and the idealist. When he became chairman of Members of Congress for Peace Through Law he brought in a tough and realistic stance. He began a campaign in the 91st Congress that has jolted the U.S. military machine. Morse decided its Achilles' heel, in terms of practical politics, was its wanton spending and waste. At his persuasion, the group undertook an investigation of military budgets. This has since been picked up by the Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee and by the Chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, and has brought important cuts.

There are few clues in Morse's background. He is an Elk and an American Legionnaire, a product of the public schools of Lowell, Massachusetts, and Boston University, where he later taught in the Law School. His initial entry into politics was modest, as a member of the Lowell City Council. Senator Leverett Saltonstall, the blue-blood Republican, brought him to Washington and placed Morse on the staff of the Armed Services Committee, where “Salty” was the ranking minority member. Brad Morse proved so valuable the Senator moved him into his own office as executive assistant. Many believe that Morse's skill at politics kept the shy and aloof Saltonstall in office despite the heavy Democratic and Irish vote in Massachusetts. During the Eisenhower Administration, Morse was Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. In 1960, the year John Kennedy of Massachusetts was elected President, Bradford Morse, a Republican, came to Congress.

His interest in world affairs was relatively late in blooming. A constituent, Stillman Williams of Lexington, Massachusetts, introduced him to the book *A Plan for Peace*, by Grenville Clark and Louis B. Sohn. This was in 1960. Most politicians would say thank you, and put the book up on the shelf. But Brad Morse sat down and read it. He saw a vision, if you want to be dramatic about it. He saw that peace, this chimera that glows and fades on the far horizon, was possible and practical. He put his energy and talents behind this goal. In the House he could have been a member of the powerful Armed Services Committee, but chose instead the lesser Foreign Affairs Committee, and joined Members of Congress for Peace Through Law.

At the time, Members of Congress for Peace Through Law was a luncheon club. When he became chairman, the organization grew in power and accomplishments. He pushed away the tax-exempt status, because he felt this limited the society to exhortations, and he wanted to lobby and move mountains. Yet, despite his personal fight on war and the policies that bring it about, he has always managed to stay on good terms with the Establishment, and to sit with them and make meaningful deals.

When the death of Ralph Bunche left the deputy UN post open, Morse saw this as an opportunity, a chance to move into an area that fascinated him. He could have stayed in his congressional seat until the cows came home. He could have had the Republican nomination for Governor of Massachusetts on a platter, and probably would have won election without much trouble. This did not interest him. The United Nations did. He lined up the kind of backing that would

impress President Nixon and was, of course, named.

In his first year at the UN, Brad Morse is likely to be fairly quiet. He will be listening and learning, finding out where the keys are. Yost says Morse "deeply believes in the United Nations" and "is a happy augury that henceforth both the executive and legislative branches of our government may be induced to resume that United States leadership in the UN which contributed so much to its earlier successes."

The problem in Washington, and Morse is said to see it clearly, is twofold. Congress is disillusioned and disheartened by world affairs. It seems unable to modify the drift toward presidential domination or to alter the policies that have put the United States in a bad light. So it says, in effect, a plague on the world.

The Presidency, whether under Kennedy, Johnson or Nixon, appears immune to suggestions from outside. Presidents or their aides seemingly go to great lengths to block out ideas which run counter to their own. Kennedy with the Bay of Pigs, Johnson with the massive war escalation, Nixon with the Cambodian invasion and the mining of Haiphong ignored Congress and less militant advice from the State Department.

Morse is said to believe that Mr. Nixon, if he can reach him, will buy the United Nations as an alternative to the heavy burden of world policeman. At some point the President, whether Mr. Nixon or a successor, will want to shake off the burden of wars and military costs that playing world policeman brings. At this point, Brad Morse will slip in with practical thoughts.

His argument with the political establishment is that America's attempt to regulate the world by force or threat of force has failed, has been extraordinarily expensive (around a trillion and a half dollars) and has made us look like King Canute and his command to the sea. We should now try the kind of multilateral negotiations so successful in the congressional cloakrooms, where a consensus is formed from the antagonistic blocs. The Congress doesn't indulge in fist-fights; it plays the old game of horse trading. Why can't this be applied to the world?

While Morse does not put down big-power summitry, he sees this is leaving out and alienating the rest of the world, and so contributing to instability as new alignments try to break through the big-power hold. It also creates an uneven world society with some gorging at the table while others starve. He has complained of this lack of balance in the United States: "In the midst of the greatest affluence the world has yet known, poor Americans, black and white, go hungry in some parts of the country. Others subsist on diet that is far below what is necessary for basic nutrition."

In purely practical terms, if there are too many have-nots, if they are denied a voice in policy making, there will be rebellions and violence. In a time of instant communication, people and nations will not indefinitely accept poverty, manipulation and war. So, you make accommodations. You get the boys together in the cloakroom, and you work out a face-saving deal. In his own practical operations, Morse has never been particularly interested in those shibboleths of American politics, "victory" and "defeat." He doesn't regard them as particularly relevant. The main thing is to bring people together, and start moving.

Morse recognizes, as Yost has pointed out, that his effectiveness will depend in good part on how the United States behaves, and what influence he can have on Washington. Yost writes: "If the U.S. Administration chooses to bypass the UN in its handling of the great international political issues of our times, if Congress chooses while voting billions for armaments to be niggardly in providing for the very modest needs of the

world's chief peacekeeping organization, then neither the United Nations nor its American Under-Secretary is likely to play a significant role in the world our troubled times demand."

That is the crunch.

But, looking at Brad Morse through those who know him well, he has an almost fanatic faith that men and nations can manage peace and world order. He wants personally to be successful in proving it. One friend says, "The United Nations post is the apogee of Brad Morse. There is nothing more he wants than to prove he can do a damn good, effective piece of work in steering the world back from the brink."

The warring powers are exhausted from war and military spending and threats to peace. They are too suspicious of one another: to take big strides toward peace in bilateral talks. The world desperately needs skilled mediators whose interests are global rather than parochial. Today's United Nations may be just the arena where the new American Under-Secretary can practice his own brand of practical politics.

The kind of bargaining that goes on almost every day on Capitol Hill, as differences are patched over to pass legislation, could make possible a compromise if the mediator had the respect of both sides. No one expects Brad Morse to be able to fall into this role overnight. He is still an unknown quantity to most of the world. But what his associates do say is that he has the capacity to become this kind of bargainer for peace—if he has the time. No one knows whether events will rush too quickly, or whether he can "sweeten" the American political establishment's view of the UN.

Everyone I have talked to agrees Brad Morse is the best hope that has appeared in a long time. This is, in itself, an extravagant compliment, and one that he shies away from. He likes to start in any labor quietly, without fanfare, without headlines.

MRS. NIXON COMMENTS

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I have previously joined with other Members of Congress in taking issue with the recent statements attributed to Jane Fonda and Ramsey Clark concerning the bombing of North Vietnam. Unfortunately, thanks to these self-appointed guardians of the Nation, millions of people around the world now believe that the United States is deliberately bombing the dikes in North Vietnam.

An editorial which appeared in the Troy Record newspaper on August 10, applauded Mrs. Richard Nixon for rising to a White House challenge and taking a strong stand against the actions of Jane Fonda in Hanoi. The First Lady commented that the actress should have used the opportunity afforded her for more constructive ends.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include the editorial from the Troy Record, an outstanding newspaper in the 30th Congressional District. I fully agree with Mrs. Nixon and the sentiments expressed in the editorial. I believe that Miss Fonda and Mr. Clark could have done their country a great

service by asking the North Vietnamese leaders to end their aggression rather than allowing themselves to be brainwashed by Communist propaganda.

I have called upon the Department of Justice to make a complete investigation of their remarks to determine if there has been a violation of any Federal statute.

The editorial follows:

MRS. NIXON COMMENTS

Being the wife of the President of the United States requires more than presiding over pink teas.

The first ladies of earlier years may have remained in the background but this is no longer possible even if they so desired. They are swept along with the new movement of greater participation of women in all affairs.

Mrs. Nixon takes well to the trend. Although essentially a homebody she unhesitatingly rises to the White House challenges.

How well she does was demonstrated in her press conference this week. She took Jane Fonda to task about her charges of Americans bombing dikes in North Vietnam and well she might. She said that the actress should have asked Hanoi to stop its aggression.

With Mrs. Nixon we concur. The right of dissent should not be and is not denied in this country but Miss Fonda carries the right of dissent too far.

One could possibly say that her attitudes are due to naivete, that she is gullible and falls for Hanoi propaganda. There are many others who are critical of the role in Vietnam but who do not go hook, line and sinker for the whole North Vietnamese line as Miss Fonda appears to do. Miss Fonda finds few flaws in the Hanoi line.

She has strengthened the Hanoi line on the damage to dikes. It is becoming increasingly apparent that the North Vietnamese are cleverly preparing for the approaching flood season when dikes may be breached by high waters. Then they can blame the trouble on the Americans.

With the entre she had to Hanoi, Miss Fonda could have done her country a service. Instead she did it a disservice. She did her part in encouraging Hanoi and thus possibly prolonging the war and deferring still longer the return of prisoners.

Mrs. Nixon is well justified in her criticism of Miss Fonda and her role in the Vietnam situation.

McGOVERN'S LACK OF INTEREST

HON. BEN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, it has recently come to my attention that Senator McGovern has refused to receive briefings by the National Security Council regarding the strategic situation of the United States. Senator McGovern has the right to refuse the briefings, but it is most unusual for a major candidate for the Presidency to wish to stay in the dark regarding the strategic position of the United States. It does not surprise me that Senator McGovern does not want a briefing on the security needs of our country. His public statements have demonstrated not only a lack of interest but hostility to those needs. That is one reason he will be soundly defeated at the polls next November.

PRICE BILL TO RESCIND DES BAN

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, an old proverb says that one should not throw out the baby with the bath water. And yet, the Federal Food and Drug Act which has required a ban on the further use of diethylstilbestrol—DES—in animal feeds has accomplished this result.

The intentions of Congress in enacting legislation to protect the quality and purity of our food supply have undoubtedly been well meaning, and the pure food and drug laws have prevented the use of hazardous substances which might otherwise have found their way to the consumer in a strictly "buyer beware" marketplace.

However, our laws must be the product of reason and must deal with real instead of imaginary problems; they must not impose a "cure" that is worse than the "disease." And yet in the application of the Delaney amendment toward the use of DES we have achieved an injustice which demands corrective action. Commissioner Charles Edwards of the Food and Drug Administration has acted to order a ban on DES in animal feeds in spite of the fact that no known hazard to human health has ever been established after two decades of prescribed use.

DES in levels established and monitored by Government has been a boon to the American meat-consuming public and has allowed livestock producers to provide our people with an abundant supply of wholesome and nutritious meat at reasonable prices. The Delaney amendment, however, because of its zero toleration standards now threatens to ban this most useful product without any compensating benefits. If residues of a food additive appearing in food destined for human consumption are a definite threat to human health, we ought to take action to prevent their presence. However, because of increasingly sophisticated technology, our ability to find residue traces has reached a point where we can detect parts per billion and perhaps even parts per trillion. At what point do residues cease to be a threat to health, or put another way, what is to be gained by requiring a zero toleration of residues?

Mr. Speaker, the Delaney amendment requires the complete ban on DES in animal feeds assumingly because insignificant residues somehow pose a threat to health. Automobiles have killed more Americans than have been lost in all the wars this Nation has ever fought combined and contribute to pollution, congestion, and urban decay—and yet who among us will propose legislation to abolish the automobile, especially those of us who drove to work today?

Every year multiple thousands of Americans suffer injury and death from accidents in the home—but do these justify prohibiting the manufacture of bathtubs, tableknives, or staircases?

Fluoride is a known poison—but are we to deny the obvious benefits of using fluoride in our water supply in trace amounts for the prevention of tooth decay?

The threat to human health posed by trace amounts of DES residues nowhere approaches the risks involved in smoking a cigarette or getting into an automobile—in fact, the threat is nonexistent according to the best information available. We need, therefore, to amend the law to provide for the flexibility needed to administer the law in a reasonable manner. Some Americans are livestock producers and they will be adversely affected by a prohibition on DES; however, all Americans are consumers, we all eat meat, and we will all pay the penalty of higher prices without any demonstrable improvement in the quality of the meat that comes to our dinner table.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to modify the Delaney amendment to permit the continued use of DES in animal feeds when residues arising out of such use will not induce cancer in the insignificant amounts detected. Furthermore, I am writing to Commissioner Charles Edwards to request that full hearings on the use of DES in animal feed be promptly called so that the maximum consideration can be given to the best interests of the public and the cattle industry by a thorough study and examination of this matter. I insert into the RECORD at this time the text of my letter to Commissioner Edwards, and I call upon my colleagues in the Congress to take prompt action on this needed legislation:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 16, 1972.

HON. CHARLES C. EDWARDS,
Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Food and
Drug Administration, Department of
Health, Education, and Welfare.

DEAR MR. COMMISSIONER: As one who has been in contact with your office many times in recent months and as the representative in Congress of a district where livestock production represents a significant part of the regional economy, I am writing to express my deep concern over the decision not to hold hearings which had been under consideration concerning the use of diethylstilbestrol in animal feeds.

While the "Delaney Amendment" requires a zero toleration of residues of additives appearing in food destined for human consumption, and in spite of the recently announced findings of lingering DES residues in tests conducted by the United States Department of Agriculture, nevertheless, I believe a mistake has been made in the decision not to hold the DES hearings.

I realize that the law gives the Food and Drug Administration no leeway in banning DES in animal feed because of persisting residues, however, in view of your own candid admission that DES in amounts being detected constitutes no known threat to human health, the decision to go ahead and hold hearings would allow a more thorough and open consideration of this whole issue and would help focus needed attention upon the advisability of amending the highly restrictive Delaney clause.

We must apply the rule of reason to the law if we are to maintain public respect for those who enact and administer the law.

Thank you for your consideration, and I

look forward to hearing from you with great interest.

Sincerely,

BOB PRICE,
Member of Congress.

FORMER MASSACHUSETTS GOV.
ENDICOTT PEABODY SERVES
PARTY AND NATION IN FOCUSING
ATTENTION ON THE VICE PRESI-
DENCY

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's action of the Democratic National Committee, establishing a commission on the Method of Selection of the Democratic Nominee for Vice President, was most appropriate for a very particular reason. The vote came on a resolution that had been submitted by Endicott Peabody, former Governor of Massachusetts and the man who has done more than anyone else in modern times to focus serious attention on the office of Vice President.

This sound and well-reasoned resolution directs that the new commission submit recommendations by January 1, 1974. The commission's report, with any revisions made by the DNC, will become part of the temporary procedural rules of the 1976 Democratic National Convention.

As you know, Peabody was a candidate this year for the Democratic vice presidential nomination—the first man ever to actively campaign for the office. In the course of his campaign, he set forth a number of principles on the vice presidency. Briefly stated, they are:

That the Vice President belongs to the people and not to any one person, and should be selected in a free and open convention;

That the traditional means of selection of the vice presidential nominee, by his designation in advance of the nominating session by the presidential candidate, demeans the Office of Vice President and the man who holds the Office;

That with the Vice President a heartbeat away from the Presidency, and the history that 12 of our 36 Presidents have been Vice Presidents, no man should come to the Vice Presidency without a mandate from the people;

That our vice presidential nominee should only achieve this position by running for the office in party primaries and conventions, and that the delegates to the national convention should have a choice, not an edict, when they make their decision.

Apart from his activity this year, his wide reading, and his energetic analyses, Peabody has an enviable record of action in the realm of practical governmental reform. In 1963-1964, when he was Governor of Massachusetts, his administration engineered a great many improvements in the government of that State—so many that I will not attempt to list them all at this time. However, it should be noted that constitutional re-

form for improvement of the structure of Massachusetts government was high on his list of priorities. When his term started, the Massachusetts office of Governor was one of the Nation's weakest. When he returned to private life, it was as strong and effective as the office in any other State in our land. Eighty-four percent of his forward-looking legislative program was approved by a legislature that was initially resistant to many of the administration measures.

The people of Massachusetts still derive great benefit from that reform administration of nearly a decade ago. The Boston Herald said:

Governor Peabody's legislative achievements are likely to be a target for future governors to set their sights on for many years to come.

He has served in other posts, State and Federal, with great distinction. At the end of 1971, after much thought about the Vice Presidency, he announced that he would run for that Office.

His announcement was greeted with some disbelief and even amusement. In fact during his campaign he more than once had to answer the question, "You mean you're really serious about running for Vice President?"

Such reactions were not entirely unfamiliar to "Chub" Peabody. His first political race, in the 1950's, was from a district that had never before elected a Democrat. He was seeking a seat on the Massachusetts Governor's Council. Newspapers and other observers did not take him very seriously at first. But disbelief began to change to respect; the odds gradually changed, and he finally won the race.

He did not win the vice-presidential nomination in 1972. But his 7-month campaign in 37 States had a real impact. In March, in New Hampshire, he became the first man ever to win a Democratic vice-presidential primary, and he got 85 percent of the vote—more than Senators MUSKIE or MCGOVERN, more than Richard Nixon or SPIRO AGNEW.

Columnist Clayton Fritchey wrote:

Since most politicians laughed when Endicott Peabody, the former Governor of Massachusetts, decided the way to become Vice President is to run for the job, it is only fair to note that the public itself doesn't seem to think that the idea is at all ludicrous.

Roscoe Drummond said:

Endicott Peabody has done the most ridiculous and constructive thing at just the right time . . . I believe . . . it will be good for politics and good for government.

On the eve of the Democratic National Convention, July 8, the New York Times editorially said:

Mr. Peabody has performed a service by focusing attention on the Vice Presidency and campaigning for the nomination as if it were in fact already open.

And after the convention, as our party sought to solve the perplexing problems precipitated by an antiquated vice presidential selection process, Milton Viorst wrote:

We all tended to laugh, I'm afraid, when Endicott Peabody, the former Governor of Massachusetts, announced some months ago that he would campaign for the Democratic vice-presidential nomination. . . . I must

concede now that his reasoning in promoting his candidacy was valid.

In fact, the words spoken by Peabody in his long and frequently lonely campaign have in recent weeks been echoed and reechoed by newspapers, radio, television, political observers and plain citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that no one in the United States is better qualified for chairman of the new DNC Commission, by reason of foresight, practical experience, energy and serious original thought, than Endicott Peabody. He has long been a valuable member of our party—and he announced soon after the convention that he would campaign for the entire Democratic ticket this fall—but in the midst of vigorous campaign activity, "Chub" Peabody never loses sight of the future and the need for sensible party reform. Very obviously, he should be a member of the Commission. I think just as obviously that naming him as chairman would insure sensible and valuable results for the Democratic Party and for the Nation.

CONGRESSMAN FISH SUPPORTS THE INTERIM AGREEMENT OF THE LIMITATION OF STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE WEAPONS

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the House is asked to concur in an agreement reached between the United States and the Soviet Union, which would impose a 5-year limitation on the construction and deployment of ICBM's. This interim agreement limiting offensive strategic arms, along with ABM Treaty, is the product of over 2½ years of negotiations by the Nixon administration at the SALT talks in Helsinki. Together these agreements represent a truly historic first step in controlling the nuclear arms race and decreasing the possibility of the outbreak of nuclear war.

They are without parallel in history. Never before have the world's two most powerful nations, deeply divided by competing political systems and conflicting national interest, formally agreed to place limitations and restraints on their strategic nuclear arsenals. Throughout history nations have sought to accumulate more military power than their rivals in order to acquire the political strength such power might confer. But now both the United States and the Soviet Union, realizing that each additional increment to military power does not necessarily represent an increment of usable political strength, have abandoned their quest for military superiority and have instead attempted to stabilize the parity of power that now exists.

I clearly recognize that these agreements are no panacea insuring world peace. But they do represent a significant step down what can be a long but vital road to real peace. For nuclear weapons, particularly in the area of stra-

tegic arms with their power to destroy entire populations, form the hinges upon which the terror of modern war is hung. Until those hinges are cut, we can have no genuine generation of peace, and only a pious hope for the survival of civilization.

Toward this end I have urged including in the Republican platform a pledge to expand and build upon the successes of the historic SALT talk agreements signed by President Nixon in Moscow. In another move toward this goal, I am presently drafting a House Concurrent Resolution to urge the President, at the conclusion of SALT talks-2 to call a conference of all nuclear powers to negotiate a "no first use" nuclear agreement and a further reduction in strategic arms with the ultimate goal of total abolition of nuclear weapons.

A brief review of what has been accomplished through negotiation over the past 10 years indicates clearly that eventual success could lay at the end of the negotiations road. For example: a limited test ban treaty has been in effect since 1963; a nonproliferation treaty has been in force since 1970; an underseas arms control treaty was ratified only this year; a ban on biological agents and toxic weapons has been negotiated by the Committee on Disarmament; and the ban on antiballistic weapons has now been ratified.

In view of these successes, I feel it is now essential that the Congress commit this country to a national policy aimed at working toward the reduction of nuclear arms and eventual total nuclear disarmament.

The approval of this Interim Agreement legislation (H.J. Res. 1227) is essential in this quest. I strongly urge all my colleagues in the House to support it.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SUPERINTENDENT OF BUILDINGS, EMMANUEL RIDGELL

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it was with sincere sorrow that I recently learned of the passing of our longtime and faithful Superintendent of Buildings, Emmanel "Manny" Ridgell of Maryland.

For approximately 25 years, "Colonel" Ridgell, as he was affectionately called by many, worked diligently and efficiently in carrying out the difficult responsibilities of House Office Building Superintendent in the allocation, assignment and maintenance of office space and committee rooms for Members. In working with the Members, he was always cooperative and helpful. He always was friendly and understanding.

Despite the many problems that he faced each day in supervising the House Office Buildings, "Manny" Ridgell somehow managed to keep things running smoothly. He was faithful, cooperative and helpful. He will be greatly missed by

the Members of the House and his successor in office will need much skill and talent to maintain the high standards set by Superintendent Ridgell.

My deepest sympathy is extended to the members of Colonel Ridgell's family.

FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF INVASION OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, despite obvious conflicting views, frequent disagreements and continuous controversy associated with our election process, this country enjoys a freedom of expression which encourages constructive reform. In any election, a majority of the voters may implement reform at local and national levels of government. And once elected, a representative is free to carry out the wishes of his constituency in a responsible manner. But even as the majority acts to implement its own programs, any segment of the population is free to petition and dissent, persuade and debate.

In January of 1968, Alexander Dubcek became the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Czechoslovakian Communist Party. He responded to the wishes of the Czechoslovakian people by promising the "widest possible democratization" of the bureaucracy. But he emphasized that this was to be accomplished within the existing political system, without recourse to violence or threat. In commenting on a public appeal for reform as stated in the "2,000 Words" letter of June 27, Premier Oldrich Cernik specifically rejected recommendations for reform which "go so far as to call for demonstrations, strikes, picketing in front of the doors of officials, pressures and threats."¹

But in disregard of this clearly stated policy for peaceful and constructive internal reform, Communist governments outside Czechoslovakia addressed themselves to a mythical issue—a manufactured concern over "enemy forces" which would "divert Czechoslovakia from the path of socialism and expose it to the danger of being torn from the Socialist community." After inventing the threat, they then sought to justify their militant stand against it:

We shall never be resigned to imperialism making a breach in the Socialist system, by peaceful or unpeaceful means, from inside or outside.²

These statements are, quite obviously, alarming and unfounded. Yet they were apparently not complete without a suggested solution to the Czech "problem," one consisting of "resolute and coura-

geous attacks on the rightest and anti-Socialist state; cessation of the activity of all political organizations acting against socialism; that the Czechoslovakian Communist party must take into its own hands the means of mass communications—the press, radio, and television—so that they should be used in the interest of the working class, the workers, and socialism."

The deplorable action on the part of the Soviet Union, consisting of an armed invasion of the country of Czechoslovakia, was based on these phrases—a rationale devoid of logic, truth, or reason. That invasion took place August 21, 1968, without warning or, as is clear, justification. It is to the great credit of the Czechoslovakian Government that bloodshed was avoided. The announcement of the Presidium of Czechoslovakia reflects the concern of the people of that country, providing us a plaintive commemoration of that day:

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE PRESIDUM OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA OF THE INVASION OF SOVIET, POLISH, HUNGARIAN, AND BULGARIAN MILITARY FORCES, AUGUST 21, 1968

To the entire people of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic: Yesterday, on August 20, around 2,300 troops of the Soviet Union, the Polish People's Republic, the GDR, the Hungarian People's Republic, and the Bulgarian People's Republic crossed the frontiers of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. This happened without the knowledge of the President of the Republic, the President of the National Assembly, the Premier, or the first secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee.

In the evening hours the President of the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee held a session and discussed preparations for the 14th Czechoslovak Communist Party congress.

The Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee Presidium appeals to all citizens of our Republic to maintain calm and not to offer resistance to the troops on the march. Therefore, our army, security corps, and people's militia have not received a command to defend the country.

(Prague Domestic Service in Czech at 0330 GMT on August 21 rebroadcast the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee Presidium announcement with the following addition: "Therefore, our army, security corps, and people's militia have not received a command to defend the country because defense of our state frontiers is now impossible.")

The Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee Presidium regards this act as contrary not only to the fundamental principles of relations between Socialist states but also as a denial of fundamental norms of international law.

All leading functionaries of the state, the Communist Party, and the National Front: Remain in your functions as representatives of the people and organs to which they have been properly elected according to the laws and other norms valid in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

Constitutional functionaries are immediately convening a session of the National Assembly of our republic, and the Presidium is at the same time convening a plenum of the central committee to discuss the situation that has arisen.

(Signed) Presidium of the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee.

Source: Prague Domestic Service, Aug. 21, 1968.

WASHINGTON REPORT

HON. JOHN WARE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. WARE. Mr. Speaker, I am placing my Washington Report for July in the RECORD:

WASHINGTON REPORT

Almost everyone, personally or through friends and relatives, was affected by the devastating floods which inundated much of Pennsylvania last month. Before the torrential rains of Agnes ended and the President declared Pennsylvania a Disaster Area, the Federal Government's disaster relief efforts, encompassing 44 separate programs, were being activated, and legislative efforts were underway to make more help available to the victims.

Military services were pressed into rescue work, the Corps of Engineers directed the fight against the flooding rivers, and the Office of Emergency Planning summoned help from every unaffected state in the union. As the disaster moved into the recovery stage, virtually every agency of the federal government became involved. Congress passed and the President signed a bill clearing \$200 million for immediate relief measures. Now the President has asked the Congress for \$1.8 billion to help rebuild flood damaged communities, and I will support him.

He also proposed special disaster loans to affected homeowners and businessmen, with the first \$5,000 as a grant, and only a one percent interest rate on the balance. Five days after Agnes struck, 23 colleagues joined me in re-introducing legislation to double the present \$2,500 forgiveness feature. I introduced this bill after the September, 1971, floods struck my district, but it languished in committee. My bill provides a number of new features, including increasing the forgiveness feature of Small Business Administration loans from \$2,500 to \$5,000. The President has adopted this feature in the Administration bill.

I also joined in sponsoring legislation requiring homeowners with FHA or VA mortgage loans to carry government-subsidized flood insurance, as now required with fire insurance; and providing financial help to restore or replace essential railroad facilities and equipment lost or damaged by the flood.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Social Security benefits will increase by 20% beginning with checks received in October. To finance this needed raise for the retired, which I supported, and keep the Social Security Trust Fund solvent, it was necessary to raise the contributions of both employee and employer next January.

POLL RESULTS

Approximately 20,000 constituents responded to my April newsletter poll. Your answers have been tabulated and will prove helpful to me as a guide as I vote on legislation in the Congress. Some respondents lamented that only "yes" or "no" answers were called for in the poll. This type of response was necessitated by two things—(1) the task of tabulating the answers, and (2) these are the only choices I have when I vote. Many times I would like to vote "yes, but . . ." on a bill, but I cannot qualify my votes. Again, my appreciation to you who helped by suggesting the questions or answering them, and now for the results, with the "yes" vote shown first and percentages in parentheses:

1. Busing: 1,335 (3.8); 18,075 (96.2); 2. Financing secondary education by state: 6,915 (40.5) by federal government: 6,990

¹ Speech by Premier Oldrich Cernik to the Czechoslovak National Assembly, June 28, 1968.

² From the "Warsaw Letter" condemning "antisocialist developments" in Czechoslovakia, July 15, 1968.

(40.8) and neither: 3,150 (18.7); 3. Value-added (national sales) tax: 5,895 (33.5), 11,743 (66.5); 4. Increasing \$1680 limit on earnings for those on Social Security: 16,203 (87), 2,401 (13); 5. Increasing Social Security benefits by 5%: 4,110 (25), 10%: 4,874 (30), 15%: 1,803 (11), 20%: 4,119 (25), none: 1,231 (9); 6. Reducing "age of responsibility" to 18: 15,307 (79), 4,011 (21); 7. Granting Amnesty to those who fled the U.S. to avoid Vietnam service: 4,771 (25), 14,385 (75); 8. Approval of President's China trip: 16,185 (85), 2,657 (15); 9. Support of Phase II wage and price controls: 13,980 (75), 4,756 (25).
 Presidential Poll—Nixon: 11,505 (62); Wallace: 2,663 (14); McGovern: 1,331 (7); Humphrey: 615 3-1/3; Muskie: 569 (3) and Kennedy: 316 (1.7). All others received less than 1-1/2 percent of total.

FEDERAL SPENDING

Lately, I have been forced into opposing some worthwhile federal programs in an effort to stem the election year spending rate forced on us by the majority in Congress. Several billion dollars have been added to President Nixon's budget, and the Congress seems headed toward adding several billion dollars more. These inflated costs, added to our existing deficit of \$30 billion, are pointing toward something you and I want to avoid—increased taxes. Economies must be effected—and it can be done. As an example, a year ago, the Congress was nationally criticized for operating its restaurant and cafeterias at a loss of \$340,000—a loss made up by taxpayers. The House Administration Committee, of which I am a member, worked on the problem—cut staff, streamlined operations, realigned prices and this year will reduce that deficit to only \$70,000. I believe this will be eliminated by year's end. Many of us in Congress are economy-minded and are trying to cut costs of operating your government. Personally, although I am authorized a staff of 16 people, I find I can effectively operate my Washington office and my district offices with half that number. These comparatively small savings, if put into effect throughout our entire Federal government, can amount to a substantial reduction in our budget.

VIETNAM

We have now withdrawn our last combat infantry brigade from South Vietnam and officially ended our ground combat role there. When President Nixon took office 550,000 American troops were there. That is now down to 49,000 and the reduction is continuing. There are hopeful signs an official end to this distasteful conflict, not just our participation, is close. There are hopeful signs efforts now underway will bring peace to this area in a manner that will not appease Communism's aggressive forces.

NATIONAL HEROIN HOTLINE

Want to join the national fight against drug abuse? The Office for Drug Abuse Law Enforcement, directed by President Nixon, has established the below phone number, manned constantly, to receive information you have on heroin traffickers. The problem is serious, with over 500,000 heroin users in the country today, feeding a habit costing \$17 million daily. Federal expenditures for narcotics law enforcement has increased from \$20 million in 1969 to \$164 million in 1972. Phone: 800—368-5363.

SEARCH FOR MENTALLY RETARDED CHILDREN

Mentally retarded children are entitled to an education. State and federal governments are cooperating to locate 40,000 such children. If you know of such a child, please call the below phone number, also manned 24 hours daily. 717—787-3990.

REVENUE SHARING

This new approach, returning federal money to local control, which I supported since first campaigning for Congress, should eliminate red tape, speed up federally-funded

projects and produce more money for local work. After two years of effort, it passed the Congress and has been signed by the President.

SALT TREATY

One of the greatest hopes for a peaceful world future is now in the hands of the Senate. I believe it will be approved easily, opening vast possibilities for even greater breakthroughs in the arms race.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AFRO-AMERICAN REPUBLICANS

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, the National Council of Afro-American Republicans, Inc., recently had some good things to say about President Nixon, and also some comments of interest to people of both parties who seek an end to racial discrimination in this country.

The council's position was expressed last month in a letter from its national coordinator, Curtis T. Perkins, to Senator ROBERT DOLE of Kansas:

NATIONAL COUNCIL, AFRO-AMERICAN
 REPUBLICANS, INC.,

New York, N.Y., July 21, 1972.

Senator ROBERT J. DOLE,
 Chairman, Republican National Committee,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOLE: On the eve of the 1972 Republican Convention set for Miami Beach, August 21, the moment of truth as it affects Blacks in the Republican Party stares us all in the face.

The National Council of Afro-American Republicans has fought sincerely and courageously against great odds to get the Party to face up to its responsibilities and the aspirations of Blacks and other minorities. Yet the achievements in this direction, although resulting in some progress, are still not encouraging or hopeful.

We joined in the doings of the Black Political Convention in Gary—speaking vigorously to all comers, the common sense of Blacks—for their own good—to belong in larger numbers to the Republican Party so as to achieve some political balance. Equally we defended the achievements among Blacks by President Nixon. We also spoke candidly and hopefully of the shortcomings of the Party as it relates to Blacks and other minorities. On the latter, it is not a positive image here that we can feel proud.

We stood up for President Nixon when there was vilification by certain of the NAACP leadership at their conference in Detroit a fortnight ago.

We watched with chagrin when the Democratic National Convention had Blacks playing visible and dominant roles in their proceedings. We know our Party is not prepared here.

But beyond all this is the moral justification, despite that Black Republicans constitute only 16% of the Black vote, that they should participate fully in their Party.

Our aims which are spelled out here as follows—are very explicit:

At least 10 Black Republicans (At large by change of rules) on the Republican National Committee. There is not one Black on this Committee (A disgrace).

Responsible Black representation on all policy and executive committees of Republican State and County Committees where large numbers of Blacks are concentrated. Such is not the case now.

At least a Black Co-Chairman or Vice-Chairmanship of the Republican National Committee and at least one paid deputy assistant Chairman with decision making responsibility (with assistants).

A paid Black assistant State Chairman on all Republican State Committees where Blacks live in large numbers.

An increase to full 200 Black delegates for the 1972 Republican National Convention. There were only 26 Black delegates in 1968 and only 50 alternates.

More accountability to Blacks by Black Republican appointed officials.

A greater share of the Republican political dollar from the national, state and county committees to help defray the expenses of Black Republican candidates on all levels and for voter education and registration of Blacks as Republicans.

Fielding 10 Black Republican Congressional candidates in the 1973-74 elections. Recent surveys show that this is possible in 10 congressional districts not presently held by Black Democrats.

An increase in Black Republican strength to 33 1/3 % of the Black registered vote by 1974 through a concentrated grass roots program to attract Blacks.

Administrative Black Republican assistants on the staffs of all Republican U.S. Senators, Governors and U.S. Representatives in states and districts with large Black populations.

Use of more Black Republican campaign managers and consultants.

More contributions by Black Republicans to all levels of the Republican structure. Blacks should help pay their own way and not wait for handouts only.

The presentation of a Black Republican Program on all aspects of matters affecting Black American to the 1972 Republican National Convention's Platform Committee.

Yet, without realizing the necessity of correcting these shortcomings, some key people around the Republican National Committee and on the periphery of the Administration have accused NCAAR of being anti-Nixon. Some of these are Black.

Although we initiated the Black Dinner for the Re-election of the President, even making the hotel reservations at the Washington Hilton, June 10th, all we got were brickbats. Our National Chairman along with our key members, worked with this affair. We cooperated by pushing at least 500 of our members to attend—only asking that those working with the Dinner support our Black Republican Awards Luncheon. We got no support. We hope this will set the matters straight.

Although the President has an excellent record on balance in aiding Blacks and other minorities, much has been done by NCAAR to let these facts come known. We distributed several thousand copies at our expense, on his achievements in this regard. However, we resent our asking for Party reforms to be taken as being against the President. We are against the slow pace the Party machinery is moving to really make for Black participation and growth as Republicans.

Here are some crisis situations confronting blacks in the Republican Party.

It may interest you to know that the National Council of Afro-Americans is beginning to evaluate the number of Blacks now being accredited to the 1972 Republican National Convention. To date the results are disappointing.

NCAAR is prepared to challenge these state delegates from areas where Blacks live in large numbers for fair and moral representation. We are prepared to go into the Federal Courts, if necessary.

A delegate to a National political convention is an important individual who helps formulate his Party's course for the next four years. Real Black Republicans are beginning to take a serious look into this Convention

for a better count than 26 in 1968; plus only 56 alternates.

NCAAR is prepared to take whatever action necessary to increase the number of Blacks at the Republican Convention and their related visibility. Secondly, we pray there will be a Black Co-Chairman for this Convention.

We recommend such outstanding delegate-designates as Mayor Edward Bivens, Jr., of Inkster, Michigan; and Dr. Ethel Allen, Member, City Council, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. There are of course, others. If there is the specter of "Me Tooism" in putting a Black woman in this spot—certainly, there are good and capable Black males.

Thirdly, we urge that Blacks be fully integrated on all committees of the Convention.

Although NCAAR has been fighting vigorously for full participation of Blacks in all Party activities—it took the Democratic Convention to show its appreciation of its Black constituency. This could have been resolved long before the Democrat farce in Black and Republican interests.

If Mr. Nixon is to receive 25% of the Black vote in 1972, certainly, the full program of NCAAR must be adopted totally. We fully support his reelection. Mr. Nixon has been a bold, imaginative and innovative President, both in domestic affairs and in international relations. No other President has dared to do so. None can certainly match his achievements. The Republican National Committee can be equally as forthright in dealing with Blacks.

We will have more to say before, during, and after the Convention—for the Republican Party belongs to Blacks as it does to any other citizens or groups who decide to work in and out of it to make it viable and effective.

My best to you always,
Cordially,

CURTIS T. PERKINS,
National Coordinator.

MORE WALLED PRISONS: THE WRONG MODEL

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the National Council on Crime and Delinquency for their recent report recommending a halt in construction of more penal institutions.

It is widely agreed that prisons corrupt rather than correct. It is time we stopped warehousing criminal offenders and started expanding the rehabilitative opportunities which have the potential for moving people away from a life of crime.

I insert in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post explaining the basis for NCCD's recommendation, and a column by Tom Wicker emphasizing that building more prisons means wasting taxpayers' money on a thoroughly discredited model of how to deal with crime and criminals.

The articles follow:

[From the New York Times, July 27, 1972]

THE WRONG MODEL

(By Tom Wicker)

The Federal Bureau of Prisons is beginning to put into effect a ten-year plan for building more than sixty new correctional facilities that will cost taxpayers over \$650 million at present estimates. This is well-intended, under President Nixon's mandate to make the Federal prison system a "model,"

but such a construction program seems to many critics the wrong way to proceed.

Norman Carlson, the director of the bureau, says that many of the new facilities are to be halfway houses and the like, instead of institutional prisons; and that the prisons to be built are to replace such outmoded facilities as McNeill Island in Puget Sound, which has been in use since 1865. "We are not going to build a lot of new Leavenworths and Atticas," Mr. Carlson insists.

But others in the corrections field argue that that is not the point. The best evidence, they say, is that the institutional prison, no matter how modern, provides the least effective kind of correctional system. Therefore, if the Federal Government wants to set up a model, it ought to be doing better things than building prisons, particularly when the trend in many states is toward closing them.

The Federal plan, for instance, calls for three new centers for youthful offenders on the West Coast; yet, in California alone, two relatively new state youth facilities have been recently emptied of inmates and two others were built and never have been used. California also is moving toward closing its medieval San Quentin prison.

This is not a radical "do-gooder" policy. Governor Ronald Reagan hardly qualifies as either of those; yet, during his administration, California has begun to subsidize the development of non-institutional correctional programs in local communities; about 80 per cent of its offenders are now in such programs, which made unnecessary the youth facilities already mentioned, as well as San Quentin.

In Rhode Island, for the last decade, a successful "deferred conviction" program has been keeping most felony offenders out of prisons, and on local probation. In Wisconsin, almost 80 per cent of offenders are in non-institutional correctional programs. New Mexico was able to drop plans for building a \$20-million prison by instituting more effective probation and parole systems. Communities like Saginaw, Mich., Des Moines and Seattle, have had great success with non-institutional correctional programs.

When the state of Florida was forced to turn loose 1,252 prisoners in 1965, because they were found (as a result of the case of *Gideon v. Wainwright*) to have been constitutionally convicted, a study showed that the recidivism rate among them was only 13.6 per cent nearly thirty months later. Among another group of convicts who served their sentences and were normally released, the recidivism rate was 25.4 per cent, which led Florida's corrections chief, Louis L. Wainwright, to say: "This mass exodus from prison may prove that there are many inmates presently in prison who do not need to be there in order to protect society." Some authorities in the field estimate that no more than 15 per cent of today's prison population needs to be behind bars for reasons of public safety.

On the other hand, almost no one disputes the proposition that prisons tend to create crime, rather than "correcting" anybody. Mr. Nixon, in his prison reform directive to former Attorney General Mitchell—one of the best papers of the Nixon Administration—called the present American prison system "a convincing case of failure." From Attica to San Quentin, that can be amply documented.

The National Council on Crime and Delinquency is preparing to make public a plea for a total halt to the building of detention and penal institutions, urging that earmarked funds be allocated to expanded community correctional programs. At the moment, almost \$2 billion in prison, jail and juvenile facility construction is projected throughout the country.

In these circumstances, the council also will recommend that the Federal Bureau of Prisons be converted into an agency that

would provide technical assistance, program guidelines and research for state and local governments that develop community corrections programs instead of building new penal and detention institutions.

Mr. Carlson undoubtedly is correct that there will always be some offenders who have to be imprisoned for public safety; but these are the few rather than the many, and they scarcely justify the Federal Government embarking now on a vast program of prison construction. That seems exactly the wrong model to provide, at a time when Federal leadership and assistance might go far toward eliminating an American penal system that encourages rather than prevents crime.

[From the Washington Post, July 28, 1972]
STUDY SEEKS HALT IN CONSTRUCTION OF PENAL INSTITUTIONS

(By Tim O'Brien)

A private organization that studies crime and delinquency in the United States called yesterday for major reforms in the nation's corrections system.

The National Council on Crime and Delinquency recommended a "total halt" to the construction of detention and penal institutions.

The council—whose members include criminologist-psychiatrist Karl Menninger, New York police commissioner Patrick V. Murphy, and Duke University President Terry Sanford—also called for abolition of the Federal Bureau of Prisons and payment of at least "established minimum wages" for work performed by the nation's prisoners.

Recommending a halt to prison construction, the council said the country should stop wasting "massive sums on a system that has not worked in the past and is not likely to work in the future." The council urged, instead, that the nearly \$2 billion now earmarked for jail construction be diverted to expanded community treatment programs.

Len Tropin, public education director for the council said "the trend now is toward community-oriented facilities and rehabilitation. That's the way the LEAA (Law Enforcement Assistance Administration) operates—pouring money into the states, cities and communities."

"Until all forms of community-based corrections are used to the optimum," the council said, "the size, location, or type of facility required for the few remaining offenders requiring institutional commitment cannot be accurately planned."

While recognizing that institutions are needed for dangerous criminals, the council reported that only 15 per cent of the people now incarcerated actually need maximum security. "On that basis," the council said, "we have vastly more institutional space than we need."

The council would also abolish the Federal Bureau of Prisons, replacing it with a "federal correction agency" that would provide program guidelines, technical assistance and leadership to state and local governments.

By turning over all federal penal institutions to the states, the federal government would be free to "monitor guide and offer strong leadership to the communities," Tropin said. "The idea is to get the federal government out of the imprisoning business and into the guidance and leadership business."

The council said the very existence of a Federal Bureau of Prisons "impedes a state's trend toward community correction."

Charging that the nation's prison labor system is counter-productive, the council recommended that inmates be salaried at established minimum wage rates. Presently, they said, the average prison laborer receives from 10 to 65 cents a day.

The council's statement also urged that prisoners be given jobs that offer adequate training that will prove applicable in the job market after their release. The council

August 16, 1972

said much of the current prison labor is nothing but "busy work."

TELEPHONE PRIVACY—XXXIV

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 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 polltakers. Also not covered would be debt collection agencies or any other individual or companies with whom the individual has an existing contract or debt.

I have received an enormous amount of correspondence on this legislation from all over the country. Today, I am placing a 32d 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:

BENSENVILLE, ILL.,
July 27, 1972.

Representative LES ASPIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ASPIN: I am most interested in having bill HR-14884 adopted to eliminate the constant nuisance calls perpetrated upon the public by the "telephone peddlers". The situation is becoming intolerable in that much too frequently I receive three calls a day trying to sell me property or home improvements. Our telephone was installed for our own personal use. I would have an unpublished listing except for the fact that frequently we have friends from out of town visiting and too often they have left our phone number at home which necessitated looking us up in the phone book. I do hope you will do all in your power to push this bill through.

I also hope in the very near future a bill will be passed to eliminate the tax on telephones which was instituted during World War II. A telephone is a necessary evil not a luxury.

Very truly yours,

GLENVIEW, ILL.,
July 28, 1972.

Representative LES ASPIN,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ASPIN: I am writing to support your bill HR-14884.

My telephone is no longer a convenience; it is a nuisance.

Selling by telephone has reached such

proportions in this area, the Chicago North Suburban area, in my opinion, it is an invasion of my privacy. It is no longer the local merchant who calls, to check to see if he can deliver his goods. All day long it is an assortment of calls: aluminum siding salesmen; dry cleaners; rug companies; charity schemes which end up being newspaper subscriptions, any number of charities asking you to go door-to-door for donations, so many charities that you do not even recognize the name of the disease it is supposed to be for. And the most blatant intruder of all of the callers, is the land scheme promoter. They call all hours of the day, outlining trips to see lake property, with invitations for "free" dinners and a presentation of film promotion of land, or to promote free trips across country to see retirement property. They even call long-distance, from all over the country.

The type of call which distresses me most, now, is the land promoter who seems to hire housewives, calling from their own homes. The other evening at 9:30 p.m. I received the fourth such call of the day, a call from one of the recreational lake promoters, and the caller was a young woman, with a baby crying in the background. This type of call, where a promoter uses people calling from their own homes, with unlimited private telephone usage, and only pays them for referral names, should be curbed immediately.

Another facet of the problem is the inactivity of the FCC. I thought one of the primary purposes of the regulatory agency was to protect the rights of the individual. I understand that the individual has a right to business by telephone, but I believe it should be regulated, so that if I do not want to have the privacy of my home invaded. I would have some recourse.

Also, I was disappointed that the FCC did not intercede and fight for the right of the individual to receive a clear TV signal, in the case of the erection of the Sears, Roebuck and Co. office building.

I have had a long discussion with one of the supervisors of the local office of the telephone company, and she offered no satisfactory solution, short of having the telephone removed (which she did not suggest, but may have to be our ultimate solution). She told me that an unlisted number does not even deter the calls, significantly.

Also, I find that the non-competitive utility, the telephone company, even gives courses on how to use the telephone for sales work, and the local library carries a book on how to increase telephone sales!

If there is anything I can do to help promote your bill, HR-14884, please let me know.

Ma Bell and/or the sales agents need regulating.

Ma Bell is now a nuisance, not a convenience!

Sincerely,

We people of Milwaukee, Wisconsin would like to add our names to people in favor of the bill pending in Congress HR-14884, under which we would not be bothered by telephone solicitors.

Mrs. Mary Haas, Mrs. Warren Geschke, Mrs. Dorothy McMillin, Wm. Betz, Pat Flood, Mrs. Chris Haase, Sharon Wiedenhoef, G. McDowell, Lillian Warnke, Mrs. Chris Haase, and Betty Stenson.

DENVER, COLO.,
August 8, 1972.

HON. LES ASPIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ASPIN: Congressional Record, July 19, 1972, page 24534, within your Extension of Remarks "Telephone Privacy—XXV", quotes an anonymous letter from Chicago, Ill., as follows:

"Hon Les Aspin, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

SIR: Add two votes in favor of your bill—H.R. 14884—to forbid telephone solicitation. I will boycott any S.O.B. who solicits business via telephone.

"Emphatically yours,

That letter expresses my views precisely. More power to you and your bill.

Sincerely,

P.S.—No reply necessary.

DR. CARL KUPFER RECEIVES SPECIAL CITATION

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to my attention that Dr. Carl Kupfer, Director of the National Eye Institute, has received the special citation awarded by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, a prestigious departmental honor award which is presented for outstanding performance.

Secretary Elliot Richardson's special citation was awarded to Dr. Kupfer for creating, with limited resources, a unified research organization at the National Institutes of Health, dedicated to conducting and supporting research on the improved prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of blinding and disabling eye diseases.

Dr. James C. Tumblin, president of the American Optometric Association, pretty well summed up the high esteem in which Dr. Kupfer is held by professional organizations in the field of vision care, when he stated:

The American Optometric Association is pleased to note Secretary Richardson's enthusiastic praise for the job Dr. Kupfer has done in organizing an outstanding research institute and assembling an exceptionally talented and dedicated staff in a relatively short period of time. His awareness of the need for a balanced program of intramural and extramural research in the areas of eye diseases and functional vision problems represents a major step toward overcoming many of the conditions which result in poor visual performance or blindness. We commend Dr. Kupfer for the outstanding work he has done, and offer our wholehearted support for the continued work of the National Eye Institute.

Dr. Kupfer, a graduate of Yale University and Johns Hopkins, is the first National Institutes of Health recipient of the Secretary's special citation since 1966. Prior to assuming the duties of Director of the National Eye Institute, he was assistant professor in ophthalmology at Harvard Medical School and later professor and chairman in ophthalmology at the University of Washington School of Medicine.

I know many of my colleagues here in the House share my interest in the progress of the National Eye Institute, which we helped to authorize through legislation in 1968. I am pleased that the Director of the National Eye Institute is a resident of my district, and I join Secretary Richardson and the eye care professions in offering Dr. Kupfer sincere congratulations on a job well done.